



P-ISSN 2355-2794
E-ISSN 2461-0275

Analysing Authorial Identity Construction in the Review Article Genre in Applied Linguistics

Ali Sorayyaei Azar^{*1}
Azirah Hashim²

¹Department of Education, School of Education and Social Sciences, Management & Science University, Shah Alam 40100, MALAYSIA

²Department of English Language, Faculty of Languages and Linguistics, University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur 50603, MALAYSIA

Abstract

Authorial identity construction is one of many professional rhetorical strategies employed by authors in academic review genres. Authors usually create a persona to represent themselves, their seniority in the field, and the community to which they belong. The author's visibility is made possible through several rhetorical devices. Perhaps the most remarkable way of such authorial identity construction in the review article genre is self-mentions. The aims of this research are (1) to find out what types of self-mention are frequently used in review articles, (2) to determine the frequency of use and distribution of self-mentions in the review articles, and (3) to investigate the rhetorical function of self-mentions in the different analytical sections of the review articles. The data, drawn from a randomly selected corpus of thirty-two review articles, were analysed using WordSmith Tools Version 6. The findings indicated that first-person plural pronouns were more frequently used than singular pronouns in the whole corpus except in the two review texts. It was also observed that the frequency of occurrence for the exclusive and inclusive pronouns was very close to each other. Most importantly, the inclusive pronouns were used not only as a politeness strategy to appreciate the readers and keep the writers' claims balanced but also as a persuasive tool to seek the readers' agreement in the evaluation of research developments. This study revealed that authors construct various professional personae

* Corresponding author, email: ali_sorayyaei@msu.edu.my

Citation in APA style: Azar, A. S., & Hashim, A. (2022). Analysing authorial identity construction in the review article genre in Applied Linguistics. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 9(1), 78-98.

Received July 26, 2021; Revised October 31, 2021; Accepted December 1, 2021; Published Online January 17, 2022

<https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v9i1.21898>

as a rhetorical strategy to carve their authorial identity and credibility in the review article genre. The findings of this study have pedagogical implications in the field of academic writing in applied linguistics as well as other disciplines.

Keywords: Authorial identity, metadiscourse, review article, rhetorical strategies, genre stance, self-mention markers.

1. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the field of academic discourse analysis has paid increasing attention to authorial identity construction. In the genre of academic reviews, identity construction is one of the key topics of study. Authorial identity construction is one of the main rhetorical strategies that interest genre analysts amongst the different available genres. Through this strategy, authors in research genres, particularly in academic-review genres as one of the sub-branches of research genres (Swales, 2004), try to construct their ‘persona’ (i.e., authorial identity or voice) as a representation of themselves or their works, and to identify the community which they belong. The persona engages the readers with the authors’ argument; in other words, it engages the readers with the propositions the authors argue or evaluate in the research genres, particularly as readers’ engagement often happens in academic review genres. Additionally, authorial identity also serves as a personal signifier that demonstrates their seniority, experience, credibility, and works (Azar & Azirah, 2014, 2019). The visibility of an author’s persona in academic review genres is made possible through several rhetorical strategies, one of which includes explicit self-mention markers, especially ‘first-person pronouns’ (i.e., ‘I,’ ‘we’).

The analysis of a writer’s rhetorical strategies and ‘first-person pronouns’ is a widely researched topic in English for Academic Purposes (EAP). According to Ädel (2022), explicit references to the current writer and/or imagined or actual readers are used to make the writer and/or imagined or actual readers visible. It is typically done with first-person pronouns. There have been plenty of studies conducted since the late 1990s (Ädel, 2022; Bondi, 2012; Chen, 2020; Harwood, 2005a, 2005b; Hyland 2001, 2002a, 2002b, 2010, 2011; Ivanič, 1998; Ivanič & Camps, 2001; Khedri, 2016; Khedri & Kritsis, 2020; Molino, 2010; Tang & John, 1999; Vassileva, 1998, 2000; Walková, 2018, 2019; Xia, 2018) that have yielded a great deal of insight into the construction of authorial identities and writer’s visibility.

While these extensive studies have also included the sub-genres of academic reviews such as book reviews (Groom, 2009; Moreno & Suarez, 2008; Motta-Roth, 1995), literature review chapters (Kwan, 2006; Ridley, 2008; Thompson, 2009), and book review articles (Diani, 2009), only a few studies focusing on academic review articles exist (e.g., Grant & Booth, 2009; Myers, 1991; Noguchi, 2006, 2009; Swales, 2004). The corpora of the previous studies did not address the review articles in the field of applied linguistics. The previous studies, for example, Noguchi’s (2006) works, mostly focused on textual analysis of the science review article genre and the move structures of science review articles. Therefore, researching the review article genre in applied linguistics would highlight not only the genre-specific features that

govern this genre but also clarify the authors' rhetorical strategies employed in constructing an authorial identity.

Applied linguistics in review articles was selected as the subject discipline because it is the researchers' area of experience and interest. Another reason is the existing gap in the literature of academic review genres, particularly the review article genre. As stated before, there have been only a few studies addressing the review article genre, and not particularly in the field of applied linguistics. Besides, it should be stated that in the current study, Kaplan's (2002) view about 'Applied Linguistics' and its subfields was followed. He believes that "applied linguistics is too broad, and it can be interpreted as a discipline with a core and a periphery, and the periphery blurs into other disciplines that may or may not want to be allied" (Kaplan, 2002, p. 9).

