Wah Academia Journal of Social Sciences
Volume 3, Issue 2, Dec 2024, pp. 573-604
ISSN – E 2958-8731 P 2958-8723
https://doi.org/10.63954/WAJSS.3.2.31.2024

Scrutinization of Authorial Stance on Artificial Intelligence: A Corpus-Based Study of Communicative Verbs in AI-based Research Article Conclusions

Tuba Latif[1], Amna Arshad[2], Huda Noor[3] and Nimra Noor[4]

Abstract

This study examines how public verbs, private verbs and suasive verbs contribute to authorial position in research conclusions that are mostly dependent on artificial intelligence. Using a corpus-based approach, 102 research findings from high-impact AI publications published between 2020 and 2024 were read. The study is centered on the aspects of attitude, engagement and graduation and in the process of doing so, the public verbs, private verbs and suasive verbs are identified with the help of appraisal theory. In particular, the results reveal how authors believe the language applying verbs of judgment and evaluating the impact of AI in the society; whereas, authors engage with counterarguments through verbs of engagement. This work contributes to the understanding of the authorial attitude in this emerging field by enriching a knowledge of how linguistic choices relate to academic written discourse in AI. Their implication implies that paying attention to the impact of private, public and suasive verbs may help researchers and corpus-based research authorial posture or stance, public, private and suasive verbs artificial intelligence (AI), and research findings verbs utilizing the framework of appraisal theory. The findings show a pattern of evaluative language that emphasizes the writers' viewpoints on the ethical issues, limitations, and possibilities of AI. In particular, verbs of judgment and evaluation are commonly employed to convey opinions regarding the impact of AI on society, whereas verbs of engagement show the authors' exchanges with opposing views. This study offers a deeper understanding of authorial attitude in this developing discipline by shedding light on how linguistic choices influence academic discourse in AI. The results have important instructional ramifications, indicating that researchers and students might develop more thoughtful and convincing academic conclusions by being aware of public, private and suasive verbs. Future research could look at the function of evaluative language in interdisciplinary AI studies or broaden the focus to include more linguistic components.

[1-4] Department of English, National University of Modern Languages, Faisalabad - Pakistan

Keywords: Corpus-based research, authorial posture, public, private and suasive verbs, artificial intelligence (AI), research findings

Introduction

In academic writing, evaluative language is employed by researchers and when doing so, they adopt the authorial stance (Hyland, 2005).Public , private and suasive verbs are important for persuasion because they allow writers to position themselves in relation to the topic they are addressing. In the case of the current AI research, writers' opinions may be either stated or implied when evaluating the potential and the limitations of AI. This paper employs a corpus-based approach to investigate the use of public, private and suasive verbs in AI research articles to demonstrate how the choice of words affects the author's stance. To comprehend how academics think it is necessary to analyze the public, private and suasive verbs in the AI-based research outcomes. To comprehend how researchers, express their opinions in a formal academic context, one has to understand the public, private and suasive verbs used in artificial intelligence (AI) study results (Chang, 2012). The main goals of this work are to identify the most frequently used public verbs in the findings of artificial intelligence (AI) research and to analyze the impact of these verbs on the author's position. By examining these language choices, the study will contribute to the improvement of our understanding of appraisal procedures in academic writing. As this study underscores the role of the evaluative language in creating convincing and complex academic outcomes, it also has important implications for instruction. to place themselves in relation to their subject matter. In the context of current artificial intelligence (AI) research, writers' opinions sometimes implicitly or explicitly assess the implications, possibilities, and limitations of AI. This work uses a corpus-based approach to analyze public , private and suasive verbs in AI research findings to show how authors' linguistic choices impact their perspective on the subject. Understanding how academics express their thoughts requires an examination of the public, private and suasive verbs used in AI-based research outcomes. Understanding how researchers communicate their opinions in a formal academic setting requires an understanding of the public , private and suasive verbs used in artificial intelligence (AI) study outcomes (Chang, 2012). Finding commonly used public verbs in artificial intelligence (AI) research

findings and examining their effects on authorial position are the main objectives of this work.

Through an analysis of these language choices, the study aims to enhance our comprehension of appraisal procedures in academic discourse. Because it highlights the importance of evaluative language in producing convincing and complex academic findings, this study also has significant instructional implications.

Students and researchers can produce writing that satisfies academic standards and clearly conveys their intended arguments by using insights about evaluative language (Khamkhein, 2018). It is becoming more and more crucial to comprehend authorial perspective in academic writing, especially when other topics like artificial intelligence become contentious ethical, technological, and societal issues. The importance of positioning and evaluative language in academic conversations across a range of subjects has been highlighted by prior research. Chang's (2012) study of placement in online corpora and Hyland's (2005) analysis of academic discourse demonstrated how public, private and suasive verbs captivate listeners by elaborating and strengthening arguments. The importance of exact language in influencing readers' perceptions of information was also highlighted by Siddique et al. (2018), who investigated position in news editorials. When taken as a whole, these studies highlighted the use of evaluative language in formal settings and promoted the use of evaluative language in formal settings and promoted the use of appraisal theory to examine posture or stance in the expanding field of artificial intelligence research.

Recent research on communicative verbs has explored how authorial stance is realized in academic and scientific writing, how such features influence reader perception, and how communicative verbs function to convey argumentation. Early studies of verb subcategorization, such as Roland and Jurafsky (1998), have shown that corpus choice affects verb frequencies and linguistic structures, and that genre and discourse type play a large role in how verbs are used. Subsequent studies were more concerned with verbs' communicative functions, including how persuasive strategies are realized through lexical choices. For instance, Kareva (2019) studied communicative verbs in scientific publications, but the details of methodology and limitations were sparse. While these studies don't explicitly discuss AI as a domain they do address a broadening interest in how authors use verbs to convey intent as well as engage with audiences. Ihsan et al. (2019) also used natural language

processing (NLP) to tag reporting verbs in citation contexts and combine sentiment analysis to determine how verb choice affects perceived stance.

Specific verb types have also been studied corpus based, for example, Arshad (2014) investigates "private" and "suasive" verbs in university prospectuses. Arshad found that expressive verbs such as private verbs (referring to inner states or intentions), and suasive verbs (used to cause or promote action), are capable of subtly influencing institutional tone and help make it seem authoritative and inviting. In continuation to verb usage analysis, Yasmin et al. (2020) undertook a comparative research of noun reporting verb usage in Pakistani and native English writers and observe the existence of the cultural impact on noun reporting verb usage. In Polish, Adam (2012) investigated the linguistic expression of cognition through public and private verbs, and how they are used to express individual versus social perspectives. In a different historical perspective, Crespo and Ruiz (2015) studied 18th century philosophy texts to see how suasive verbs were used as persuasive tools. These studies highlight the complex ways in which communicative verbs contribute to authorial stance, but the study of these verbs in high stakes, contemporary fields such as artificial intelligence (AI) is limited. Therefore, the present study extends previous analyses by investigating public, private, and suasive verbs in AI research conclusions, to better understand authorial stance and persuasive intent in a leading-edge scientific domain. This study aimed to provide a thorough knowledge of how language affects readers' interpretation of AI research findings by focusing on the relationship between authorial perspective and discourse on AI.

