Vị Thế Đối Thoại Trong Thư Cho Lời Khuyên Của Sinh Viên: Góc Nhìn Chuyên Sâu Theo Thuyết Đánh Giá

TÓM TẮT

Nghiên cứu vận dụng Lý thuyết Đánh giá phân tích vị thế đối thoại thông qua các nguồn lực tương tác trong thư tư vấn của sinh viên năm nhất Trường Đại học Quy Nhơn. Tác giả kết hợp phương pháp định tính và định lượng nhằm khảo sát cách sinh viên kiến tạo ý nghĩa liên nhân trong bài viết của mình. Kết quả cho thấy sinh viên sử dụng đa dạng các nguồn lực tương tác, trong đó nguồn lực mở rộng chiếm ưu thế, giúp họ cân bằng giữa tính uy quyền và sự đồng cảm, qua đó xây dựng mối liên kết đối thoại hiệu quả với người đọc. Nghiên cứu kết luận rằng việc sử dụng có chiến lược các nguồn lực tương tác góp phần nâng cao tính thuyết phục và sự gần gũi trong giao tiếp. Ngoài ra, nghiên cứu đề xuất các ứng dụng sư phạm nhằm giúp sinh viên nâng cao nhận thức về vị thế đối thoại và phát triển khả năng viết thư tư vấn bằng tiếng Anh một cách hiệu quả và đồng cảm hơn trong bối cảnh tiếng Anh như là một ngoại ngữ.

Từ khóa: *Lý thuyết Đánh giá, Tương tác, Mở rộng, Thu hẹp, Thư tư vấn*

Dialogic Positioning in Students' Advice Letters: Insights from Appraisal Theory

ABSTRACT

The study employs Appraisal Theory to analyze dialogic positioning through engagement resources in the advice letters written by first-year students at Quy Nhon University. The author combines qualitative and quantitative methodologies to examine how students construct interpersonal meaning in their writing. The analysis reveals that students employ various engagement resources, with expansion resources being predominant, enabling them to balance authority and empathy while fostering effective dialogic connections with readers. The study concludes that the strategic use of engagement resources enhances persuasiveness and interpersonal closeness in communication. It also suggests pedagogical applications to improve students' awareness of dialogic positioning and their ability to produce effective, empathetic advice writing in English as a foreign language context.

Keywords: *Appraisal Theory, Engagement, Expansion, Contraction, Advice Letters*

1. INTRODUCTION

Appraisal Theory, rooted in Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), [1] focuses on the interpersonal function of language. Within SFL, language is classified into three metafunctions: experiential, interpersonal, and textual. Martin[2] and White[3] categorize SFL into two key systems for conveying meaning: the transitivity system, which relays experience, and the Appraisal system, which conveys emotion. Appraisal explores the interpersonal metafunction of texts, analyzing how language communicates attitudes, evaluations, feelings, judgments of others, and appreciation of entities. In text analysis, Appraisal focuses on the rhetorical function of evaluative words and the relationship between interpersonal meaning and social connection. Engagement in Appraisal Theory provides valuable tools for understanding how writers position themselves in relation to readers' voices and perspectives. Engagement resources allow writers to open or close dialogic space within a text, influencing how readers interpret or respond to advice, particularly in contexts involving recommendation, persuasion, or behavioral guidance.

Several studies have investigated engagement resources in various genres of student writing. Xinghua and Thompson[4] explore engagement in argumentative essays, using White's Appraisal Theory to examine how writers negotiate meaning with readers through dialogic resources. Ngo Thu et al.[5] analyze engagement resources to enhance attitude expression in non-native English students' writing. However, research specifically focusing on advice letters remains limited, particularly in EFL contexts. This study, therefore, seeks to know what types of engagement resources are employed in the advice letters written by first-year students at Quy Nhon University; and how these engagement resources contribute to the persuasiveness and interpersonal effectiveness of students' advice writing. The research not only provides insights into students' linguistic strategies in constructing interpersonal meaning but also contributes to the understanding of how Appraisal Theory can be applied in EFL writing pedagogy. The findings are expected to inform teaching practices, helping teachers design activities which foster students' awareness of engagement resources and enhance their ability to produce persuasive, empathetic, and reader-oriented advice letters in English.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Appraisal Theory, as proposed by Martin and White,[6] is a framework within SFL that addresses the evaluative and interpersonal aspects of discourse. It categorizes interpersonal meaning into three domains: Attitude, Graduation, and Engagement.