The main focus of applied linguistics is to find answers to the language-based problems that people may face in the real world. Moreover, applied linguistics typically incorporates other disciplinary knowledge beyond linguistics in its efforts to address language-based problems. This field also includes several other sub-fields of study, including second language acquisition, forensic linguistics, language testing, corpus linguistics, lexicography, and dictionary-making, language translation, and to name a few more. That is why some members of these fields do not consider themselves applied linguists, but their work addresses practical language issues. In sum, applied linguistics has broad coverage in all the social sciences and these are the main reasons why the researchers have limited themselves to the field of applied linguistics.

This study attempts to investigate authors' stance strategies taken in the review article genre. In other words, it is intended not only to analyse the overall frequency of explicit self-mentions used in the corpus but also to study the methods utilized by writers to present themselves and their credibility in the review article genre. According to Hyland (2005b), self-mention and attitude markers, the two major features of metadiscourse, lead to the development of a relationship between authors and readers. Thus, this part of the research was limited to focus on self-mentions in review articles in applied linguistics due to several reasons, which are as follows: (1) to find out which self-mention resources the writers employ in their review article genre, (2) to determine the frequency of use and distribution of self-mentions in the review articles, and (3) to analyse the rhetorical function of self-mentions in the different analytical sections of the review articles. The following research questions are formulated based on the objectives of this research:

1. Which self-mention resources do authors opt for to construct their identity in the review articles in applied linguistics?
2. What is the frequency of use and distribution of self-mentions in the review articles?
3. What rhetorical functions do first-person pronouns fulfil in the review articles?
4. What are their functions in the different analytical sections of the review articles?

In the following section, the theoretical framework of this research and reviews of related literature are described and discussed to indicate how the authors take a stance and construct their authorial identity in the propositions they argue or evaluate in the review article genre.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Theoretical Framework

The term metadiscourse was first coined by the structural linguist [Harris \(1959\)](#) and later further developed by writers like [Kopple \(1985\)](#) and [Crismore \(1989\)](#). [Hyland \(2005b, p. 37\)](#) expands on their work, claiming that “metadiscourse is the cover term for the self-reflective expressions used to negotiate interactional meanings in a text”. The writer’s involvement here is defined as anticipating the reader’s anticipated reactions, objections, and processing needs. It consists of two parts: (1) an ‘interactive’ component that is used to organise propositional material in a way that a projected target audience will find cohesive and persuasive; and (2) an ‘interactional’ component that focuses on the participants’ interactions and it attempts to reflect the writer’s persona and a tenor that is consistent with the disciplinary community’s standards ([Hyland, 2005a](#)).

It is worth noting that the current study focused on interactional metadiscourse, for these resources are at the heart of academic communication as a socio-rhetorical activity that provides authors of research genres a variety of ways to mark their presence, negotiates knowledge claims, and engages their readers. Different scholars have used different terminologies to refer to different components of academic communication interaction: attitude ([Hyland, 1994](#)), epistemic modality ([Hyland, 1998](#)), appraisal ([Martin, 2000](#)), stance ([Biber & Finegan, 1989](#); [Hyland, 1999](#)), and metadiscourse ([Crismore, 1989](#); [Hyland, 1999](#)). Despite the abundance of studies, [Hyland’s \(2005b\)](#) interaction model provides a comprehensive and integrated model for academic argument and engagement. Interactions in academic writing, according to [Hyland \(2005b\)](#), are achieved by selecting choices from interpersonal systems of stance (including attitude markers, hedges, boosters, and self-mention markers) and engagement (including directives, questions, reader pronouns, shared knowledge, and personal asides). [Hyland \(2005b, p. 178\)](#) proposed an overall stance paradigm for academic writing that focused on “writer-oriented features of the interaction and referred to the ways academics annotate their texts to comment on the possible accuracy or credibility of a claim, the extent they want to commit themselves to it, or the attitude they want to convey to an entity, a proposition, or the reader”.

The visibility of the authors’ persona is made possible through self-mention markers in the propositions developed by the authors. The term self-mention has been defined as the explicit use of first-person pronouns and possessive adjectives by authors in written discourses. Self-mention resources can represent the writers’ presence in academic discourses ([Hyland, 2008](#)). These features can be measured by the frequency of first-person pronouns, objective pronouns, and possessive adjectives (e.g., ‘I,’ ‘me,’ ‘my,’ ‘we,’ ‘our,’ ‘us’). As has been highlighted by several experts ([Ädel, 2022](#); [Wang & Zeng, 2021](#)), the most visible and prominent presence of authorial identity is the first-person pronoun. All written discourses carry information about the writer, but the convention of personal projection through first-person pronouns is perhaps the most potent means of self-representation ([Ivanič, 1998](#)). One of the essential aspects of academic review genres is to present the authors’ interaction and persona. Thus, this significant feature happens through the authors’ involvement, and it can be presented explicitly with self-mention resources through the texts. There

is a range of discursual features to construct this authorial identity. However, the most significant one can appear in the form of self-reference.

This study, following Hyland's (2002a) functional classification for personal pronouns, focuses on the classification of four different discourse functions for the aspect of self-mentions in the review article genre. They are as follows: (1) stating a purpose, (2) explaining a procedure, (3) elaborating an argument, and (4) stating results or claims. Hyland's classification refers to the fact that certain functions contain more powerful authoritativeness (i.e., 'elaborating an argument' and 'stating results or claims') than others (i.e., 'stating a purpose' and 'explaining a procedure'). The writers strategically use an exclusive 'we' to refer to themselves or an inclusive 'we' to refer to themselves, discourse community members, or readers. It is the exclusive 'we' and explicit self-mention resources that this study is concerned with because WordSmith tools cannot spot and identify the implicit features of written texts, being one of the shortcomings of text analysis tools. In the following section, several studies analysing self-mentions in academic genres are reviewed.

