

Linguistic Identity of Conference Messages in the Philippines

Lynn M. Besa¹, Gina O. Gonong²

^{1,2} *Department of Arts and Languages*

Email: ¹besalynn@yahoo.com, ²Gonong.go@pnu.edu.ph

Abstract

Writing is an expression of oneself. Hence, it becomes an avenue in constructing identity. This study explored the structure of the conference messages, examined the linguistic features that characterized a certain group of writers, and explained how identity gets constructed using linguistic features. Discourse analysis was used in the analysis of 246 messages from different international conference programs held in the Philippines. The messages are revealed to be structured in an introduction-conference details-closing structure, which resembles a linear writing pattern. The linguistic features characterize such as the lexical bundles provided immediate clues that serve as essential means in facilitating discourse processing and producing with ease. Metadiscourse markers empowered the writers to express themselves as authorities while guiding the readers towards a clear, fluid, and engaging discourse. The linguistic styles such as code-switching, the language of religion, polite expressions, and positive tone reflected the distinct ways of expressing ideas. Moreover, the other linguistic elements, including deictics, the generic pronoun 'all,' and addition and reiteration, strengthened clarity and inclusiveness in the discourse. In conclusion, linguistic features in the conference messages were instrumental in constructing a clear, interactive, inclusive, religious, polite, and positive linguistic identity.

Keywords— construction, discourse analysis, linguistic identity, language features

I. INTRODUCTION

Language, as a form of expression, links identity. Language gives shape to the images of identity [1]. It serves as a 'site of identity construction' [2]. Reference [3] in [4] cited that some aspects of identity are constructed for humans while others construct themselves through linguistic development and language use, which is called linguistic identity. Linguistic identity refers to the identity expressed depending on which language one uses in a given setting. It is not a subtype of natural identity since individuals do not acquire identity through birth but as they socialize into the language [5]. [6] expounded this by stating that linguistic identities belong to the broader social identity or a community of equal language resources [7]. It means that a person is creating an impression globally and identifies himself/herself socially through language.

Writing is an expression of oneself and a reflection of one's soul. Writing, as a discourse, is central to personal experience and social identities. According to [8], as cited by [9], writing is a tool in the construction of identity where "discourse becomes a carrier of social values" and "as a manifestation of social interaction." The language used in writing performs an essential role both in the construction and expression of identity. [10], in his study among African American student writers, revealed a strong relationship between students writing and their socially constructed realities as demonstrated in their written text. [11], on his part, found that writers' representations of identities are indicated in their multi-literate choices of communication. In several reviews, [12] mentioned that identity becomes a fundamental concept in studying written discourse. [9], in their investigation, found that metadiscourse elements play an

essential role in the construction of identity in academic writing. [13] reviews on studies on voice as a significant rhetorical style in projecting identity arrived similar findings.

Similarly, [14], in their review of numerous studies in academic discourse, found correlations between identity and various linguistic resources. Thus, several linguistic features are found to be associated with the construction of linguistic identity. Therefore, the language used in written messages is a good source of data. It could enrich current studies on identity, communication, and culture. Furthermore, it could lead to a more integrated and stronger theory of linguistic identity—understanding the power of language in constructing identity and considering the dearth in the study of linguistic identity using the discourse of academic messages.

This study intended to uncover the linguistic identity of international conference program messages held in the Philippines from 2013-2018. Specifically, this study aimed to determine the structure of the conference messages, examine the linguistic features that characterize a certain group of writers, and explain how identity gets constructed using linguistic features. Moreover, the study explored discourse as a social practice and how language was used as a means of identity construction.

Since sociolinguistics is committed to advancing knowledge about social life and the role of language in it, the study also tried to uncover insights on linguistic use for the expressions of identity. This study attempted to disclose data that demonstrate different linguistic categories to help see things in context and link language usage to a collective identity formation in the written discourse. As part of 21st-century teaching and learning skills, communication, collaboration, and social skills, this study also aimed to impact some implications for a second language curriculum and pedagogy that will point to the need for the integration of new ways of teaching specifically in the area of written communication and will

provide valuable contributions to sociolinguistic research and discourse analysis.