Review of the Literature

According to Biber and Finegan (1988,1989), stance is the way a writer expresses their views, feelings opinions or degree of dedication to propositional information. This idea has received a lot of attention lately in academic writing research especially when it comes to analyzing the use of evaluative language in research findings from different fields and cultural backgrounds. Public, private and suasive verbs, adverbs, and modal auxiliaries are examples of position markers that allow writers to communicate their opinions, engage audiences, and accomplish rhetorical goals in academic writing (Biber, Conrad, & Cortes, 2004; Hyland, 2005).

This analysis is particularly important because the criticality of the field: Artificial Intelligence (AI) demands accurate explicit language for the evaluative assessment

of the dependability of technologies, ethical considerations. Lastly, the current research is also lacking in cross-linguist and interdisciplinary approaches. Moreover, the current research lacks extensive evaluations of the evaluative stance in AI-related findings across disciplines and cultures. Loi et al., (2016) and Wei et al. (2015) pointed out that perhaps a more harmonious perception of the communicative self-confirmation might be applicable to stance-taking behaviors in other fields and cultures. This suggests the need for a wider and comparative perspective on how AI researchers use rhetoric and evaluative language when making arguments during target forums. In addition to the changes in the conventions and the genre-specific assumptions that defined the use of stance markers in different registers, Biber (2004) also looked at the historical evolution of stance devices. The study conducted across different cultures showed that academic and cultural factors played a major role in posture or stance.

According to Deng and He is (2023) examination of study findings from Chinese and English authors, Chinese authors tended to take a more assertive stance, whilst English authors typically hedged their remarks. Similar patterns were found in studies comparing academic writers from Persian and English. For instance, Zamani and Ebadi (2016) observed differences in the evaluative language employed in study findings, showing different communicative practices and rhetorical strategies between cultures. As AI developed, researchers faced new problems that necessitated the use of complex evaluative language, particularly when discussing study results. Since AI research frequently explored complex topics with social and ethical ramifications, researchers had to carefully employ attitude indicators to highlight the significance, dependability, and repercussions of their findings. The dedication or epistemic ideals of AI research community were frequently reflected in public, private and suasive verbs.

According to Hyland (2005), these verbs were essential for holding readers' attention on and conveying authority, especially in technical domains where academics were addressing issues of technological accuracy and ethical responsibility. Numerous studies have examined verb usage in academic and professional texts using corpus-based analysis, concentrating on the way authors express their viewpoint and intention. In order to investigate the communication functions of private and suasive verbs, Arshad (2014) examined their distribution across sections in university prospectuses from Pakistan and India.

Similar to this, Ihsan et al. (2019) tagged reporting verbs in citation texts using natural language processing, offering information on the verbs' sentiment and frequency. Yasmin et al. (2020) looked at discipline-specific reporting verb usage by comparing the use of reporting verbs in research papers written by Pakistani and local writers. In a related study, Crespo (2015) investigated persuasive techniques in English philosophical books from the 18th century, concentrating on suasive verbs and other modal structures to comprehend the relationships between authors and readers. In order to identify variations in disciplinary reporting methods, Jirapanakorn (2012) categorized verbs by type and compared reporting verbs in Thai and international medical publications. Despite the differences in language and situation these studies highlight how crucial verb choice is in expressing the author's position and intent, especially when using suasive, private and public verbs. When taken as a whole, they offer a fundamental comprehension for investigating how these verbs could disclose the author's position on subjects like artificial intelligence in scholarly writing.

Even though there have been more studies discussing position in academic publications, there are still significant gaps, especially when it comes to the role of public, private and suasive verbs in AI research findings.

Research initially focused mostly on scholarly discourse in general with little attention paid to debates around artificial intelligence. Although stance markers have been extensively examined in the context of academic writing, only a small number of researchers examined how evaluative stance was communicated in findings related to AI. Given that AI has many facets with moral ramifications, it is likely that researchers in this field used unique assessment techniques that are different from those used in more traditional academic fields. This disparity emphasized the need for a targeted evaluation of the evaluative role in writing about AI, where issues of credibility, morality, and societal impact are crucial.

Furthermore, public, private and suasive verbs were not given enough attention as a distinct field of study. Previous studies mostly ignored the critical role public, private, and suasive verbs play as position indicators in favor of more general classifications like modality and hedging. As a result, little research has been done on the precise role that public, private and suasive verbs play in creating authority and credibility in conversations about artificial intelligence. AI is a critical field where accurate reporting of evaluative information regarding reliability of

technologies and ethical issues is important and such analysis becomes relevant. Lastly, the current research is also lacking in cross-linguist and interdisciplinary approaches. Moreover, the current research lacks extensive evaluations of the evaluative stance in AI-related findings across disciplines and cultures. Loi et al., (2016) and Wei et al. (2015) pointed out that perhaps a more harmonious perception of the communicative self-confirmation might be applicable to stance-taking behaviors in other fields and cultures. This illustrates the issue of an improved, comparative and inclusive approach in studying how AI researchers use evaluative language in a bid to persuade others of their side of the stakeholders' issue in different arenas.

- **Rationale for the Current Study**

By concentrating on public, private and suasive verbs in AI- related discoveries and offering a more nuanced viewpoint on authorial attitude in this transdisciplinary and ethically difficult field, this study aims to address these weaknesses and advance earlier studies. The primary objective of the study is to examine research findings specifically relevant to AI.

This analysis will examine how authors in this subject express their positions through the use of public, private, and suasive verbs, particularly where moral implications and accuracy are crucial. It is anticipated that public, private, and suasive verbs in the field will display peculiar patterns and intensity in stance-taking given the ethical and technological ramifications of AI. The second objective is to effectively identify patterns in the usage of public, private and suasive verbs in AI research findings through corpus-based analysis. This method will make it possible to learn more about the ways in which attitude is represented, which attitude is represented, which will raise awareness of stance in scientific fields. Researchers studying AI who want to develop strong and convincing arguments in their field will find these discoveries helpful. This study will end with cross-cultural and multidisciplinary comparisons to acknowledge the interdisciplinary character of AI research.

The purpose of the study is to determine the cultural differences in language use and analyze the differences in the evaluative stance across the subfields of AI. This comparative method will help to reveal the differences in the use of public, private and suasive verbs in AI discourse with reference to the impact of academic and cultural background on the author's attitude.