2.2 Review of Related Studies

Hyland (2002b) believes that one of the fundamental factors in pragmatic competence is constructing authorial identity and conveying the main message of the research without simply reporting results or taking a stance to persuade their readers. The authors often adopt these communicative social practices and rhetorical features of a community they belong to and take a stance to carve out their different identities based on personal styles and formality. Personal styles and preferences may be considered crucial factors in constructing authorial identities in research genres. According to Ädel (2022, p. 53), "there is the possibility that certain discourse phenomena rely on individual preferences to a relatively large extent, such that in-group variation regarding for instance (im)personal style is also due to individual choice". This identity can be taken as a community member having adjusted their choice of discursual features to be following the values and beliefs of that specific community.

Another contribution in constructing authorial identity refers to Ivanič's (1998) study. Ivanič (1998) classified writers' identities into three aspects, including (1) 'autobiographical self' (the writers bring their life-history in a text to establish a unique territory and claim significance and centrality of their knowledge in that field), (2) 'discursual self' (the writers bring their image or voice in a text), and (3) 'authorial self' (the writers intrude into a text, and they stand in a position of a creator). Although the focus of the current study was on the third aspect of authorial identity, an attempt has been made to find out if the authors of review articles in applied linguistics have tried to take various voices and stand in different positions. Taking various voices and standing in different positions helps the authors to establish their positions. This rhetorical strategy indicates the degree of authoritativeness in their academic genres. Research has shown that writers often choose various stances in their clauses in the form of first-person pronouns (i.e., 'I' and 'we') to indicate that they oversee their claim, to influence the readers with their argument, and include their life history to establish a strong territory, taking over interaction in their texts (Gosden, 1993; Ivanič, 1998). Therefore, the self-mention aspect of stance markers is essential to affirm writers' credibility in their respective academic genres explicitly.

A noteworthy study related to self-mention resources is Tang and John's (1999, p. S31- S32) typology. They have proposed a typology of six different identities behind the first-person pronouns in English. The classification of their typology is as follows: (1) a representative role (e.g. 'as we already know...'), (2) a guide through the text (e.g. 'let us refer to this example...'), (3) an architect of the text (e.g. 'In this research, I will argue...'), (4) a recounter of the research process (e.g. 'I asked the participants to answer the questions...'), (5) an opinion-holder (e.g. 'I disagree with him/ her...') and (6) an originator (e.g. 'one part of the problem here, as I see it, refers to...').

Referring to this study (Tang & John, 1999), the range of the identities as mentioned varies from the most authoritative author to the least authoritative one. The former author, the most powerful one, holds the role of the originator. This type of writer claims authority and reveals that he/she has the capability to create new ideas. These writers can be identified through exclusive pronouns. The latter author, the least powerful one, holds a representative role. This type of writer does not claim authority nor creates any views or ideas. He/she may introduce himself/herself alongside other researchers and writers. He/she can be recognized through inclusive pronouns.

The use of self-mentions in academic writing of various disciplines was explored by Hyland (2001). He focused on using self-citation and exclusive first-person pronouns in a corpus of 240 published research articles in eight disciplines. The result revealed a greater use of first-person pronouns in soft disciplines. Hyland believes that self-mention plays a crucial role in mediating the relationship between writers' arguments and their discourse communities. It allows writers to create an identity as both a 'disciplinary servant' and 'persuasive originator.' Writers in the hard sciences downplay their roles in the research. In contrast, the higher frequency of personal pronouns in the soft sciences indicates their voice and authorial visibility in texts. He also emphasizes that arguments in soft knowledge domains are different from those of hard science domains due to the nature of these sciences. As Wang and Zeng (2021) contend, the use of first-person pronouns varies based on the discursive rules of each discipline. In a recent study, Hyland and Jiang (2018) found that self-mention pronouns have increased dramatically in sociology, biology, and electrical engineering over the last 50 years but have decreased in applied linguistics.

In another study, Hyland (2002a) has suggested his functional classification for personal pronouns in an academic setting. As discussed above, the current study follows his taxonomy, which suggests classifying four different discourse functions in terms of self-mentions in an academic setting. His classification, like that of Tang and John (1999), refers to the fact that certain functions contain more powerful authoritativeness. All in all, there are different classifications proposed in the literature for self-mention resources. The different classifications have been compared in Table 1 below to highlight their discursal functions.

The four basic identities and functions overlap and share the same functions as self-mention markers, as shown in Table 1. As 'we' descends the continuum from top to bottom, the writer's role changes from least authoritative to most authoritative as 'opinion holder' and 'originator', as identified by exclusive pronouns (such as 'I' and 'we').

Table 1. Identities and functions of self-mention resources.

Identities (Tang and John, 1999)	Functions (Hyland, 2002a)	The least powerful writer
Representative Role e.g., “As we already know...”		
Reader Guide e.g., “Let us see two examples...”		
Architect of the Text e.g., “In this paper, I will discuss...”	Stating { <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a background or a purpose 	
Recounters of the research process e.g., “I administered the questionnaire to two groups...”	Explaining a procedure	
Opinion holder e.g., “I agree with him/ her...”	Elaborating an argument	
Originator e.g., “Part of the problem here, as I see it, is...”	Stating { <ul style="list-style-type: none"> results or Claims 	
		The most powerful writer

Nevertheless, in another study, [Tse and Hyland \(2008\)](#) analyse a corpus of academic book reviews written by male and female writers, along with interviews with academics both from philosophy and biology. They discovered that both genders used interactional metadiscourse features twice as much as interactive markers, with male writers using them twice as much as female writers, demonstrating the genre’s evaluative nature. Male writers made more use of ‘engagement markers,’ ‘hedges,’ ‘boosters,’ and ‘self-mentions; the interviews with academics also confirmed this finding. As for interactive features, female writers made more transitions, which was the second most significant feature in male writers’ texts. It can be proven by both genders’ tendency to make a clear argument for their readers. Female writers were heavy users of evidential markers, and this was confirmed in academic interviews. There was, however, no significant difference between them in the use of code glosses. In summary, according to the genre (spoken or written) and community of practices in which genres happen, both genders apply meta-discourse features differently.