II. METHODOLOGY

Research Design

A descriptive qualitative design was activated in the conduct of the study. According to [15], descriptive qualitative design helps explore the negotiation and construction of meaning. It also demonstrates discourse production through language use [16] while considering the social actions in communicating within a socio-cultural context [17].

As such, discourse analysis, which also serves as text analysis as van Dijk used the term [18], was the method used in the study. It involves analyzing a text and how writers with social, cultural, and personal identities use language in social and cultural contexts. Discourse analysis was employed in analyzing language in use where the pattern of discourse structure was unveiled, shared linguistic features were characterized, and consequently, linguistic identity was constructed. In the method of discourse analysis, texts were accounted collectively. It was their interconnection that made discourse analysis valuable. Thus, referring to the concrete bodies of the text where discourses were produced, allowing the disclosure of the interplay between discourse, text, and identity as constructed built the focus of discourse analysis [17].

Source of Data

The messages are the source of data in the study. These messages were forwarded to the organizing committee by selected personalities, primarily political figures, institutions' officials, conference chairs, and organization heads in the different international conference programs held in the Philippines from 2013-2018. The messages were selected based on the hierarchy of positions of the personalities giving the messages. To avoid duplication of names of the message providers or the so-called writers, the next in rank officials were chosen as alternatives. The message providers originated from Asian, Middle East, African, European and American regions. Thus, it could be

surmised that the majority of the message providers are Filipinos.

The messages in the international conferences were categorized into the following nature or fields:

Multidisciplinary, Engineering, Science and Technology, Language, Literature and Language Education, Social Sciences and Philosophy, Teacher Education, Philippine and Asian Studies

Medicine, Biology/ Biodiversity, Nursing, Sexual Health and Rights, Health, Surgery and Therapy, Transplantation, Pharmacy, Ophthalmology

Economic, Business, Finance, Energy, Food Trades and Industry, Agriculture,

Tourism, Korean Studies and Cultural Studies

Governance, Urban Planning, Public Administration

Community Issues, Human Rights, Red Cross/ Humanitarian, Poverty and Sustainable Development, Environment, Children studies, Gender studies.

Data Collection and Analysis

The study was limited to available but different international conferences held in the Philippines from 2013-2018. To collect the required data, the researcher used snowball sampling. Snowball or chain referral sampling is mostly utilized in qualitative sociological research when referrals are made by people or informants who share the same characteristics [19]. In this study, the researcher first identified a group of people who attended international conferences in the Philippines from 2013 to 2018, from whom she requested copies of the conference programs. Then, those identified individuals recommended people who provided the needed data [20].

The other conference programs were requested directly from the conference committee through the suggestion and recommendation of those aware or participants of the other conferences held within the coverage period. In comparison, the rest of the other data were retrieved from public online archives, considered open-source data.

In the data analysis, several steps were accomplished to realize the objectives of the study. In the initial stage, preliminary activities such as collecting, consolidating, and sorting conference program books were made. The final selection of the messages was conducted by considering the criteria of the selection of materials. In uncovering the program messages' structure, the semantic macrostructure [21] was used as a guide in determining the gist or themes of the messages. Topics were extracted, categorized, coded, and themed. In shaping the paragraph stages, themes were extracted and outlined following [22] model of contrastive rhetoric and [23] discourse structure to uncover the pattern of paragraphs stages and arrive at the overall structure of the messages. Thus, stages or sequences were closely monitored through validation to check the patterns of text organization. Linguistic features were analyzed through discourse analysis, and following [24] Model of interactional metadiscourse. Finally, in explaining how identity was constructed and what linguistic identity was constructed, the researcher examined the linguistic features' characteristics that marked their distinction as international conference program messages from 2013-2018 held in the Philippines and connected it to the overall text structure. The interpretation of data involved the attachment of meaning to linguistic features and the link of the structure to the features. This process was done by looking for relationships and linkages between linguistic features and linguistic identity. Eventually, the linguistic identity was identified and described through the use of linguistic features.