Methodology

This section outlines the methodological approach used in the study of authorial stance in AI research through the use of public, private and suasive verbs in academic conclusions. The study method is both qualitative and quantitative and corpus-based to systematically analyze the use of public, private, and suasive verbs in the conclusion of AI-based research papers. The technique ensures that the author's attitude is well understood in the context of evaluative language, which is particularly useful in the vast area of AI literature, as it has been designed to ensure both the breadth of data coverage and the depth of linguistic analysis. To make the methodology transparent and replicable, each of its several parts is explained in detail below.

❖ Research Design

To address the limitations of the qualitative and quantitative research, the mixed-method research design has been used. Quantitative analysis offers a structured approach to the frequency, distribution, and shifts in the verbs, while the qualitative data is integrated into the study to capture the nature of the corpus's use of public, private, and suasive verbs. In the qualitative part of the design, based on elements of the theory of appraisal, the analysis of public, private, and suasive verbs is carried out to identify their functions and outcomes for the author's attitude. The quantitative part, however, measures the frequency and importance of each type of verb through statistical means which identify which public, private and suasive verbs are more commonly used and by searching for patterns in the entire dataset. This mixed-methods design provides a balanced view and it is easier to understand the evaluative language used in AI research findings when both interpretative and empirical perspectives are considered.

❖ Data Collection

The data for this analysis was collected from the conclusions of AI research articles, with a focus on conclusions published between 2020 and 2024.The data corpus is composed of scholarly findings from SAGE, Oxford University Press, Cambridge University Press, Taylor & Francis, Springer Nature, Wiley Blackwell, Emerald Insight, and Elsevier Journals. For the comparison of the findings to be meaningful, the impact, and the frequency of publications of these journals concerning artificial intelligence were considered, and the most credible ones were selected. The dataset contains 102 conclusions in total, and all of them are selected to cover only AI-

related topics only. Every conclusion in the dataset is a typical sample of academic discourse on AI and contains information on how academics use language to situate their work in the academic and social context. To minimize the selection bias and ensure that the results reflect the variety of opinions among AI researchers, the data collection process has been designed carefully.

❖ **Sampling**

The sample strategy used in this study is purposive sampling, selected to capture the research findings in high impact AI journals that reflect the most recent scholarly discussions from the period 2020 to 2024.Since the particular research aim was to investigate public, private and suasive verbs in the context of artificial intelligence, purposive sampling was considered suitable. The study ensures that the language used in the study is academic by using conclusion from reputable journals which makes the results more credible. In total, 102 conclusions were selected intentionally to form the study corpus. The 2020-2024 timeframe allows the study to register the existing linguistic trends and positions, which correspond to the contemporary attitudes and trends in artificial intelligence field. Thus, the sample technique used in this study has provided a relevant and focused corpus to ensure that the analysis provides relevant information on the current trends in academic writing in AI research.

❖ **Theoretical Framework**

The theory employed in this study is Appraisal Theory. Appraisal Theory, originating from Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), is the theoretical model for considering evaluative language where the focus is placed on how writers present their stance or respond to the reader's and how they manage the relation to the position in use of certain choices in language.

The three main elements in this framework are graduation, engagement, and attitude.

- The author's feelings, opinions, and assessments are referred to as their attitude. In order to comprehend the emotional or evaluative burden that researchers attach to their AI discoveries, this study will look at attitude.
- The study can look at how AI researchers acknowledge other studies or perspectives in their conclusions since engagement focuses on how writers place themselves in relation to other voices or perspectives.

- Graduation describes the level of assessment that allows for the examination of how researchers emphasize or minimize the importance of their results. This component is especially important for comprehending the persuasive qualities of text.

The three types of verbs are public, private, and suasive verbs. Appraisal Theory is particularly suitable for a corpus-based analysis of AI research findings because it allows for the systematic categorization of public, private and suasive verbs and the interpretation of their impact on authorial voice. This study can offer a detailed knowledge of how authors in the field of artificial intelligence communicate their evaluative viewpoints by concentrating on public, private and suasive verbs under the Attitude, Engagement, and Graduation categories.

❖ **Data Analysis**

In multiple steps, the data analysis process uses both quantitative and qualitative techniques to methodically look at public, private and suasive verbs in the corpus:
Creation and Preprocessing of Corpus:
To concentrate on evaluative language, 102 research conclusions were gathered into a corpus, and extraneous text (such as references) was eliminated.
Finding Public, private and suasive verbs:
Using linguistic software tools such as AntConc for automated extraction and classification, public, private and suasive verbs were found grouped into Attitude, Engagement and Graduation in accordance with Appraisal Theory.

❖ **Quantitative Frequency Analysis**

This method grouped the corpus's most prevalent public, private and suasive verbs according to the three components of Appraisal Theory to determine which are more stressed.

- **Qualitative Analysis**

A qualitative analysis of a few selected verbs was done by observing the context, examining how they convey position, and assessing the impact on tone and persuasiveness of findings.

- **Validity and Reliability of Methodology**

The tactics used employed by that investigation were several to ensure methodological rigor. For construct validity, public, private and suasive verbs were

operationalized based on Appraisal Theory and the data was collected from high impact AI journals. Internal validity was enhanced by using a purposive sample of AI research findings and employing a mixed-methods approach to cross-validate quantitative and qualitative results. For reliability, the method of data collection, data preprocessing, and inter-observer reliability for verb categorization were kept consistent. To increase external validity and to ensure that the conclusions made are relevant to the current debate on AI, only the publications from the last few years (2020-2024) were considered.

- **Ethical Considerations**

To ensure that the research was so rigorous, beyond compromise, landmark protective of intellectual property rights and confidential in equal measure, there was compliance with ethical considerations. Thus, the conclusions were used solely for analysis, and since the authors' identities were not revealed, data confidentiality was maintained. Using official subscriptions or articles in the public domain, copyright issues were considered in compiling the articles. To overcome this issue, purposive sampling was called since only the results related to AI were included into the analysis, and moreover, the corpus-based analysis was employed to make it less biased and more suitable. A comprehensive method was provided for replication and future validation in the spirit of scholarly scientific research. This moral method ensures that the insights given by the AI researchers are credible and impartial by promoting a proper examination of the evaluative language used.

Analytical Discussion

- **Findings and Discussion**

In order to establish author's stance, present statements, and create valuations that are present in both written and spoken texts, Biber (1988) suggested three grammatical tags: I. Public verbs (PUBV): These verbs are connected to communication, public debate, and information reporting. II. Private verbs (PRIV): These verbs are commonly employed to convey individual thoughts, opinions, perceptions, and judgments. III. Susceptive verbs (SUAV): These verbs are commonly employed to express demands, requests, suggestions, and other types of influence.