- **Attitude** refers to the expression of feelings, including Affect (emotions), Judgment (ethics/morality), and Appreciation (aesthetic values).

- **Graduation** concerns the grading of Attitude or Engagement in terms of force (intensity) or focus (sharpening/softening meaning).

- **Engagement**, the focus of this study, deals with how writers/speakers position their voice in relation to other voices and alternative viewpoints in the communicative context.

White[3] explains that Engagement encompasses all linguistic resources speakers use to express their interpersonal positioning in texts. Martin and White[6] clarify that Engagement focuses on the linguistic means by which writers "*enter into a dialogue*" with readers to present a stance toward a particular evaluation or attitude and to position readers to align or disalign with this stance. Read et al.[7] note that Engagement provides resources for speakers to construe their point of view and adopt stances toward others' opinions. White[8] states that Engagement's scope is broader than traditional modality, evidentiality, and hedging but narrower than metadiscourse in other frameworks.

The Engagement system distinguishes between monoglossic (single-voiced) and heteroglossic (multi-voiced) utterances.

2.1. Monoglossic versus Heteroglossic

A monoglossic utterance is a simple declaration without variation, assuming convergence between the writer's and reader's ideological and social positions based on shared assumptions. Monoglossic utterances are regarded as "fact" because they lack evaluation, associated with objective voices. Martin and White[6] (p.157) state:

"Via monoglossia, the writer construes the value propositions of those who have a different view… as not needing to be recognized or engaged with in any way. As a consequence, those who might hold to such a dissenting view are excluded from any possible solidarity with the writer."

A heteroglossic utterance uses variation to acknowledge multiple voices. Martin and White[5] classify utterances as monoglossic when they make no reference to other voices and as heteroglossic when they invoke or allow for dialogistic alternatives. Heteroglossic utterances are divided into two subcategories: dialogic expansion and dialogic contraction.

2.2. Expansion

Expansion refers to ways in which the dialogical voice can be opened up to alternative viewpoints. It "*actively makes space for alternative positions and voices*". [6] (p. 102) by either *entertaining* an evaluation through Entertain resources, or *attributing* it to a named

or unnamed source external to the text by using Attribution resources. In other words, Entertain resources present the author's position as one inside a range of possible options; and Attribution resources provide an external source for a given opinion.

2.2.1. Entertain

Entertain is the dialogistic expansiveness of modality and evidentiality. Martin and White[6] (p. 104) define Entertain resources are "*those wordings by which the authorial voice indicates that its position is but one of a number of possible positions and thereby, to greater or lesser degrees, makes dialogic space of those possibilities*."

The authors also clarify that Entertain refers to a semantic domain which is traditionally considered as "*epistemic modality*" by Palmer[9] and Coates[10] and "*evidentiality*" by Chafe and Nichols.[11] Under Entertain, modality includes expressions of likelihood by means of modal auxiliaries (*could, may, might, must,…*), modal adjuncts (*perhaps, probably, definitely,…*), modal attributes (*it's likely that…, it's possible that…etc.*). Entertain can also be realized by some mental verbs or attribute projections (*I suspect that…., I think…., I believe…, I'm convinced that…, I doubt that…etc.*), by evidence/appearance-based postulations (*it seems, it appears, apparently, the research suggests,…*) and certain types of "*rhetorical*" or "*expository*" questions that are exploited to put a proposition into play as one possible view (*Does the bank's plan really backfire?*). Martin and White[6] hold that the primary functionality of such locutions is "*to make allowances for, and hence to make space for, alternative voices and value positions in the ongoing colloquy within which the text is located.*" (p.108)

2.2.2. Attribution

Attribution, another dialogically expansive element, refers to lexical items by which the author advances his/her position by attributing it to certain external resources. According to Martin and White,[6] it involves the presence of an external voice which takes over the responsibility for an evaluation or claim from the authorial voice. Droga and Humphrey[12] state that Attribution means the writer uses the words or thoughts of an outside source to validate or challenge attitudes including those of the writer. As White[13] mentions, Attribution is much broader than "*projection*".[1] The writer uses several terms to indicate Attribution: "*source*", or "*extra-vocalisation*", "*intertextual positioning*".[3]

Martin and White[6] distinguish between Entertain and Attribution by saying that Entertain resources refer to the internal voice of the speaker/writer (*I believe, in my view,…*), while Attribution resources refer to some external voice (*many English believe, in Thomas' view, there is an argument that,…*)

The theory of Attribution can be introduced either by Acknowledge or Distance.