To conclude this section, authorial identity is used broadly through ‘stance’ features. Stance is broadly defined as linguistic features employed by authors to indicate their views, attitudes, evaluations, and judgment. [Hyland \(2008\)](#) contends that the perspective of stance can be referred to as “the writer’s textual voice or community recognized personality” (p. 5). Stance features such as self-mentions may indicate the writer’s authorial identity in academic review genres, so we have focused on analysing self-mentions in the review article genre in Applied Linguistics.

3. METHODS

3.1 The Corpus

The corpus was limited to applied linguistics discipline as described and specified in applied linguistics academic handbooks (e.g., Kaplan, 2002; Schmitt, 2002). The data of this research was drawn from a randomly selected corpus of thirty-two review articles, published between 2000-2007, from a discipline-related key journal in the field of applied linguistics (Annual Review of Applied Linguistics published by Cambridge University Press). The prestige and reputation of this journal in publishing review articles were taken into consideration. Another step in the sampling methodology of this study is to consult specialist informants in that particular field (i.e., ‘informant nomination’) and is an established procedure in sampling and selecting the corpus-based studies (Azar & Azirah, 2017a, 2017b; Hyland, 2000; Kuhl & Behnam, 2011; Kuhl et al., 2012). These specialist informants, who were the writers of review articles in applied linguistics, were asked to name the most prestigious journals with a high reputation among academics in which their review articles were published. The informants’ recommendation was to refer to review articles in applied linguistics in the ARAL journal for sampling methods.

3.2 The Corpus Tool

WordSmith Version 6 (Scott, 2012) is used to identify and extract self-mention markers automatically. The corpus tool identifies and reads plain text files, which end with a .txt directory. WordSmith Version 6 extracts lists of linguistic features in n-grams using statistical measures. In order to analyse, identify, and extract self-mention markers in the corpus, the computer-readable review texts were carefully scanned and analysed in search of self-representation resources.

3.3 Data Analysis Procedure

The study on the use of self-mentions was based on Hyland’s (2002a) model and classification. The analysis of self-mentions in the corpus was conducted in the subsequent steps. First, thirty-two review articles were analysed using WordSmith Version 6 (Scott, 2012). A list of eight markers was selected and developed based on previous works and literature lists, especially Hyland (2002a). The focus was on the investigation of explicit self-representation features used in the corpus. At the same time, a rigorous manual analysis of the context was also carried out to ensure authorial identity was expressed, focusing on frequency, type, and function of the self-mentions.

Several important factors and steps were considered at this stage of analysis. First, the analytical sections of the review articles were analysed in detail and carefully screened and marked. Then, the frequency and functions of individual self-mentions were presented and tabulated. Second, several cases were found to be irrelevant for the study and were deleted from the results (e.g., ‘I’ was found in the review texts as the term for ‘Internalized (I) Language’ was used by scholars). All first-person pronouns in integral and non-integral citations which denoted other writers’ ideas and positions were also deleted from the results. In order to analyse the first-person plural pronouns in the single-authored and multiple-authored review articles, all cases of the first-

person singular and plural pronouns identified in the entire corpus were reviewed in detail. The investigation of these pronouns in the corpus indicated that they were present in the review articles with varying frequencies. We standardised the frequency counts at 1,000 words and applied them for the entirety of this study.

In addition, at this stage, to obtain higher reliability in the findings of the current study, the second-rater's analysis was also included. Four different sections of review articles were reviewed thoroughly (i.e., the four analytical sections of the review articles were read word by word to ensure that the features stood for self-mention resources). This stage of the analysis was necessary to ensure the reliability of the findings. The second-rater double-checked the items. The inter-rater reliability was above 95%, which suggests high overall reliability in this research.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of the current study are presented in three sub-sections: (1) describing the type of self-mentions in the corpus, (2) explaining the frequency of use and distribution of self-mentions in the corpus, and (3) discussing their rhetorical functions in the different analytical sections of the review articles.

4.1 Type of Self-Mentions in the Review articles

There are two main types of self-mentions, namely first-person singular pronouns (such as 'I,' 'me,' and 'my') and the first-person plural pronouns (such as 'we,' 'us,' and 'our'). These pronouns include subjective, objective, and possessive cases. Generally, it was noted that first-person plural pronouns were more common than first-person singular pronouns, which was also the case in single-authored review articles. Table 2 summarizes the type of self-mentions in the entire corpus tabulated by WordSmith. It also shows the number of hits per 1,000 words for the different self-mentions in the corpus.

Table 2: Type of self-mention markers in the review articles.

No.	File	Overall words	Hits	per 1,000
	Overall	198426.00	534.00	2.69
1	we	198426.00	302.00	1.52
2	I	198426.00	102.00	0.51
3	our	198426.00	73.00	0.36
4	us	198426.00	43.00	0.21
5	me	198426.00	2.00	0.01
6	my	198426.00	3.00	0.02
7	the author	198426.00	7.00	0.03
8	the writer	198426.00	2.00	0.01

The findings indicated eight types of self-mention markers in the corpus, including 'we,' 'I,' 'our,' 'us,' 'me,' 'my,' 'the author,' and 'the writer.' The subjective pronoun 'we,' with a frequency of 302 items/1.52 in 1,000 words were used more frequently than other types of self-mentions (e.g., 'I,' the second most frequent feature in this study with 102 items/0.51 in 1,000 words). Overall, there were 534 hits/2.69 items in 1,000 words in the corpus.