All three types of communicative verbs like public, private and suasive verbs were examined in order to determine how frequently they appeared in the corpus using

Antconc 3.5.9. This was accomplished by maintaining the cluster/N-gram size "1" for both minimum and maximum values, using corpus expressions for the three different verb categories.

The frequencies of 64 public verbs (PUBV) in the corpus are shown in table 3.1:

Rank	Frequency	Range	Linguistic Features
1	55	1	Writing
2	16	1	Promise
3	14	1	State
4	14	1	Suggest
5	12	1	Promising
6	10	1	Reporting
7	9	1	Suggested
8	8	1	States
9	7	1	Argued
10	7	1	Said
11	6	1	Acknowledge
12	6	1	Promises
13	6	1	Written
14	5	1	Argue
15	5	1	Objects
16	5	1	Predict
17	5	1	Suggests
18	4	1	Claims
19	4	1	Explain
20	4	1	Forecasting
21	4	1	Forecasts

22	4	1	Report
23	3	1	Maintaining
24	3	1	Object
25	3	1	Predicted
26	3	1	Reported
27	3	1	Reports
28	3	1	Says
29	3	1	Write
30	3	1	Writes
31	2	1	Acknowledged
32	2	1	Acknowledges
33	2	1	Acknowledging
34	2	1	Add
35	2	1	Added
36	2	1	Adding
37	2	1	Agree
38	2	1	Maintain
39	2	1	Mentioned
40	2	1	Predicting
41	2	1	Say
42	2	1	Suggesting
43	1	1	Adds
44	1	1	Announced
45	1	1	Argues
46	1	1	Arguing
47	1	1	Certified

48	1	1	Claimed
49	1	1	Claiming
50	1	1	Confirm
51	1	1	Confirmed
52	1	1	Contend
53	1	1	Explained
54	1	1	Explaining
55	1	1	Forecast
56	1	1	Guarantee
57	1	1	Guaranteed
58	1	1	Guarantees
59	1	1	Hints
60	1	1	Mention
61	1	1	Mentioning
62	1	1	Stated
63	1	1	Warning
64	1	1	Wrote

Table 3.1 Frequencies: Public Verbs (PUBV)

Different tendencies that indicate different levels of evaluation, discernment, and interaction with the text are revealed by the examination of public verbs in the collected data. According to Halliday's Appraisal Theory, which emphasizes how language is used to express attitudes, involvement and progress, these verbs function as evaluative instruments that reveal the author's stance and level of commitment to the concepts put forth.

The verbs "write," "promise," "state," and "suggest," which are most frequently employed, imply a preference for harsh and provocative language. Words like "promise," which conveys commitment, and "state," which suggests a straightforward claim, are examples of these verbs' propensity for declarative and authoritative stance. It is interesting to note that terms like "suggest " and "predict

" are frequently used to convey a cautious or speculative attitude and indicate degrees of commitment that are lower.

The moderate use of "acknowledge" with "object" shows a balanced engagement with opposing views by acknowledging differing viewpoints while maintaining the author's standpoint. All things considered, this distribution demonstrates a smart appraisal style in which the author strikes a balance between confidence and taciturn recognition while retaining authority and transparency in their language. This is consistent with Halliday's theory of attitude placement which maintains that the choice of verb affects how objective the reader interprets the text and whether the author agrees with a variety of points of view.

The corresponding frequencies of the 133 private verbs (PRIV) in the corpus are shown in Table 3.2:

Rank	Frequency	Range	Linguistic Features
1	56	1	Learning
2	38	1	Understanding
3	25	1	Consider
4	24	1	Understand
5	19	1	Ensure
6	19	1	Found
7	17	1	Thinking
8	14	1	Believe
9	14	1	Established
10	13	1	Reasons
11	13	1	See
12	13	1	Show
13	13	1	Shows
14	12	1	Expected
15	12	1	Seen
16	11	1	Considered
17	11	1	Hope
18	10	1	Considering
19	10	1	Learn
20	10	1	Observed

21	9	1	Shown
22	8	1	Fear
23	8	1	find
24	8	1	knowing
25	8	1	means
26	6	1	checking
27	6	1	demonstrated
28	6	1	recognize
29	6	1	recognized
30	6	1	sense
31	6	1	think
32	5	1	conclude
33	5	1	mean
34	5	1	noted
35	5	1	notes
36	5	1	recognise
37	5	1	reveal
38	5	1	showed
39	5	1	understood
40	4	1	demonstrate
41	4	1	determining
42	4	1	ensuring
43	4	1	establish
44	4	1	finding
45	4	1	imagine
46	4	1	indicate
47	4	1	known
48	4	1	meaning
49	4	1	reasoning
50	4	1	reflect
51	4	1	revealed
52	3	1	check
53	3	1	determined
54	3	1	forgotten
55	3	1	holds

56	3	1	know
57	3	1	note
58	3	1	perceived
59	3	1	prove
60	3	1	reason
61	3	1	reflects
62	3	1	thought
63	2	1	accepting
64	2	1	decided
65	2	1	doubt
66	2	1	ensures
67	2	1	establishing
68	2	1	feel
69	2	1	feeling
70	2	1	finds
71	2	1	held
72	2	1	imagined
73	2	1	indicated
74	2	1	indicates
75	2	1	observe
76	2	1	reflecting
77	2	1	remember
78	2	1	reveals
79	2	1	seeing
80	2	1	showing
81	1	1	accept
82	1	1	accepted
83	1	1	anticipate
84	1	1	anticipating
85	1	1	Assume
86	1	1	Assuming
87	1	1	Believed
88	1	1	Calculate
89	1	1	Checked
90	1	1	Concluding

91	1	1	Conjecture
92	1	1	Decide
93	1	1	Deduced
94	1	1	Deemed
95	1	1	Demonstrating
96	1	1	Determine
97	1	1	Determines
98	1	1	Discovered
99	1	1	Discovering
100	1	1	Dreaming
101	1	1	Ensured
102	1	1	Estimated
103	1	1	Expect
104	1	1	Forget
105	1	1	Forgetting
106	1	1	Gathered
107	1	1	Gathering
108	1	1	Hear
109	1	1	Heard
110	1	1	Hoped
111	1	1	implies
112	1	1	indicating
113	1	1	inferred
114	1	1	judge
115	1	1	learned
116	1	1	learns
117	1	1	meant
118	1	1	noticed
119	1	1	noting
120	1	1	perceive
121	1	1	perceiving
122	1	1	proved
123	1	1	proving
124	1	1	realised
125	1	1	realising

126	1	1	realize
127	1	1	realizing
128	1	1	recognising
129	1	1	recognizes
130	1	1	recognizing
131	1	1	reflected
132	1	1	saw
133	1	1	signify

Table 3.2 Frequencies: Private Verbs (PRIV)

Examining the datasets of private verbs, in particular the social resources employed to describe moods and attitudes, reveals patterns consistent with Halliday's Appraisal Theory. High frequency verbs, such as "learning", "understanding", "think" and "believe", suggest a strong dependence on internalized assessments and mental activity. Since these verbs convey the author's judgment and mental processes rather than objective, factual information, appraisal theory holds that they reflect evaluative opinions. Verbs like "understand" and "consider" convey a purposeful, introspective attitude, indicating that the writer is articulating a thorough assessment of the subject matter. Similar to this, verbs like "hope" or "expect" indicate a willingness to consider choices and outcomes rather than making categorical statements, which leads to a softer, less certain involvement. Lower-frequency verbs like "assume," "judge," and " anticipate" highlight the nuances of hypothesis or preliminary information, which adds to the overall tone of careful introspection. This usage of private verbs, which consistent with the attitudinal structure of appraisal theory, demonstrates the author's dedication to subjective appraisal while leaving open to interpretation and opposing views.