III.RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Structure of the Conference Messages

The messages unveil the **introduction-conference details-closing** flow of messages, which resembles a **linear structure**. The linear structure of writing means that the first paragraph acts as the introductory or initial part. The introductory paragraph precedes the conference details, where most of the information about the conference is expressed. It is followed by the last paragraph, which is

tagged as the closing part where the writers dominantly forward their positive aspiration of the outcome of the conferences.

In the given data, although there are instances that deviate from the standard components of the initial paragraph, the introduction part typically includes greeting, welcome, and recognition. The **recognition part** of the introduction is presented in acknowledgment, commendation, congratulatory statements, and appreciation. The **greetings** express sincerity condition which establishes an interpersonal relationship between the writer and the audience. Thus, greetings are aimed at the courteous indication of the recognition of the audience. Moreover, greetings are classified as **topic initiation, verbal salute, and references** to the audience. The data are also classified as **time-free greetings** as categorized by [25] while expressing perfunctorily, if not genuinely, certain feelings of politeness toward the audience. The Welcome in the messages are symbolic installations that are testimonials about particular events [26]. **Commendation** expresses an act of commending, praising, or giving favorable representation in words that show a sense of affection or respect; compliment; and greeting, which is the ground of approbation or praise given in recognition. **Acknowledgment** displays an act of acknowledging or expressing gratitude equivalent to **Thank you**, which expresses sincerity where the writers want to enhance the harmonious atmosphere to some degree equivalent to "how are you," "Good luck" [27]. In the **conference details** section of the program, messages contain detailed presentations or information about the conferences and organizations, while the closing part generally comprises the aspiration for a positive outcome.

The overall structure of the program messages shows a **linear flow of presentation of information**; a typical writing pattern acted about what is expected in an essentially local context motivated by social norms. Writers typically start the communication thread by giving the audience a sense of recognition and

making them feel at ease through greetings and welcome remarks. Then, pieces of information will be presented. The last paragraph is usually an expression of solidarity through an assumption of a positive outcome. Moreover, the linear pattern implies a direct intention to send a positive atmosphere by welcoming, acknowledging, and thanking both the participants and Committee members while hoping for an insightful result.

In sum, it could be gleaned that the themes in each paragraph, which is based on van Dijk's Macrostructures and the sequence of the themes which illustrates the structure of the conference program messages, following the typical textual progression posited by [22], stating that the English text was a characteristically linear and hierarchical textual pattern. Thus, the structure helped create emphasis and build the frame of the conference program messages.

Lexical Choices Used in the Messages

Lexical bundles are sequences of words that reveal formulaic expressions and certain language patterns. These formulaic sequences or language often have pragmatic and discourse functions used and recognized within a specific context [28]. The study discloses several lexical items used in constructing linguistic identity. These lexical bundles functioned not only as introductions, closing, leave-taking, and offering of positive reinforcement [27], but they also unveiled the writers' stance, which implicates both linguistic form and social norms concerning social factors to enhance rapport or solidarity. Moreover, these available expressions are the so-called socio-culturally appropriate language that provides the writers the power to express ideas and the chance to establish solidarity among the readers [29].

Pronouns claim solidarity by conjoining the audience and indirectly symbolize social relation as they manifest a pragmatic function of **inclusiveness**. The word "**also**" functions as a clarificatory signal or reminder of the idea presented. Similarly, the adverb **again** and the phrase **once again**, meaning once more, are not only used as transitional markers but are used to

repeat or **reiterate** an idea. The use of **also** and **once/again** stress something previously said while **projecting clarity** of information or idea. **Deictic expressions** such as spatial deixis (this, here) and time deixis (now) are used to help realize what is close to the writer and what is not by defining the author's 'situatedness' in the rhetorical space [30]. Spatio-temporal deictics condition the audience of the idea presented and position them to take part in the discourse [31], which helps establish joint attention and a shared domain in space and time [32].