4.2 Frequency of Use and Distribution of Self-Mentions in the Review Articles

It was noted that self-mention resources appeared in the four analytical sections with different frequencies. For example, 36 self-mentions (7.25 per 1,000 words) were hit in the Abstract sections and 60 resources (5 per 1,000 words) in the Introduction sections, which was less frequent than self-mentions in the Conclusion sections (77 items, 7.74 per 1,000 words). The analysis also illustrated those self-mentions were the least frequent in Body sections (361 items, 2.11 per 1,000 words). Table 3 illustrates the frequency of self-mentions in the four different analytical sections of the corpus. Table 3 also summarizes the frequency of self-mentions in each analytical section of the entire corpus tabulated by WordSmith.

Table 3: Distribution of self-mentions in the analytical sections of review articles.

Self-mention markers	Abstract		Introduction		Body		Conclusion	
	Freq.	Per 1,000	Freq.	Per 1,000	Freq.	Per 1,000	Freq.	Per 1,000
We	21	4.23	31	2.75	206	1.20	44	4.42
us	1	0.20	2	0.17	34	0.19	6	0.60
our	7	1.41	7	0.58	41	0.23	18	1.81
I	7	1.41	18	1.50	68	0.39	9	0.90
me	-	-	-	-	2	0.01	-	-
my	-	-	2	0.17	1	0.01	-	-
the author	-	-	-	-	7	0.04	-	-
the writer	-	-	-	-	2	0.01	-	-
Total	36	7.25	60	5.00	361	2.11	77	7.74

It is interesting to highlight that the total appearance of self-mentions in the current study was almost two times lower than Hyland's (2005b) results. He found that self-mentions in his corpus (30 Applied Linguistics research articles) appeared with a frequency of 4.8 per 1,000 words, whereas the findings of the current study indicated that self-mentions occurred with a frequency of 2.69 per 1,000 words in the corpus (i.e., two times lower than the previous study). This difference can be related to the type of article researched.

There is a significant difference between the research article genre and the review article genre. There is a possibility that the authors (in Hyland's study) in the qualitative and quantitative research articles presented themselves more explicitly than the review article authors. Although the presence of writers in academic discourses is disciplinary-specific (Hyland, 2001; Martínez, 2005), there is also a variation in a genre colony or genre family. As discussed in other studies, (Azar & Azirah, 2014; Swales, 2004), research articles and review articles are two sub-genres of the research genre. There is a possibility that authors' visibility in the research article genre is higher than the review article genre. Authors of research articles may try to express themselves more frequently and explicitly than review article authors due to the nature of that genre.

Two key points were yielded from the analysis of this data. First, most self-mentions belonged to the subjective pronoun 'we' (302 cases/1.52 per 1,000 words). In other words, it had the highest frequency among the authors' explicit self-mentions. In contrast, other self-mentions such as 'us,' 'our,' 'I,' 'me,' 'my,' 'the author,' and 'the writer' were rarely used. The second most frequent self-mention was the first-person singular pronoun 'I' (102 cases/0.51 per 1,000 words), very closely followed

by the possessive adjective ‘our’ (73 cases/0.36 per 1,000 words). Notably, it was found that the possessive adjective ‘our’ (0.36 per 1,000 words) was more common than the objective pronoun ‘us’ (0.21 per 1,000 words) in the corpus. Otherwise, the results of other researchers indicated that explicit self-mentions in other disciplines were invariably present and frequent in research articles. [Kuo’s \(1999\)](#) analysis of self-mentions in engineering fields and [Martínez’s \(2005\)](#) study in Biology, for example, indicated that a writer’s authorial voice was clearly visible in their works, particularly when using the exclusive ‘we’ more explicitly in the Result sections than other analytical sections.

As previously discussed, the subjective pronoun ‘we’ can be used inclusively or exclusively. For example, in the following excerpts, (1) and (2), taken from the corpus of this study, the use of ‘we’ was presented in two different situations. The first example indicates an inclusive ‘we.’ This review article was a single-authored text, where the author engaged the readers in his argument and evaluation of corpus linguistics. In the second example, the review text was not single-authored, and the writers explained the structure of the chapter. Besides, they referred to the limitation of the review article to avoid criticism:

- (1) We should recognize that corpus analysis is not a different and improved way of dealing with the object of study of linguistics...We need to note too that the object of study in corpus linguistics is a particular language in itself...not as a representative of language in general... (RevA.1, theme-bound unit, p.24)
- (2) We have omitted from this part of the chapter some of the most central areas of conversation-analytic inquiry-in particular, sequence organization ([Schegloff, 1990](#)) and the analysis of the formation... (RevA.9, theme-bound unit, p. 9)

Here, the author of the first review article intends to engage readers and evaluate the theme. The author negotiates with his immediate audience and tries to build a relationship with his readers. It is one of the rhetorical strategies to persuade readers to accept the author’s view (i.e., ‘persuasive strategy’). [Hyland \(2005a\)](#) believes that using an inclusive ‘we’ binds the authors to the readers. These rhetorical strategies (i.e., using inclusive ‘we’ and using ‘clusters of attitude markers’) are employed in argumentative and evaluative discourses, for example, critical evaluative review articles, to interact professionally with the immediate audience and persuade them to agree with the authors’ ideas.