Acknowledge is a "*neutral*" way of introducing an external voice which obscures the authorial voice's stance concerning the propositions that are made. Martin and White[6] define Acknowledge as "*those locutions where there is no overt indication at least via the choice of framer, as to where the authorial voice stands with respect to the proposition.*" (p. 112) Acknowledge is typically realized through the use of a reporting device: *"say", "report", "suggest", "declare",….* Meanwhile, distance involves introducing an external voice in such a way that the authorial voice "*washes its hands*" of the proposition it makes and explicitly distances itself from it. Martin and White[6] (p. 113) state "*distance involves formulations in which, via the semantics of the framer employed, there is an explicit distancing of the authorial voice from the attributed material.*" This is achieved through the use of reporting verbs such as *claim*, *maintain, purport,…* and the use of "*scare*" quotes which refer to quotations without specific references where punctuation is used to signal that someone else's words are being used.

In short, both entertaining and attributive options are dialogically expansive as they ground the propositions in the subjectivity of an individual, thereby opening the space for dialogic alternatives.

2.3. Contraction

Within Contraction, according to White,[13] the authorial voice explicitly or implicitly invests in the current proposition as "*true*" or "*valid*" and sets itself against an actual or potential proposition. Droga and Humphrey[12] maintain that Contraction restricts or challenges alternative positions, that is, the authorial voice acknowledges other viewpoints but does not support them.

Contraction involves two main aspects of analysis: disclaim and proclaim

2.3.1. Disclaim

Disclaim according to Martin and White[6] refers to the ways in which the textual voice positions itself at odds with, or rejecting some contrary positions.

- Disclaim is divided into two subtypes: Deny and counter;

+ Deny dialogically rejects alternative positive position after having been introduced in the dialogue, and hence acknowledging it. Deny is linguistically sourced through negating words: *no, not, never, …*or through some verbs: *neglect, ignore,…* It differs from ordinary negation in that its function is not just to deny a proposition, but to deny an expectation or assumption which the naturalized reader is construed as holding. [2,6]

+ Counter serves to replace the denied expectation with an alternative opinion that the authorial voice presents as preferable or more correct/justified. The main meanings that Counter conveys are concession and counter-expectation. Counter is realized by means of contrastive conjunctions: *although*, *however*, *nonetheless*, *but, yet,….* and certain adjuncts: *even, only, just, still,…* and a small set of comment adverbials: *surprisingly, strangely enough,…*[6]

Counter and Deny often occur together but when authors choose to deny, they introduce an external voice so as to acknowledge it, and then present a negative orientation to reject it. Through Counter, authors also invoke a contrary position to the one introduced, but unlike Deny, they do so by introducing a proposition which replaces or substitutes the one expected.

2.3.2. *Proclaim*

Martin and White[6] states that proclaim refers to the way in which the textual voice sets itself against, suppresses or rules out alternative positions.

Proclaim involves three subtypes: concur, pronounce and endorse.

- Through Concur, authors assume the audience will share the same view because it is the conventional wisdom or at least widely accepted in the current context of communication. As observed in Martin and White[5] Concur is presented as something that is given, as being in accord with generally known or expected.

Concur can be referred to as affirmation and it is heteroglossic in that it involves the marking of the subjective authorial stance and the expected reader stance towards a proposition, thus construing a dialogue. Concur can be realized textually by two ways: affirming and

conceding. These are conveyed with such locutions as *obviously, of course, naturally, admittedly, certainly,* or through certain types of "*rhetorical"* questions in which the writer assumes no answer is needed because the answer is so obvious.