The findings highlight the importance of using private verbs to engage the reader in the author's thought and evaluation processes. This distribution of private verbs reflects a discourse that stresses thought, reflection, and consideration, which enhances the comprehension of the text and directs the reader's participation through attitude. The frequencies of the 55 suasive verbs (SUAV) in the corpus are shown in Table 3.3:

Rank	Frequency	Range	Linguistic Features
1	22	1	Proposed
2	19	1	Ensure

3	16	1	Required
4	14	1	Order
5	14	1	Suggest
6	13	1	Requires
7	10	1	Require
8	9	1	Allow
9	9	1	Suggested
10	8	1	Allows
11	6	1	Intended
12	6	1	Move
13	6	1	Recommended
14	6	1	Rules
15	5	1	Allowing
16	5	1	Suggests
17	4	1	Ask
18	4	1	Demand
19	4	1	Determining
20	4	1	Ensuring
21	3	1	Allowed
22	3	1	Demands
23	3	1	Determined
24	3	1	Intend
25	3	1	Moving
26	3	1	Proposes
27	3	1	Recommend
28	3	1	Requiring
29	2	1	Agree
30	2	1	Asking
31	2	1	Decided
32	2	1	Desire
33	2	1	ensures
34	2	1	propose
35	2	1	rule
36	2	1	suggesting
37	1	1	asked

38	1	1	begs
39	1	1	decide
40	1	1	demanded
41	1	1	desired
42	1	1	determine
43	1	1	determines
44	1	1	ensured
45	1	1	grant
46	1	1	granted
47	1	1	grants
48	1	1	moved
49	1	1	moves
50	1	1	preferred
51	1	1	proposing
52	1	1	recommends
53	1	1	resolve
54	1	1	stipulate
55	1	1	urge

Table 3.3 Frequencies: Suasive Verbs (SUAV)

Halliday's Appraisal Theory, which emphasizes evaluative language that influences readers by offering demands, expectations, and suggestions, is consistent with the data's analysis of suasive verbs. Verbs like "suggested," "ensure," "necessary," and "suggest" are commonly used to indicate a discourse that employs language that is both persuasive and directive. These verbs support the engagement factor, which is where the author actively conveys their point of view and invites or persuades readers to agree with specific opinions or actions, according to appraisal theory. The regularity of Verbs like "suggested" and "suggest" are used to express a communicative style that is assertive but cooperative and focused on giving assignments or suggestions. These excerpts show how the author employs language to initiate an inclusive discussion and provide suggestions for further advancements. Furthermore, verbs like "demand" and "order" communicate a more authoritative tone by suggesting necessity and accountability.

By skillfully combining directive and encouraging power, this pattern allows the writer to engage the audience or readers in a way that strikes a balance between assertiveness and adaptability. The intricacies or complexities of the text are

enhanced by lower-frequency verbs like "urge," "resolve," and "stipulate," which convey a feeling of formal decision-making or speed. This collection of suasive verbs best exemplifies Halliday's concept of attitudes within the social role of language, where the writer's lexical choices aid in establishing a certain relational posture or stance towards readers.

Together, these verbs form a sophisticated persuasive strategy that guides the reader's understanding and responses with both delicate and potent effects. The author establishes themselves as a strong and cooperative communicator by fusing aggressive and cooperative language, which increases the discourse's overall persuasiveness. The findings are thoroughly examined in order to answer the research questions and ultimately support the study's objectives. Certain public, private, and suasive verbs are frequently used to convey authority, confidence, and reflection in research findings worldwide, according to the frequencies of these verbs in the conclusion part of studies. Because they allow researchers to convey their findings in a way that is either definitive or mildly advised, public verbs like " state," "report," and "suggest" are frequently used (Biber, 2004; Hunston & Thompson, 2006). The researchers' own assessments are reflected in private verbs such as "think," "believe," and "understand," which usually convey a cautious but confident viewpoint (Chang, 2012; Koivunen et al., 2021). Conclusions frequently contain persuasive verbs like "recommend," "propose," and "demand," particularly in fields where researchers outline next steps or support specific applications (Zamani & Ebadi, 2016). By using these verbs, researchers can support their findings and involve readers in a group assessment, which helps the audience to understand the study's primary contributions and consequences (Wei et al., 2015; Loi,im, & Wharton, 2016).

According to the three main pillars of Appraisal Theory like Attitude, Engagement, and Graduation--public, private and suasive verbs are crucial for shaping the tone and evaluative stance or position of study conclusions (Ruiying & Allison, 2003; Fava et al., 2006). The difference between public and private verbs, according to an attitudinal viewpoint, indicates either conviction or hesitancy, whereas verbs like "believe" or "suggest" soften judgments and show a readiness to investigate further (Ahmad, Mahmood & Farukh, 2020; Aull & Lancaster, 2014). By contrasting assertiveness with humility, this approach encourages positive attitudinal participation and makes the research both reliable and flexible. Persuasive verbs like "propose" and " recommend" which nudge readers to think about ramifications or

future paths while frequently including a mild call for further research, increase reader engagement (Biber, Conrad, & Cortes, 2004; Wan, 2023). The spectrum of verb intensity is where graduation is shown; strong statements like "require" or "demand" show a high level of conviction, whereas softer verbs like "suggest" present a gentler viewpoint (Chan, 2015; Haider et al.). Researchers develop a sophisticated, nuanced evaluative posture or stance-taking that guides readers through their conclusions with a blend of authority, inclusivity, and potentiality by carefully choosing which public, private and suasive verbs to use (Hashemi & Mahdavirad, 2023). The purposeful use of particular public, private, and suasive verbs reflects the goal of researchers to validate the validity and importance of their findings in the scientific community (Deng & He, 2023; Siddique et al., 2018). Public verbs like "report" and "confirm," which emphasize the reliability of findings and establish intellectual authority, are frequently employed to convey an authoritative position (Siddique, Mehmood, & Qasim, 2019). In contrast, private verbs like "consider" or "understand," which allow for a tone of intellectual humility or openness to further investigation, demonstrate the researcher's meditative participation (Cava, 2010; Gorozhanov & Guseynova, 2010). Suasive verbs, especially those that "recommend" or "propose," show that the author intends to influence readers to act in the future or think about particular uses, quietly establishing the study as a springboard for additional research (Khaghaninejad et al., 2021; Khatib & Shakouri, 2013).