Consequently, the author in the first excerpt uses inclusive ‘we’ together with the modal verb ‘need to’ to create an obligatory situation in evaluating and weighing corpus linguistic studies. He wants the readers to be aware of the advantages and disadvantages of corpus linguistics. Several functions such as ‘presenting evaluation,’ ‘directing to some important works or views,’ and ‘giving suggestions’ were also observed in the corpus. These self-mentions, mainly ‘we’ may refer to the contributors or the singular author of review articles.

In excerpt (2), the authors explain the focused themes and present the review text structure. The authors explicitly use an exclusive ‘we’ to strengthen their position and support their claims. Here, the authors’ role in the review of research developments can be presented by the significant presence of the subjective pronoun ‘we.’ The writers may also support their claims or counterclaims and strengthen them in the thematic units of review articles. These rhetorical strategies were commonly used to present the review article authors’ evaluation, feeling, judgment, argument, and

attitude towards the proposition they discuss or argue. It is important to note that in the comparative form, a few self-mentions were very scarce in the entirety of the corpus, such as ‘my,’ ‘me,’ ‘the author,’ and ‘the writer.’

The second point is that self-mentions in the Introduction sections appeared with five items per 1,000 words, while they were found in the Conclusion sections with a frequency of 7.74 items per 1,000 words (see Table 3). Although the word count in the Introduction sections (11,983 words) was higher than the Conclusion sections (9,947 words), the self-mentions in the Conclusion sections (77 hits) appeared more frequently than the Introduction sections (60 hits). In the Conclusion sections, as Table 3 clearly illustrates, the self-mentions (7.74 items per 1,000 words) were used slightly more than in the Abstract sections (7.25 items per 1,000 words). One main reason for the differing frequency is referred to the moves used by the authors in the Conclusion sections such as Move 2: ‘Evaluating developments’ with two specific strategies by which the authors most probably presented themselves (i.e., Strategy 1: ‘Indicating significance’ and Strategy 2: ‘Presenting limitations’) and Move 3: ‘Giving suggestions’ containing the clear presence of the authors (i.e., Strategy 1: ‘Offering possible solutions’ and Strategy 3: ‘Recommending further research’). For example, the second move in the Conclusion section dealt with evaluating research or other scholars’ views. In this move, the authors evaluated the significance and limitations of these developments by using writer-oriented linguistic features like attitude markers and self-mentions.

Overall, these two features help the review article authors make an interactive connection with their immediate audience. The findings indicated that they were employed in several moves of the analytical sections (i.e., Abstract, Introduction, Body, and Conclusion sections) with differing frequencies. The second move (Move 2: ‘Evaluating the review’) and the third move (Move 3: ‘Giving suggestions’) of the Conclusion sections, for instance, included many instances of this rhetorical device employed by the authors. The authors used explicit self-mentions to present the essence of the review and indicate the authors’ purpose, develop an argument, indicate the significance or limitations of the developments in the related field, and take a stance. For example, self-mentions were found in the Abstract sections in Move 3: ‘Presenting the review’:

- (3) I then argue that recent developments...may provide a more solid basis for partnership. (RevA.5, Abstract, p. 3)
- (4) In the following chapter, I will show how a field that increasingly informs psychology can also inform...I examine brain mechanisms that are involved in second language acquisition motivation... (RevA.6, Abstract, p. 23)
- (5) In this chapter, I provide an overview of some of the current themes and research directions that I find particularly novel or forward-looking... I argue that the initial research inspiration... (RevA.7, Abstract, p. 43)

In the Introduction sections, self-mentions were also found in Move 3: ‘Presenting the review article’:

- (6) My purpose in this contribution is to look into this question of applicability as it relates to language pedagogy... (RevA.1, Introduction, p. 21)

- (7) In this review, I identify some past barriers to cooperation between psychology and linguistics. I argue that these barriers appear to be dropping... (RevA.5, Introduction, p. 3)
- (8) In this chapter, we review and reflect on developments...we sometimes address earlier work to provide...To make our task manageable, we have limited ourselves to... (RevA.20, Introduction, p. 70)

In the theme-bound units, self-mentions were found in Move 3: 'Presenting evaluation':

- (9) It seems to me that this assumption of dependency is mistaken. I want to argue that... (RevA.1, theme-bound unit, p.22)
- (10) ...as far as I can see, almost all of the many new journals that have been springing up have an English-only submission policy. We are facing a real loss in professional registers in many national cultures with long scholarly traditions. (RevA.3, theme-bound unit, p. 67)
- (11) I would even argue that the label 'ESP teacher' no longer seems appropriate for anyone involved in the field because of... (RevA.4, theme-bound unit, p. 85)

In the Conclusion sections, self-mentions were found in several moves, namely, Move 1: 'Summarizing the review,' Move 2: 'Evaluating the review,' and Move 3: 'Giving suggestions.' Some examples taken from the corpus are as follows:

- (12) This chapter has attempted to show how stimulus appraisal, foraging, and social cognition are primarily implemented by the same neural system. Extending this view, I have argued that motivation in second language acquisition... Therefore, I believe that the continued integration of psychology and neurobiology will contribute significantly to our knowledge... (RevA.6, Conclusion 'Moves 1 & 3', p. 36)
- (13) However, I have tried to highlight the fact that there is not enough research being done, particularly in L2 contexts... (RevA.19, Conclusion 'Move 2', p. 60)
- (14) We suspect that any such alternative model will require a shift in focus...More work is needed to determine the implications of these new approaches for the various issues we have mentioned in this article... (RevA.13, Conclusion 'Move 3', p. 16)

The analysis indicated that the authors employed the pronouns 'we', 'our,' and 'us' in the Conclusion sections of review articles more frequently than other analytical sections because these pronouns presented and carried corresponding rhetorical functions such as were mentioned in the titles of these sections. These functions were also identified in the literature (Harwood, 2005a; Hyland, 2002a; Tang & John, 1999).