- Pronounce refers to an item in which the author emphasizes or asserts the value of the proposition. By using Pronounce, authors may intervene explicitly to express that their opinion is firm, without referring to other voices. Pronounce can be linguistically realized through certain phrases: *I contend/insist that…, The fact of the matter is that…, you must agree that…,* and intensifiers with clausal scope such as *really, indeed,* etc.

- Endorse refers to propositions from external sources presented by the writer as correct, unquestionable and valid. The major lexico-grammatical realizations that are employed to realize Endorse include verbs: *show, demonstrate, prove, indicate, point out, find,…*

According to Martin and White[6], it should be noted that through Endorse and Attribution, the writer advances his/her positions by attributing it to certain external resources but they have different purposes. Attribution employs the grammar of reported speech to explicitly disassociate the proposition being advanced by the external source from the author's own voice. Meanwhile, Endorse assumes that the writer shares responsibility with the cited source for such a proposition.

By way of conclusion, although both Expansion and Contraction in Engagement indicate the subjective nature of the writer's stance, Expansion entertains alternatives, whereas Contraction functions to challenge or restrict them. That is, it construes a dialogic space with the aim of "*closing down*" dialogue and suppressing alternative stances.[2,6]

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study analyzed the advice letters written by first-year students at Quy Nhon University as part of a writing task. The task required students to write a 200-word letter responding to a pen pal's request: "*I'm going for a job interview next Monday. I'm quite worried about how to make a good impression. Do you have any advice for me*?"

Thirty letters, totaling 6,040 words, were selected based on content and topic relevance, with consideration for their length. The analysis employed both quantitative and qualitative

methods. Quantitative analysis involved identifying and counting subtypes of Engagement resources in the letters. Qualitative analysis examined the lexical items of Engagement through close reading of each letter, illustrating how students utilized these features to interact with the audience, supported by examples from the data. In addition, the study emphasized the interplay between linguistic choices and communicative purposes, showing how Engagement resources not only shaped interpersonal meaning but also revealed students' strategies for constructing credibility, empathy, and persuasion in their written responses.

4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

4.1. Overall Usage of Engagement

Table 1. Engagement resources in the advice letters

Engagement	Number of sentences	Percentage
Monoglossia	147	41.5%
Heteroglossia	208	58.5%

The data shows that heteroglossic resources appear more often than monoglossic resources in the letters. Monoglossic sentences make up 41.5%, while heteroglossic ones reach 58.5%. This difference explains that the writers prefer heteroglossic resources because they help bring the reader into the discussion. By choosing this style, students open more space for interaction and make their advice sound less direct and more flexible. The numbers clearly show that students not only give strong instructions but also try to engage the reader in a dialogic way.

Overall, these findings suggest that students want their advice to sound more persuasive and supportive.

4.2. Usage of Monoglossia

The results denote that students often rely on monoglossic sentences because their knowledge may be still weak, so they mostly depend on clear and simple forms. Their limited language skills make them choose sentences that are easier to write and understand. Moreover, they may want to sound helpful and trustworthy by giving direct and strong instructions.

1. You arrive at the interview on time.

2. Dress comfortably and politely.

3. Before you go in, take some time to sit quietly and breathe.

4. Look online for some example interview questions and prepare answers to each question.

When we look at all four examples together, it is clear that they are monoglossic because they present advice as certain, factual, and not open to challenge. Sentence 1 sounds like a rule that must be followed. It does not suggest alternatives, such as arriving early or being flexible with time, so the advice becomes fixed and leaves no dialogic space. In sentence 2, the writer makes a strong statement that sounds like a strict guideline. It does not show space for different opinions about how to dress, and so it works as monoglossic. The third sentence also functions in the same way. The advice is expressed as if it were the only correct method to prepare before the interview, without opening room for doubt. The fourth one presents the suggestion as something obvious and necessary. It does not signal that there might be other good strategies, so the message becomes closed.

In short, the example sentences focus on giving direct instructions rather than encouraging dialogue or negotiation with the reader.

4.3. Usage of Heteroglossia

Heteroglossic has two main parts: **Expansion** (Entertain, Attribute) and **Contraction** (Disclaim, Proclaim). Each part shows the percentage distribution as follows.