Metadiscourse unveils how the writers present their arguments while projecting their attitudes and commitments to their readers. Furthermore, metadiscourse enables the writers to judge certain propositions as they convince the audience about the significance of their position in the discourse [33]. The metadiscourse elements used in the study are divided into two, namely, **interactive** and **interactional**. **Interactive metadiscourse** features include *transitions* and *frame markers*, while the **Interactional features** consist of two categories: *stance* and *engagement*. *Stance* includes *hedges* where *modals* manifested, *self-mentions*, and *boosters* where *amplifiers* and *emphatics* are expressed. *Engagement* involves *reader pronouns* and *rhetorical questions*. Metadiscourse unveiled how ideas are organized and signaled writers' attitudes and assisted the readers by negotiating and engaging them in the text [34]. The interactive plane acted as the text constructor, which informed the reader of what was going on. Thus, interactive resources focus on cues that signal the arrangement of texts according to the reader's background [35]. On the other hand, interpersonal resources involved the audience in developing the text by shaping and constraining the texts [36]. A strong relationship and interaction between writers and readers are established in the conference program messages through metadiscourse markers. As [37] states, relationships and social interaction between writers and readers are revealed through metadiscourse.

Language Styles Used in the Messages

Code-switching

Code-switching (CS) is a variety of language styles where the language used in text shifts from one code to another for various purposes and to establish conversational footings [38]. Writers are found to use CS as forms of end greetings and thanks. Some of the code-switched languages are regional dialects- L2 and Philippine regional dialects native to most message providers. Some are insertions of native/ official languages like Mexican, Korean, Thai, and Indonesian as evidence of national identity. The other code-switched languages, such as *Animo La Salle! (Spirit, La Salle)* and *Mabuhay ang mga guro para sa bayan! Padayon UP! (Let us move forward, UP)* are academic institutions' trademarks used not only to express group identity but also to create an identity. The utilization of CS patterns (re) constructs and negotiates individual and interactional aspects of identities. CS allows the positioning of the writers in the text. The different CS patterns exhibited multifaceted identities and became a means for identity expression and belonging signalization [39] emphasizing self-identity and marking group membership and solidarity. The use of CS allows the writers to unpack a social identity, which eventually unravels ethnic identity [40] to represent this affiliation while claiming an identity. The data reveals that the CS patterns (re)construct and negotiate individual and interactional aspects of their identities. The different CS patterns exhibit multifaceted identities [39], which emphasizes self-identity and marks group membership and solidarity. Thus, CS serves as a key element in building and negotiating a collective identity [41].

Inclusion/ Presence of Religious Language

One unique characteristic of the messages is the inclusion and acknowledgment of an external force, a supreme power as an intervening action. The citation of "God" and "blessing" reveals a culture of religiosity. Hence, it could be detected from the messages the invocation of divine guidance for the success of the

conference. The inclusion of the lines ‘*God bless us all*’ indicates the writers’ acknowledgement of a supreme being who ‘*shall provide*’, ‘*bless us all*’ and could grant a ‘*fruitful conference*’. Their religiosity which perceived to provide armor against anguish and a key towards a flourishing life according to [42] may somehow reflect South East Asian culture.

Manifestation of Positive Tone

The writers’ use of *I wish, I hope, I’m looking forward, May the...* pertain to a positive tone. The use of these phrases exhibits a positive assumption of the outcome of the events which unveils positive identity. This positive tone holds the writer’s personal, relational, and social identities by [43]. Through the use of these phrases, the writers constructed a positive tone of writing by understanding their role-identity and aligning their messages with the expectations of the audience. Through group identification, they try to categorize themselves as part of the social group and associate themselves as members, sharing the same emotional and social involvement with the other group members [44].