4.3 Analysis of the Rhetorical Functions of Self-mentions in the Review Articles

The analysis of self-mentions using WordSmith tools indicated that the authors used this feature of meta-discourse to interact with their immediate audience in the different analytical sections of the review article. Not only did the authors seek to negotiate with the readers, but they also wished to indicate their contributions to the field and inspire confidence regarding their knowledge. The authors' visibility in academic review genres is not only discipline-oriented (i.e., the nature of disciplines is an important key); it also depends on the authors' personal style and seniority.

The significance of self-mentions was scrutinised in the different analytical sections. As an example, it was observed in the Abstract and Introduction sections (particularly in Move 3: 'Presenting the review' in which the authors try to indicate objectives), the Theme-bound Units (Move 1: 'Making claims,' Move 2: 'Counter-claims,' and in Move 3: 'Describing methodology, explaining findings, and elaborating an argument and guiding readers through the argument'), and the Conclusion section (Move 2: 'Evaluating developments,' and in Move 3: 'Giving suggestions'). It was found that the authors used the subjective pronoun 'I' in the review articles for various functions which were identified in the literature (Hyland, 2002a; Tang & John, 1999). The authors of the review articles, for example, used the subjective pronoun 'I': (a) to indicate the objectives or purposes, (b) to present the structure of the review texts, (c) to elaborate an argument, and (d) to guide the readers through the article.

Analysis of the subjective pronoun 'we,' the objective pronoun 'us,' and the possessive adjective pronoun 'our' analysed in the single-authored review articles indicated that several authors in these review articles used inclusive pronouns. These inclusive pronouns referred to the authors and the readers (excerpts 1-4). The inclusive pronouns were employed in the review texts to 'give suggestions' and 'make recommendations,' 'guide readers through the evaluation and argument,' and 'promote the research by presenting its contribution.' For example, it was found that the inclusive pronoun such as 'us' was employed to 'explain how the results of studies can help the field.' In review articles, the objective pronoun 'us' mainly was collocated with several verbs (e.g., '...give us', '...help us', '...teach us', '...tell us', '...remind us', '...warn us', and '...lead us'). Some instances taken from the corpus are as follows:

- (15) I argue that these barriers appear to be dropping due to the rise of new research methodologies and that we are now entering a time that may see a new convergence between the disciplines. (RevA.5, Introduction, p.4)
- (16) The computer provides us with the capability of accumulating and analysing vast amounts of language that users have actually produced. We no longer have to depend on our intuitions about the language that people use... (RevA.1, theme-bound unit, p. 23)
- (17) ... from this review, I hope that we can infer the current methodological preoccupations in this work. I begin by looking at two studies... (RevA.10, Introduction, p.34)
- (18) Part of this issue simply derives from the massive amount of new information that is now available; for example, we now have several studies that can tell us much about the evolution of professional discourse... (RevA.3, theme-bound unit, p. 60)

The analysis of the first-person plural pronouns used indicated that the possessive adjective pronoun 'our' was usually used as an inclusive pronoun in single-authored review articles and mainly was collocated with nouns such as 'our understanding' and 'our knowledge.'

- (19) Recent work on child interpreters...has contributed to our understanding of some of these issues. (RevA.16, Conclusions, p. 70)
- (20) Clearly, notions of quality of interpretation and theories about the assessment of this quality, both currently underdeveloped, will be basic to our understanding of the differences... (RevA.16, Conclusions, p. 70)

- (21) Therefore, I believe that the continued integration of psychology and neurobiology will contribute significantly to our knowledge of issues important to the field of applied linguistics. (RevA.6, Conclusions, p. 36)

However, the authors in single-authored review texts also used exclusive pronouns such as ‘we,’ ‘us,’ and ‘our’ in review articles. They referred to themselves, the discourse community, or a group of researchers who contributed and helped the research process. According to Azabdaftari (2016), one of the specialist informants of the current study, this type of first-person plural pronoun is called the ‘royal we.’ He further adds that if people avoid using ‘I’ and ‘we,’ the causes may be due to:

A lack of confidence in their views, b) an inclination to offer a low profile of themselves, c) a lack of expertise on the issue they are handling, or d) use of other persons’ views (a case of plagiarism), and e) regarding your question on pronouns, I may say that a function of ‘we,’ called the ‘royal we’ is realized when the writer or speaker intends to affiliate himself/ herself as part of the discussion/research group. (Prof. Azabdaftari, Personal Communication, Jan. 2016)

Some instances taken from the corpus are as follows:

- (22) A final pressing problem for those engaged in qualitative research is determining a standard...It is imperative for those of us working within “interpretive” research traditions to address these issues...so that we can ensure that all published research, both qualitative and quantitative, is truly quality research. (RevA.10, Conclusion, p. 43)
- (23) In our research, we have been interested in measuring individual differences in cognitive control... In the study to be summarized here, we asked whether... (RevA.5, theme-bound unit, p.12)

As illustrated in excerpts above (22 and 23), it is possible that these studies were a collective effort, and a group of researchers or contributors collected the data. It was observed that in single-authored review articles, first-person plural pronouns such as ‘we,’ ‘us,’ and ‘our’ were also used to refer to a group of researchers who were involved in conducting research or who had assisted the single author during the research project. The author’s role in these projects was considered a researcher was conducting research, and a group of researchers or scholars collaborated with the author during this research process.