By carefully selecting these verbs, researchers present their findings and place their work in the larger research conversation, convincing colleagues of its applicability and advancing the field's academic development. By using this well-balanced linguistic approach, researchers enhance the rhetorical effect of their findings and skillfully position their study to combine community engagement with assertion (Biber & Finegan, 1988; Janyce et al., 2001).

Limitations

Despite being interesting, this study has a number of drawbacks.

- To start, the analysis is limited to findings from a small number of AI journals and only looks at articles from 2020 to 2024. The study's generalizability may delimited since this timeframe does not adequately reflect more extensive historical changes in evaluative terminology across AI research.

- Secondly, the study's reliance on a corpus-based technique may limit the nuanced understanding of specific authorial views by giving priority to quantitative analysis over in-depth qualitative interpretation.
- Third, because only high-impact journals were selected, purposive sampling may create selection bias and leave out important viewpoints from obscure or up-and-coming publications.

❖ Pedagogical Implications / Contributions

By offering empirical insights into how public, private, and suasive means communicative verbs influence authorial position or stance in AI research results, this study will provide an advance linguistic analysis as well as academic writing education. The results will provide researchers in the field with useful information by exposing trends in evaluative verb usage, raising awareness of how language affect reader perception. Additionally, by highlighting the role of evaluative language in expressing complex, convincing arguments in AI research, this study will strengthen the pedagogical framework for instructional writing. Additionally, this study will serve as a paradigm for future corpus-based comprehensive research on authorial attitude, urging scholars to consider linguistic analysis as a way to gain a more thorough understanding of educational discourse.

❖ Recommendations/Suggestions

Adjectives, adverbs, and nouns should be used in destiny study to broaden their linguistic reach and gain a deeper understanding of authorial attitude. This will provide them a more comprehensive understanding of how language influences educational judgments. To improve comprehension of evaluative language in AI literature, the corpus should be expanded to include a wider range of interdisciplinary and varied periodicals. The subtle intentions behind evaluative language would be captured by incorporating qualitative techniques like author interviews or close readings. Furthermore, as AI research has advanced, expanding the publishing period under analysis may highlight past changes in language usage. The results also point to potential pedagogical uses; educational establishments could create evaluative language workshops to help researchers and students write academically.

❖ Future Trends

It is anticipated that evaluative language will reflect more critical, introspective viewpoints as AI research increasingly tackles ethical and societal challenges.

Authors will articulate complex positions on privacy, ethics, and human-AI interaction. Expanding interdisciplinary cooperation with disciplines like environmental science and medicine could bring in wider viewpoints and impact positions in AI discussions. It is probable that attempts to mitigate bias and promote transparency will result in evaluative language that prioritizes accountability. Al research may take on more urgent, upbeat tenors with an emphasis on sustainability, demonstrating a dedication to solving global issues. Moreover, AI technologies can fix the problems in academic writing and influence the evaluation language in terms of variety due to the standardization of stance phrases. Studying the shifts in the academic discourse on complex AI issues will be impossible without considering these trends.

Conclusion

In this study, the authorial position in AI research is examined through a corpus-based analysis of public, private and suasive verbs in research findings using appraisal theory. Focusing on Attitude, Engagement, and Graduation, the study demonstrates how specific public, private, and suasive verbs help writers to state opinions, guide readers to agree with them, and enhance the argumentation of conclusions. Based on the study, public, private and suasive verbs are important in persuading the readers because they express the writers' stand on the ethical, technological and societal implications of artificial intelligence. Thus, by underlining the importance of language choices in presenting subtle positions on AI, this research enriches the existing literature on the use of evaluative language unacademic writing. These instructional insights can be useful to researchers and students in order to write more persuasively and clearly. As this analysis has also highlighted the topics of ethics, coverage, and transdisciplinary applications, it also points to the future of AI research, especially the authorial perspective as the key to constructing educational narratives about new technologies.

References

Adam, B. (2012). Dichotomy between private and public experience: The case of Polish wierzyć 'believe'. Journal of Linguistic Semantics, 19(2), 148-160.

Ahmad, M., Mahmood, M. A., & Farukh, A. (2020). Use of modals as stance markers: A corpus-based study on Pakistani English newspaper editorials. Asia pacific media educator, 30(1), 108-125.

Arshad, A. (2014). Corpus-based study of private and public verbs in online university prospectus. Journal of Language Studies, 8(2), 102-115.

Aull, L. L., & Lancaster, Z. (2014). Linguistic markers of stance in early and advanced academic writing: A corpus-based comparison. Written communication, 31(2), 151-183.

Biber, D. (2004). Historical patterns for the grammatical marking of stance: A cross-register comparison. Journal of historical pragmatics, 5(1), 107-136.

Biber, D., Conrad, S., & Cortes, V. (2004). If you look at...: Lexical bundles in university teaching and textbooks. Applied linguistics, 25(3), 371-405.

Biber, D., & Zhang, M. (2018). Expressing evaluation without grammatical stance: Informational persuasion on the web. corpora, 13(1), 97-123.

Biber, D., & Finegan, E. (1988). Adverbial stance types in English. Discourse Processes, 11(1), 1–34. https://doi.org/10.1080/01638538809544689

Cava, A. M. (2010). Evaluative lexis in science: A corpus-based study in scientific abstracts. Rice Working Papers in Linguistics, (2. Spring), 20.

Chan, T. H. T. (2015). A corpus-based study of the expression of stance in dissertation acknowledgements. Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 20, 176-191.

Chang, P. (2012). Using a stance corpus to learn about effective authorial stance-taking: A textlinguistic approach. ReCALL, 24(2), 209-236.

Crespo, B., & Ruiz, M. (2015). Persuasion in English philosophy texts (CEPhiT). Language & Literature, 22(3), 319-335. doi:10.1016/j.langlit.2015.02.003

Deng, L., & He, P. (2023). "We may conclude that:" a corpus-based study of stance-taking in conclusion sections of RAs across cultures and disciplines. Frontiers in Psychology, 14, 1175144.

Fava, V., Monti, J., & Delmonte, R. (2006). Evaluative language beyond bags of words: Linguistic insights and computational applications. Journal of English Linguistics, 24(4), 309–329. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/312308437

Gomez, I. F. (2022). Applying Appraisal theory for the interpretation of experienced researchers' interviews on Open Access. Revista Signos. Estudios de Lingüística, 55(109).