Table 2: Heteroglossic resources in the advice letters

Heteroglossia		Number of instances	Percentage
Expansion	Entertain	210	74.20%
	Attribute	45	15.90%
Contraction	Disclaim	22	7.77%
	Proclaim	6	2.12%

The analysis of the engagement resources shows a clear dominance of expansion over contraction. Out of the total 283 instances, expansion resources account for almost 90%, with entertain alone representing 74.2% and attribute 15.90%. This strong reliance on expansion indicates that most advice letters are written in a way that opens dialogic space for readers and allows multiple positions to be considered. The high percentage of entertain suggests that writers frequently use modal verbs, probability markers, or tentative expressions to signal uncertainty and possibility. This strategy makes the advice sound less forceful and more friendly, which is suitable for the genre of advice giving. Attribute, at 15.90%, also plays a noticeable role. It shows that the writers sometimes rely on external voices, references, or other people's opinions to make their advice appear more reliable and credible, though it is not as dominant as entertain. On the other hand, contraction resources together make up less than 10%, with disclaim at 7.77% and proclaim at only 2.12 %. This shows that advice letters rarely close down alternative voices or insist on one single view.

Overall, the distribution reveals that advice letters aim to engage readers with openness and flexibility rather than certainty or exclusion.

4.3.1. Entertain

Entertain resources are often used in advice letters because they help the writer sound polite, flexible, and engaging. The words like *should, may, might, can,…* allow the writer to suggest rather than command. This makes the advice easier to accept and creates a friendly tone, keeping the reader interested and open to the message. nên lọc VD: không nên đưa ra 1 list c

5. You should research the company carefully before the interview.

6. You should avoid using informal language.

7. You may feel more confident if you practice with a friend before the interview.

8. You can impress the interviewer if you prepare good answers and act confidently.

9. It would be possible to impress the interviewer by preparing answers carefully.

10. You need to dress neatly to make a good impression.

11. You seem unsure of your skills, but you should highlight your strengths confidently.

12. You might be given the position if you answer all the questions.

In the sentences given, the writer uses many entertain resources, mostly with modal

verbs, to give advice in a polite and open way. In sentence 5, the word "*should*" shows strong advice but still leaves room for choice. In sentence 6, the same modal creates guidance without sounding like an order. Regarding the seventh, "*may*" opens the possibility and shows that the effect depends on the reader's action. As for the eighth, "*can*" highlights ability and makes the suggestion seem achievable. Sentence 9 uses a conditional form, showing potential but not certainty, which softens the advice and encourages preparation without pressure. In sentence 10, the verb "*need to*" indicates necessity, which is stronger than "*should*" but still not absolute, balancing firmness with politeness. It also reflects a sense of responsibility and seriousness**,** emphasizing the importance of the suggested behavior. Sentence 11 combines a judgment "*seem unsure*" with advice "*should*", which encourages improvement while acknowledging feelings, making the advice more empathetic and relational. This combination shows how the writer manages both attitudinal and engagement meanings to build solidarity with readers. Finally, sentence 12 uses "*migh*t" to indicate possibility, keeping the advice realistic and motivating. It shows that the outcome depends on the reader's effort, reinforcing the interactive and dialogic nature of the advice.

Overall, these entertain elements prevent the text from sounding imposing. Instead, they open a dialogic space, invite cooperation, and allow the reader to feel respected while being guided, which is especially important in advice writing.

4.3.2. Attribute

Attribute resources are less common in advice letters because the main purpose may be to give direct and useful guidance. Quoting or reporting others' opinions might make the message less personal and less focused. In other words, writers usually prefer clear suggestions, so readers feel the advice comes straight from them, not from outside sources. In addition, as students may not have much knowledge or experience, they rarely use attribute resources. It is easier for them to give simple advice directly, instead of reporting what experts or other people say. Finally, they want their letters to be short and clear, so they often avoid adding outside voices or complex references. This makes the letter easier to understand and follow.