Reflection of Polite Expressions

The conference program messages hint at traces of **politeness**. The introduction, which contains greetings, acknowledgment, and commendation, presents a culture of positive politeness. Lexical bundles reflect a highly ritualistic interaction of taking on a face [45]. Metadiscourse which seems to be culturally induced, functions as politeness strategies [46]. The use of interactional elements such as stance and engagement implicitly demonstrate polite manners by down-toning or indirectly stating facts and acknowledging the presence of the readers. They operate as mitigators [47] [48] and exhibit politeness strategy [49], which shapes polite communication. **Politeness** and **indirectness** are also demonstrated through hedging as writers indirectly build their arguments in the messages, parallel to [50]

study, where hedges make indirect and polite statements.

Construction of Linguistic Identity Through the Use of Linguistic Features

The presence or use of selected linguistic features- *lexical bundles, metadiscourse elements, linguistic styles, and other linguistic items* such as deictics, generic pronoun all, and addition and reiterations enable the construction of identity of the conference program messages. The linguistic features in the conference program messages exhibit identity while negotiating the meaning in the texts. [51] mentioned that identities might be linguistically indexed through linguistic structures, labels, stances, and styles. Thus, linguistic features play a pivotal role in constructing linguistic identity.

The conference program messages are identified to have negotiated a common ground in expressing information: Transitions and frame markers facilitated the shifting of ideas and a smooth flow of information. The presentation of themes and sequence of paragraph organization discloses a **linear** and **clear** presentation of ideas. Moreover, the conference program messages create an **interactional** and **inclusive environment**. Through the aid of lexical bundles, additions, reiterations, deictics, and boosters, readers are easily able to decipher the purpose of the messages. The generic pronoun all, including the engagement markers like reader pronouns and rhetorical questions, creates an interactional atmosphere and establishes **inclusiveness** among the participants in the discourse. The messages are identified to exhibit an **interactive** and **engaging** atmosphere because the writers tried to interact with the audience through the pronouns you, we, and our and rhetorical questions [as forms of engagement]. The writers’ involvement of the audience in the discourse [52] strengthens the **identity of solidarity**.

In the development of well-structured messages, the use of hedging redirects impact while boosting amplifies the arguments. The

linguistic features also reveal a welcoming atmosphere as [53] accounted that soft field articles use more hedges and boosters to make arguments. On the one hand, linguistic features unveil a sense of authority while being interactive. The use of self-mentions reflects a sense of **authority**, while the lexical bundle *in/on behalf* of illustrates **representation**. These stance elements provided the writers the textual voice [54] and audience participation [55] which implies social interaction [53].

Different linguistic styles visibly create a sense of linguistic identity. Code-switching is closely associated with identity expression. Various codes could be viewed as an automatic indicator of membership in a particular ethnic or socioeconomic group. The switching of codes also expresses either **empathy** or **solidarity** as a form of identity. Thus, CS allows the expression of identities, which creates a sense of closeness both to culture and family [56],[57]. Since CS is cultural, it is socially motivated [58], which allows the "negotiation of change in the social distance." [59]. The presence/ inclusion of religious phrases demonstrates a **religious identity** typical to Christian nations like the Philippines. The linguistic features depict an image of **politeness** and a **positive attitude**. In the closing part of the messages, the writers utilized lexical bundles such as *I hope, I wish, and I am looking forward*, which suggest a positive outlook towards the outcomes of the conferences.

Therefore, the linguistic features manifest a social construction of **linguistic identity**. The way linguistic features were used in writing the program messages display a collective linguistic identity [60]. The manifestations of linguistic features such as lexical bundles, the universal pronoun 'all,' addition and reiteration, deixis and metadiscourse, and linguistic styles show the construction of a **linear, clear, authoritative** yet **interactive, inclusive, religious, polite, and positive linguistic identity**. This collective identity in written discourse emerged from the discourse community's social practices [61]. Considering

that writing is a social practice, writers' identity is constructed, negotiated, and created through social practice [9].