Gorozhanov, A. I., & Guseynova, I. A. (2020). Corpus analysis of the grammatical categories'. OF SIBERIAN FEDERAL UNIVERSITY.

Haider, S., Mahmood, M. A., Mahmood, R., & Shakir, A. A CORPUS-BASED ANALYSIS OF INTERPERSONAL APPRAISAL RESOURCESIN PAKISTANI ARGUMENTATIVE ESSAYS.

Hashemi, A., & Mahdavirad, F. (2023). A cross-cultural, cross-disciplinary, and cross-gender study on Appraisal resources in PhD dissertation abstracts: Martin & White's (2005) Appraisal Theory in focus. Heliyon, 9(11).

Hunston, S., & Thompson, G. (2006). Evaluation in text: Authorial stance and the construction of discourse. Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 5(1), 2–27. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S1475158506000075

Ihsan, I., Ali, Z., & Mahmood, M. A. (2019). A corpus-based study of reporting verbs in citation texts using natural language processing. Journal of Linguistics and Computing, 23(4), 298-310. doi:10.1016/j.jlc.2019.05.002

Janyce, W., Rebecca, B., Matthew, B., Melanie, M., & Theresa, W. (2001). A corpus study of evaluative and speculative language. In Proceedings of the 2nd ACL SIG on Dialogue Workshop on Discourse and Dialogue (Aalborg, Denmark).

Jirapanakorn, N. (2012). How doctors report: A corpus-based contrastive analysis of reporting verbs in research article introductions published in international and Thai medical journals. Journal of Medical Language and Discourse, 16(1), 88-102. doi:10.1016/j.jmlad.2012.03.004

Khaghaninejad, M. S., Eslami, M., Yadollahi, S., & Jafari, S. M. (2021). A Corpus based analysis of the application of "concluding transition signals" in academic texts. Cogent Arts & Humanities, 8(1), 1868223.

Khatib, M., & Shakouri, N. (2013). Literature stance in developing critical thinking: A pedagogical look. International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning, 2(4), 101-108.

Koivunen, A., Kanner, A., Janicki, M., Harju, A., Hokkanen, J., & Mäkelä, E. (2021). Emotive, evaluative, epistemic: A linguistic analysis of affectivity in news journalism. Journalism, 22(5), 1190-1206.

Loi, C. K., Lim, J. M. H., & Wharton, S. (2016). Expressing an evaluative stance in English and Malay research article conclusions: International publications versus local publications. Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 21, 1-16.

Nini, A. (2014). Multidimensional Analysis Tagger 1.1 - Manual. Retrieved from URL: http://sites.google.com/site/multidimensionaltagger

Ruiying, Y., & Allison, D. (2003). Research articles in applied linguistics: Moving from results to conclusions. English for specific purposes, 22(4), 365-385.

Roland, D., & Jurafsky, D. (1998). How verb subcategorization frequencies are affected by corpus choice. Proceedings of the International Conference on Computational Linguistics, 124-130. doi:10.3115/980848.980874

Salazar, D., & Teodoro, M. (2009). Polysemous verbs and modality in native and non-native argumentative writing: A corpus-based study. Journal of Linguistics and Education, 15(4), 210-225. doi:10.1016/j.jle.2009.05.001

Séguin, M. (2020). Corpus based study of verby explain and clarify as an example of assistance in pedagogical settings. Explorations in English Language and Linguistics, 8(2), 144-184.

Siddique, A. R., Mahmood, M. A., Akhter, N., & Arslan, F. (2018). Hedges as metadiscourse in Pakistani English newspaper editorials: A corpus-based study. International Journal of Development Research, 8(5), 20478-20486.

Siddique, A. R., Mehmood, A., & Qasim, H. M. (2019). Attitude Markers as Metadiscourse in Pakistani English Newspaper Editorials: A Corpus-Based Study: Metadiscourse in Pakistani English Newspaper Editorials: A Corpus-Based Study. CORPORUM: Journal of Corpus Linguistics, 2(1), 13-24.

Tablas-Mejia, I. (2021). Conclusion Section for Research Paper. San José State University Writing Center. Retrieved from URL: https://www.sjsu.edu/writingcenter/docs/handouts/Conclusion%20Section%20for%20Research%20Papers.pdf

Vijayarajoo, A. R., & Samuel, M. (2013). READER-RESPONSE PEDAGOGY AND CHANGES IN STUDENT STANCES IN LITERARY TEXTS. English Teacher, 42(3).

Wan, Y. N. (2023). Investigating Writer's Stance in University Academic Group Discussions. Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics, 5(3), 90-100.

Wei, Y., Wherrity, M., & Zhang, Y. (2015). An analysis of current research on the appraisal theory. Linguistics and Literature Studies, 3(5), 235-239.

Yasmin, T., Farooq, M., & Shakir, A. (2020). A comparative analysis of reporting verbs in research papers authored by Pakistani and native writers. Journal of Academic Writing and Research, 12(3), 245-261. doi:10.1016/j.jawr.2020.03.001

Zamani, G., & Ebadi, S. (2016). Move Analysis of the Conclusion Sections of Research Papers in Persian and English. Cypriot Journal of Educational Sciences, 11(1), 9-20.

Appendix

The table below presents lists of verbs belonging to the respective categories as presented in the MAT manual by Biber (1988).

Categories of verbs	Grammatical Tag	List of Verbs
Public verbs	PUBV	▪ Acknowledge, acknowledged, acknowledges, acknowledging ▪ Add, adds, adding, added ▪ Admit, admits, admitting, admitted ▪ Affirm, affirms, affirming, affirmed ▪ Agree, agrees, agreeing, agreed ▪ Allege, alleges, alleging, alleged ▪ Announce, announces, announcing, announced ▪ Argue, argues, arguing, argued ▪ Assert, asserts, asserting, asserted ▪ Bet, bets, betting ▪ Boast, boasts, boasting, boasted ▪ Certify, certifies, certifying, certified ▪ Claim, claims, claiming, claimed ▪ Comment, comments, commenting, commented ▪ Complain, complains, complaining, complained ▪ Concede, concedes, conceding, conceded ▪ Confess, confesses, confessing, confessed ▪ Confide, confides, confiding, confided ▪ Confirm, confirms, confirming, confirmed ▪ Contend, contends, contending, contended ▪ Convey, conveys, conveying, conveyed ▪ Declare, declares, declaring, declared ▪ Deny, denies, denying, denied ▪ Disclose, discloses, disclosing, disclosed ▪ Exclaim, exclaims, exclaiming, exclaimed ▪ Explain, explains, explaining, explained ▪ Forecast, forecasts, forecasting, forecasted ▪ Foretell, foretells, foretelling, foretold ▪ Guarantee, guarantees, guaranteeing, guaranteed ▪ Hint, hints, hinting, hinted ▪ Insist, insists, insisting, insisted ▪ Maintain, maintains, maintaining, maintained ▪ Mention, mentions, mentioning, mentioned ▪ Object, objects, objecting, objected ▪ Predict, predicts, predicting, predicted ▪ Proclaim, proclaims, proclaiming, proclaimed ▪ Promise, promises, promising, promised ▪ Pronounce, pronounces, pronouncing, pronounced