13. *People say you should search the company first.*
14. *Managers say you should dress neatly.*

15. *Experts advised that getting to know the company in advance would be beneficial in the interview.*
16. *It's said arriving early helps.*

It can be noted that sentences 13, 14, and 15 are examples of Acknowledge because they only report what others say without showing the writer's opinion. These sentences act as neutral reports that present advice as general or expert information. Sentence 13 employs the phrase "*people say*," which shows that the advice comes from a general group. This strategy makes the suggestion appear widely accepted and reliable, without sounding too strict. In sentence 14, the writer refers to "*managers*," who are people with authority and experience. By doing this, the advice about dressing neatly becomes more persuasive because it is linked to professionals in charge of hiring. Sentence 15 presents advice through "*experts*," suggesting that the guidance is based on specialized knowledge. In contrast, sentence 16 shows an example of Distance. The sentence uses "*it's said*," which works as a neutral reference to common knowledge. This form avoids imposing the idea directly and lets the reader consider it more freely.

In short, these attribute resources help the advice sound credible and polite, as they bring in different voices instead of only the writers'.

4.3.3. Disclaim

Disclaim appears when writers deny or counter an idea before giving better advice. Disclaim is sometimes used in advice letters because it often starts with a negative form, which may sound strict or unfriendly. Advice letters usually aim to be polite and encouraging, so writers prefer positive expressions that motivate readers more gently.

17. *You don't need to memorize every answer, but preparing key points is helpful.*
18. *Don't be late; try to arrive a bit early.* monoglossic
19. *It's not enough to just show up; you should research the company.*
20. *Avoid casual clothes, but choose something professional yet comfortable.*

In sentence 17, the phrase *"You don't need..."* is a clear example of deny in disclaim. The writer rejects the idea that memorization is necessary, but then opens space by suggesting a softer alternative "*preparing key points*". This use of denial guides the reader without sounding too strict. Sentence 18 shows disclaim since it says what not to do **"***Don't be late***"** and then gives the right actio**n "***arrive early***",** joining a denial

with advice. In sentence 19, the phrase *"It's not enough ....."* also functions as Deny in Disclaim. The writer denies the sufficiency of minimal preparation and contrasts it with the stronger requirement of researching the company. This helps stress the importance of serious effort. The word *"but"* in sentence 20 signals Counter in Disclaim. The writer contrasts casual clothing with professional yet comfortable clothing, showing a clear preference. The countering resource highlights a better option while rejecting the weaker one.

In short, disclaim is less common in advice letters because it often uses negative forms to reject ideas, which can sound too direct. Advice writing usually aims to be polite and supportive, so writers prefer positive expressions that encourage and guide readers gently.

4.3.4. Proclaim

Proclaim is rarely employed in advice letters because it states ideas strongly as facts, leaving little space for readers' opinions. Advice writing usually tries to sound friendly and flexible, so writers prefer softer language that invites readers to accept suggestions willingly.

21. Without doubt, confidence makes a strong impression in an interview.
22. Of course, you should research the company thoroughly.
23. The fact is that preparation boosts your confidence.
24. Obviously, practicing answers will make you more confident.

The phrase *"Without doubt"* in sentence 21 shows proclaim through pronounce. It presents confidence as a guaranteed factor for interview success and reduces space for the reader to disagree. This expression adds certainty and makes the advice sound very firm. In sentence 22, the phrase *"Of course"* illustrates concur, because it presents the suggestion as something natural and obvious. By doing this, the writer reduces debate and makes the advice easier to accept. The phrase *"The fact is that"* in sentence 23 is another case of proclaim, also working as pronounce. Here, the writer presents the idea of preparation as undeniable truth, giving strong weight to the message. In sentence 24, the phrase *"Obviously"* is a proclaim resource that works as *pronounce*. It shows the advice is clear and should be accepted without doubt. This makes the suggestion stronger but also leaves less space for the reader to disagree. When we compare these examples, it is clear that proclaim resources make advice appear stronger, more confident, and

persuasive. At the same time, they can limit openness because the reader has less room to question or resist the advice.

In brief, proclaim resources are not popular in advice letters because they often sound too strong or forceful. Writers usually prefer softer language that encourages readers while leaving them space to choose.