IV. CONCLUSION

The study reveals that the messages are composed of an introduction-argument-closing format as the general structure. Hence, the message structures detail that the introduction part contains some formulaic expressions which signal welcome and greetings in general and recognitions. The argument part included the details of the conferences, such as the background, theme, and objectives or significance of the events. In comparison, the closing part expressed the writers' positive outlook towards the outcome of the conferences.

The messages also disclose several linguistic features which led to the construction of linguistic identity. These linguistic tools help the writers express themselves clearly and coherently, while the same guide the writers toward the ideas presented by the writers. Thus, the linguistic features available in the messages substantiate the construction of linguistic identity. Therefore, it is recommended that teachers inculcate writing not just as a mechanical activity, but as a medium of self-expression and an avenue of identity projection. Students should be exposed to the possibility of the pragmatic implications of their use of linguistic elements, which could unveil identity. Thus, introduce the different modes and tools of writing, allowing them to exercise their writing skills in the new normal setup fully.

REFERENCES

1. Pagliai, V. (2003). *Lands I Came to Sing: negotiating Identities and Places in the Tuscan "Contasto"*. In *Sociolinguistics: The Essential Readings*. UK: Blackwell Publishing.
2. Khatib, M. &. (2011). *Mutual Relation of Identity and Foreign Language Learning: An Overview of Linguistics and Sociolinguistic Approaches to Identity*. *Theory and Practice in language Studies*, 9(12), 1701-1708. doi:10.4304/tpls.1.12.1701-1708

3. Dowling, S. (2011). *Constructing Identity*. Thesis. Georgia: Georgia State University. Retrieved from https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/art_design_theses/88
4. Hortobagyi, I. (2009). The Role of Identity in Intercultural Communication. *Bulletin of Transilvania of Brasov*, 2(51).
5. Rajagopalan, K. (2001). The Politics of Language and the Concept of Linguistic Identity. *CAUCE, Revista de Filologia y su Didactica*, 17-28.
6. Nowshin, N. (2017, February 27). On the language of identity. *The Daily Star*. Retrieved from <https://www.thedailystar.net/op-ed/the-language-identity-1364392>
7. Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. (2005). Identity and Interaction: a sociocultural linguistic approach. *Discourse Studies*, 7(4-5), 585-614. doi:10.1177/1461445605054407
8. Ivanic, R. (1998). *Writing and identity: The discursial construction of identity in academic writing*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.
9. Kuhi, D., & Rahimivand, M. (2011). An Exploration of Discursial Construction of identity in Academic Writing. *The Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 4(2), 97-129.
10. DePolo, J. (2017). Second language Writing and Bidialectalism: A Case for African American Student Writers. *English language Teaching*, 10(9), 140-149.
11. Chen, H. (2013). Identity Practices of Multilingual Writers in Social Networking Spaces. *Language and Learning Technology*, 17(2), 143-170. Retrieved from <http://llt.msu.edu/issues/june2013/chen.pdf>
12. Matsuuda, P. (2015). Identity in Written Discourse. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 35, 140-159. doi:10.1017/S0267190514000178
13. Javran, S. (2014). Identity manifestation in second language writing through the notion of Voice: A Review of literature. *Theory and practice in language Studies*, 4(3), 631-634. doi:10.4304/tpsls.4.3.631-635
14. Flowerdew, J., & Wang, H. (2015). Identity in Academic Discourse. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 81-99.
15. Adjei, S. (2013). *Discourse Analysis: Examining Language Use in Context*. *The Qualitative Report*, 18(25), 1-10. Retrieved from <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol18/iss25/2>
16. Ayoub, M., Awan, A., & Abbas, G. (2016). Textual Analysis of Print Media Text Discourse. *New Media & Mass Communication*, 50, 1-6. Retrieved from www.iiste.org
17. van Dijk, T. (1997). *Discourse as structure and process* (Vol. 1 and 2). London: Sage.
18. Baker, P., & Ellece, S. (2011). *Key Terms in Discourse Analysis*. India: Continuum.
19. Biernacki, P., & Waldorf, D. (1981). *Sociolinguistic Methods and Research* (Vol. 10). USA: Sage Publications, Inc.
20. Naderifar, M., Geli, H., & Ghaljaei, F. (2017). Snowball Sampling: A Purposeful Method of Sampling in Qualitative Research. *Strides in Development of medical Education*, 14(3). doi:10.582sdme.67670
21. Van Dijk, T. (1980). *Macrostructures: An interdisciplinary study of global structure in discourse, interaction, and cognition*. New Jersey: LEA.
22. Kaplan, R. B. (1966). Cultural thought patterns in intercultural education. *Language Learning*, 16, 1-20.
23. Gylling, M. (2013). *The Structure of Discourse*. dissertation. Copenhagen, Denmark: Copenhagen Business School.
24. Hyland, K. (2005). *Metadiscourse. Exploring Interaction in Writing*. London. New York: continuum.
25. Halliday, M. (1979). Modes of Meaning and Modes of Expression: Types of Grammatical Structure and their Determination by Different Semantic Functions. In D. Allerton, E. Carney, & D. Holdcroft (Eds.), *Function and Context in Linguistic Analysis: essays offered to William Haas*. London: Cambridge University Press.
26. Adamus-Matuszynka, A., & Dzik, P. (2019). 'Welcome signs' in public space: separation and identity. *ResearchGate*, 61(4), 1-14. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/333894695>
27. Jung, W.H. (1994). *Speech Acts of "Thank You" and Responses to It in American English*. Baltimore: American Association for Applied Linguistics.
28. Chen, Y.-H., & Baker, P. (2010). Lexical Bundles in L1 and L2 Academic Writing. *Language Learning and Technology*, 14(2), 30-49. Retrieved from <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol18/iss25/2>