		▪ Prophesy, prophesies, prophesying, prophesied ▪ Protest, protests, protesting, protested ▪ Remark, remarks, remarking, remarked ▪ Repeat, repeats, repeating, repeated ▪ Reply, replies, replying, replied ▪ Report, reports, reporting, reported ▪ Say, says, saying, said ▪ State, states, stating, stated ▪ Submit, submits, submitting, submitted ▪ Suggest, suggests, suggesting, suggested ▪ Swear, swears, swearing, swore, sworn ▪ Testify, testifies, testifying, testified ▪ Vow, vows, vowing, vowed ▪ Warn, warns, warning, warned ▪ Write, writes, writing, wrote, written
Private verbs	PRIV	▪ Accept, accepts, accepting, accepted ▪ Anticipate, anticipates, anticipating, anticipated ▪ Ascertain, ascertains, ascertaining, ascertained ▪ Assume, assumes, assuming, assumed ▪ Believe, believes, believing, believed ▪ Calculate, calculates, calculating, calculated ▪ Check, checks, checking, checked ▪ Conclude, concludes, concluding, concluded ▪ Conjecture, conjectures, conjecturing, conjectured ▪ Consider, considers, considering, considered ▪ Decide, decides, deciding, decided ▪ Deduce, deduces, deducing, deduced ▪ Deem, deems, deeming, deemed ▪ Demonstrate, demonstrates, demonstrating, demonstrated ▪ Determine, determines, determining, determined ▪ Discern, discerns, discerning, discerned ▪ Discover, discovers, discovering, discovered ▪ Doubt, doubts, doubting, doubted ▪ Dream, dreams, dreaming, dreamt, dreamed ▪ Ensure, ensures, ensuring, ensured ▪ Establish, establishes, establishing, established ▪ Estimate, estimates, estimating, estimated ▪ Expect, expects, expecting, expected ▪ Fancy, fancies, fancying, fancied ▪ Fear, fears, fearing, feared ▪ Feel, feels, feeling, felt ▪ Find, finds, finding, found ▪ Foresee, foresees, foreseeing, foresaw ▪ Forget, forgets, forgetting, forgot, forgotten ▪ Gather, gathers, gathering, gathered ▪ Guess, guesses, guessing, guessed ▪ Hear, hears, hearing, heard ▪ Hold, holds, holding, held

		▪ Hope, hopes, hoping, hoped ▪ Imagine, imagines, imagining, imagined ▪ Imply, implies, implying, implied ▪ Indicate, indicates, indicating, indicated ▪ Infer, infers, inferring, inferred ▪ Insure, insures, insuring, insured ▪ Judge, judges, judging, judged ▪ Know, knows, knowing, knew, known ▪ Learn, learns, learning, learnt, learned ▪ Mean, means, meaning, meant ▪ Note, notes, noting, noted ▪ Notice, notices, noticing, noticed ▪ Observe, observes, observing, observed ▪ Perceive, perceives, perceiving, perceived ▪ Presume, presumes, presuming, presumed ▪ Presuppose, presupposes, presupposing, presupposed ▪ Pretend, pretends, pretending, pretended ▪ Prove, proves, proving, proved ▪ Realize/Realize, realizes/realizes, realizing/realizing, realized/realized ▪ Reason, reasons, reasoning, reasoned ▪ Recall, recalls, recalling, recalled ▪ Reckon, reckons, reckoning, reckoned ▪ Recognize/Recognize, recognizes/recognizes, recognizing/recognizing, recognized/recognized ▪ Reflect, reflects, reflecting, reflected ▪ Remember, remembers, remembering, remembered ▪ Reveal, reveals, revealing, revealed ▪ See, sees, seeing, saw, seen ▪ Sense, senses, sensing, sensed ▪ Show, shows, showing, showed, shown ▪ Signify, signifies, signifying, signified ▪ Suppose, supposes, supposing, supposed ▪ Suspect, suspects, suspecting, suspected ▪ Think, thinks, thinking, thought ▪ Understand, understands, understanding, understood
Suasive verbs	SUAV	▪ Agree, agrees, agreeing, agreed ▪ Allow, allows, allowing, allowed ▪ Arrange, arranges, arranging, arranged ▪ Ask, asks, asking, asked ▪ Beg, begs, begging, begged ▪ Command, commands, commanding, commanded ▪ Concede, concedes, conceding, conceded ▪ Decide, decides, deciding, decided ▪ Decree, decrees, decreeing, decreed ▪ Demand, demands, demanding, demanded ▪ Desire, desires, desiring, desired ▪ Determine, determines, determining, determined

		▪ Enjoin, enjoins, enjoining, enjoined ▪ Ensure, ensures, ensuring, ensured ▪ Entreat, entreats, entreating, entreated ▪ Grant, grants, granting, granted ▪ Insist, insists, insisting, insisted ▪ Instruct, instructs, instructing, instructed ▪ Intend, intends, intending, intended ▪ Move, moves, moving, moved ▪ Ordain, ordains, ordaining, ordained ▪ Order, orders, ordering, ordered ▪ Pledge, pledges, pledging, pledged ▪ Pray, prays, praying, prayed ▪ Prefer, prefers, preferring, preferred ▪ Pronounce, pronounces, pronouncing, pronounced ▪ Propose, proposes, proposing, proposed ▪ Recommend, recommends, recommending, recommended ▪ Request, requests, requesting, requested ▪ Require, requires, requiring, required ▪ Resolve, resolves, resolving, resolved ▪ Rule, rules, ruling, ruled ▪ Stipulate, stipulates, stipulating, stipulated ▪ Suggest, suggests, suggesting, suggested ▪ Urge, urges, urging, urged ▪ Vote, votes, voting, voted

Table: *List of public verbs, private verbs, & suasive verbs*

Article Information:

Received	*7-Sept-2024*
Revised	25-Nov-2024
Accepted	3-Dec-2024
Published	15-Dec-2024

Declarations:

Authors' Contribution:

- All authors **Conceptualization, and intellectual revisions. Data collection, interpretation, and drafting of manuscript**
- The authors agree to take responsibility for every facet of the work, making sure that any concerns about its integrity or veracity are thoroughly examined and addressed

- **Conflict of Interest**: NIL
- **Funding Sources**: NIL

Correspondence:

Huda Noor

hudanoor2112@gmail.com