5. CONCLUSION

The study aims to identify the linguistic elements of engagement employed to reveal the features and achieve the communicative purposes of students' advice letters, particularly which engagement resources are given greater emphasis and how they are used to interact with readers. The analysis indicates that students employ both monoglossic and heteroglossic resources in their writing; however, the latter predominates, reflecting the students' tendency to engage with readers' perspectives through dialogic expansion. In particular, the frequent use of *entertain* strategies shows that the writers tend to open up dialogic space by presenting their propositions as one of several possible viewpoints. This dialogic positioning demonstrates an attempt to balance confidence and empathy, yet it also reveals a writing style typical of less assertive and less authoritative writers. Moreover, students with limited linguistic proficiency often rely on monoglossic statements because they are simple, direct, and linguistically manageable. This tendency suggests that while writers can convey advice effectively, they may lack the linguistic flexibility and confidence to use a wider range of engagement strategies to fully establish a persuasive and interactive stance.

In teaching and learning, teachers can help students use both monoglossic clarity and heteroglossic openness, so their communication becomes more convincing and considerate. However, teachers should strongly encourage students to rely much more on heteroglossic resources, especially expansion resources because these resources enable students to construct dialogic, reader-oriented texts. In fact, a greater use of heteroglossic resources allows students to engage multiple perspectives, invite readers' involvement, and make their writing more flexible, interactive, and persuasive. For example, teachers can guide students instead of employing the monoglossic sentence: "*Dress professionally*", they can use the heteroglossic one: "*You might consider dressing professionally to make a strong impression.*" The use of the modal verb "*might*" introduces uncertainty and

suggests a recommendation rather than a command. This structure opens up dialogic space, acknowledging that the listener may have different perspectives or choices. The sentence avoids asserting a single viewpoint. In addition, teachers can design classroom discussions where students identify and transform monoglossic statements into heteroglossic ones. Such activities encourage students to recognize how language can include or exclude readers' voices. Moreover, teachers can also integrate heteroglossic awareness into writing feedback, highlighting places where students could use engagement markers such as *perhaps*, *according to*, or *it seems* to soften claims or invite agreement. Finally, by introducing students to various forms of engagement expression early on, teachers can help them create more nuanced and engaging texts. This approach not only improves writing skills but also develops critical thinking and empathy in communication, which fits well with the interpersonal goals of advice letters.

The study's limitation lies in its focus solely on engagement, neglecting other appraisal elements like attitude and graduation. This narrow scope limits understanding of how students' emotional expressions or intensity of assertions influence their writing. Exploring attitude could reveal how students convey emotions or judgments, while graduation could highlight how they modulate the strength of their statements. A wider analysis that includes these elements would give a clearer and more complete understanding of students' persuasive writing strategies.

REFERENCES

1. M. A. K. Halliday. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* (2nd ed.), Edward Arnold, London, 1994.
2. J. R. Martin. Analysing Genre: Functional Parameters. In F. Christie, J. R. Martin (Eds.), *Genre and Institutions: Social Processes in the Workplace and School*, Cassell, London, **1997**, 3–39.
3. P. R. R. White. Beyond Modality and Hedging: A Dialogic View of the Language of Intersubjective Stance, *Text*, **2003**, 23(2), 259–284.
4. X. Li, P. Thompson. Attitude in Students' Argumentative Writing: A Contrastive Perspective, *Language and Intercultural Communication*, **2009**, 9(2), 71–82.
5. T. Ngo, L. Unsworth, S. Feez. Enhancing Expressive Communication in Young EFL Learners through Appraisal Resources, *TESOL Quarterly*, **2012**, 46(3), 567–589.
6. J. R. Martin, P. R. R. White. *The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2005.
7. J. Read, D. Hope, J. Carroll. Annotating Expressions of Appraisal in English, *Proceedings of the Linguistic Annotation Workshop*, **2007**, 1–8.
8. P. R. R. White. *Telling Media Tales: The News Story as Rhetoric*, Doctoral Thesis, University of Sydney, 1998.
9. F. R. Palmer. *Mood and Modality*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1986.
10. J. Coates. The Semantics of Modal Auxiliaries, Croom Helm, London/Canberra, 1983.
11. W. L. Chafe, J. Nichols (Eds.). *Evidentiality: The Linguistic Coding of Epistemology*, Abex, Norwood (NJ), 1986.
12. L. Droga, S. Humphrey. *Getting Started with Functional Grammar*, Target Texts, Berry (NSW), 2002.

Conclusion nên được viết gọn ở lại (có thể lược bỏ các phần ứng dụng, và phần hạn chế)