- <http://lt.msu.edu/vol14num2/chenbaker.pdf>
29. Pang, W. (2010). Lexical Bundles and the Construction of an Academic Voice: A Pedagogical Perspective. *Asian EFL Journal*. Professional Teaching Articles, 47, 1-13.
 30. Zupnik, Y. (1994). A pragmatic analysis of the use of person deixis in political discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 21, 339-383
 31. Verdonk, P. (2010). *Stylistics*. China: Oxford University Press.
 32. Misra, P. S. (2012). *An introduction to Stylistics. Theory and Practice*. Delhi: Orient Blackswan Private Limited.
 33. Khedri, M., Heng, C., & Ebrahimi, S. (2013). An exploration of interactive metadiscourse markers in academic research article abstracts in two disciplines. *Discourse Studies*, 319-331.
 34. Anwardeen, N., Luyee, E., Gabriel, J., & Kalajahi, S. (2013). An analysis: The usage of metadiscourse in argumentative writing by Malaysian tertiary level students. *English Language Teaching*, 6(9), 83-96.
 35. Hunston, S. (2000). *Evaluation in text: Authorial stance and the construction of discourse*. London: Oxford University Press.
 36. Fa-gen, L. (2012, January). Identification and Function of Metadiscourse. *US-China Foreign Language*, 10(1), 846-854.
 37. Hyland, K. (2010). *Language Awareness*. Retrieved from <http://www.caes.hku/hk/kenhyland/files/2012/08/Hedges-boosters-andlexical-invisibility-noticing-modifiers-in-academic-texts.pdf>
 38. Hall, K., & Niley, C. (2015). *Code-switching, identity and Globalization*. USA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
 39. Tung, M. (2013). Common usage of code-mixing among trilingual Hong Kongers. *Language Identity and Society*. Centennial College. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/8666953/Common_usage_of_code_mixing_among_trilingual_Hong_Kongers
 40. Garcia-Sanchez, I. (2010). Serious Games: Code-switching and Gendered Identities in Moroccan Immigrant Girls' Pretend Play. *Pragmatics*, 523-555.
 41. De Fina, A. (2007). Code-switching and the construction of ethnic identity in a community of practice. *Language in Society*, 36, 371-392.
 42. Batara, J. (2015). Overlap of religiosity and spirituality among Filipinos and its implications towards religious prosociety. *International Journal of research Study in psychology*, 4(3), 3-21.
 43. Morgan, L., & Creary, S. (2011). *Positive Identity Construction: Insights from Classical Contemporary Theoretical Perspectives*. (G. M. Spreitzer, & K. S. Cameron, Eds.) Oxford: Oxford University Press.
 44. Bernardo, A., Datu, J. D., & King, R. B. (2015). Positive Psychology Research in the Philippines. *Philippine Journal of Psychology*, 4(3), 3-21.
 45. Redmond, M. (2015). Face and politeness Theories. *English Technical Reports and White Papers*, 2, 1-37. Retrieved from http://lib.dr.iastate.edu/engl_reports/2
 46. Larson, T. (2017). A functional classification of the introductory It pattern: Investigating academic writing by non-native speaker and native speaker students. *English for Specific Purposes*, 48, 57-70. Retrieved from <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2017.06.001>
 47. Karimkhanlooei, G., & Vaezi, N. (2017). Politeness Strategies in written communications: The Issue of Iranian EFL Learners. *Journal of language and Cultural Education*, 5(3), 108-126. doi:10.1515/jolace.2017.0031
 48. AlAfnan, M. (2014). Politeness in Business Writing: The Effects of Ethnicity and relating Factors on Email Communication. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*, 4, 275-289. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/ojml.2014.42022>
 49. Hollinger, A. (2005). Politeness in Business Letters. *Languages for Specific Purposes (LSP)-from Theory to Practice*, 1, 20-26.
 50. Munalim, L., & Gonong, G. (2019). Stances in Student- Teachers' Spoken Reflection: An Exploratory Linguistic Study to Enhance a Reflection Inventory. *Iranian Journal of language Teaching Research*, 7(1), 119-139.
 51. Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. (2005). Identity and Interaction: a sociocultural linguistic approach. *Discourse Studies*, 7(4-5), 585-614. doi:10.1177/1461445605054407

52. Fa-gen, L. (2012). Identification and Function of Metadiscourse. *US-China Foreign Language*, 10(1), 846-854.
53. Hyland, K. (2000). Language Awareness. Retrieved from <http://www.caes.hku.hk/kenhyland/files/2012/08/Hedges-boosters-and-lexical-invisibility-noticing-modifiers-in-academic-texts.pdf>.
54. Sahragard, R., & Yazdanpanahi, S. (2017). English Engagement markers: A Comparison of Humanities and Science Journal Articles. *Language Arts*, 2(1), 111-130. doi:10.22.62.39511.111130
55. Alyousef, H. (2015). An Investigation of Metadiscourse Features in International Postgraduate Business Students' Texts: The Use of Interactive and Interactional Markers in Tertiary Multimodal Finance Text. Sage, 1-10. doi:10.1177.215824401560796
56. Lo, K. (2007). Cultural identity and code-switching among immigrant Chinese students, parents and teachers. Doctoral dissertation. Faculty of Education-Simon Fraser University.
57. Velasquez, M. (2010). Language and Identity: Bilingual Code-switching in Spanish-English Interviews. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education University of Toronto.
58. Al Heeti, N., & Al Abdely, A. (2016). Types and Functions of Code-switching in English Language Use by Iraqi Doctors in formal settings. *International Journal of Advanced Research and Review*, 1(8), 10-18. Retrieved from www.ijarr.in
59. Hassan, Z. M., Abubakr, S. N., & Muhedeen, B. L. (2019). Code-switching as Identity Marker: A Sociolinguistic Study of Kurdish EFL University Students. *Journal of University of Human Development*, 5(3), 57-64. doi:10.21928/juhd.vn3y2019.pp.57-64
60. Paltridge, B. (2012). *Discourse Analysis: An Introduction*. India: Bloomsbury.
61. Zhang, Y., & Huxham, C. (2019). Collective Identity Construction in International Collaborations. *Journal of general management*, 1-57.