The results of this study illustrate that an inclusive ‘we’ was used in both single-authored and multiple-authored review articles. As has been pointed out, using inclusive pronouns such as ‘we,’ ‘us,’ and ‘our’ has been considered as a strategy to interact and negotiate with the immediate audience in academic writing (Harwood, 2005b; Hyland, 2005a). This persuasion technique can also be used in review articles to create a bond between the author and the reader, allowing authors to include their readers in their arguments and assessments. It helps the authors to establish solidarity and ensure their readers’ agreement.

Using these rhetorical strategies, authors can include their presence and views in the evaluation and persuade their readers to accept their judgments and claims. For example, it was found that the author of the review article (RevA.11) used both the exclusive and inclusive ‘we.’ In the exclusive ‘we,’ the author included the research he and other scholars conducted to present a model. In the exact review text, the author

discussed a new relevant software that he suggested could assist manual analysis. The new software, the author claimed, would contribute to our knowledge and increase our conception of language. The following excerpts are taken from the corpus present these instances:

- (24) Mode is concerned with semiotic distance, as this is affected by the various channels of communication through which we undertake activity... (RevA.11, theme-bound unit, p. 62)
- (2) The success of this enterprise depends on the development of relevant software...I expect this technology to affect our conception of language...since for the first time; we'll be able to manage large-scale socio-semantic analyses of data. (RevA.11, Conclusion, p. 62)

It was also found that the inclusive 'we' was employed by review article authors to 'give suggestions' and 'offer possible solutions.'

- (25) Further investigations into corpus sizes and sampling techniques are needed, as well as further research into the kinds of variation that exist in language so that we can make sure to capture all kinds of variation in new corpora. (RevA.12, Conclusion, p. 87)
- (2) ...we need to investigate pedagogic approaches that do not short-circuit the strategic dimension of L2 listening...We need further research on teaching listeners in classroom settings how to negotiate meaning... (RevA.17, Directions for Further Research, p. 18)

The analysis of variation in the use of inclusive and exclusive 'we' in review articles reveals a significant difference between the authors associated with the frequency of use of the subjective pronoun 'we.' The results showed that some authors did not explicitly represent themselves in review articles such as in Rev A.2 and Rev A.21. In contrast, other authors expressed themselves repeatedly in the review texts, such as in Rev A.1, Rev A.5, Rev A.6, Rev A.7, and Rev A.26. There can be several reasons for this finding, such as the type of review article (i.e., we need to find out if it is a critical evaluative review or a bibliographic review article) which requires further study. Another reason is the author's style and preference, along with their seniority or position in that field. The current research findings align with the findings of other studies on the inclusive and exclusive 'we' (for example, [Harwood, 2005b](#); [Hyland, 2001](#); [Kuo, 1999](#); [Tang & John, 1999](#)).

The analysis also showed that authors in single-authored review texts mostly used first-person plural pronouns as inclusive pronouns, due to the desire to engage their readers with their evaluation and argument. The inclusive pronouns referred to the author and the reader or the author and the discourse community (as 'royal we'). As it was found, the exclusive 'we' was used in the corpus of this study with an overall average frequency of 30%, followed by the inclusive 'we' very closely with a frequency of 27% among first-person pronouns. It is noteworthy that the frequency of occurrence of exclusive 'we' and inclusive 'we' was very close to each other in the corpus of this study.

It can be contended that the inclusive pronouns are used not only as a politeness strategy to appreciate readers and keep the writers' claims balanced in the review article genre but also as a persuasive strategy to seek readers' agreement in their evaluation of the research developments. It is important to note that the authors construct various professional personas as a rhetorical device to establish their

authorial identity and credibility in the review article genre. It seems that different personas depend on the nature of the review article genre and its scope.

5. CONCLUSION

In this study, the focus was on one of the stance elements, particularly self-mentions in the review articles in applied linguistics. The self-mention resources in the corpus were classified according to Hyland's (2005b) classification. The corpus was then screened using WordSmith tools after it had been transformed into readable texts. They were examined to see which types of self-mentions were used in the corpus to indicate authors' positions. In other words, we highlighted not only the genre-specific features that govern the review articles but also the strategies employed to show their authorial identity in the corpus.

It is worth noting that in academic writing, mentioning oneself is an effective persuasive strategy. The authors use the stance features to gain immediate agreement from the readers, gain credibility, and establish their attitude. They indicate their position in the field as one of the discourse community members. The higher frequency usage of self-mentions can indicate the authors' strong position and contribution to that field. The high-frequency use of self-mentions can "point to the personal stake that writers invest in their arguments and their desire to gain credit for their claims" (Hyland, 2011, p. 11). The author who expresses himself/ herself explicitly in the review article may be one of the discourse community pioneers, and so correspondingly wish to distinguish himself/ herself to being at the frontier of the respective field (Harwood, 2005b; Hyland, 2001). The author creates a persona, particularly an 'assertive persona' rather than an 'impersonal persona,' to claim and comment on its veracity. This strategy can be considered not only as a strategy of politeness but also one of persuasiveness.

While it is acknowledged that English for Academic Purposes (EAP) courses offered at the university level have focused on academic writing skills, this study suggests that writing academic review genres should be emphasized to give instructive guidance to junior researchers and novice writers on how to critically review research developments, and thus preparing them for efficient and high-quality critical literature review writing. The findings of this type of research can also heighten awareness amongst junior postgraduates and researchers on macro and micro-organizational structures of the academic review genres like review articles.

It is now necessary to acknowledge the limitations of our research. It would have been preferable to conduct a comparative analysis using a different discipline. The review articles in this corpus are all from applied linguistics and were published between 2000 and 2007 (not from non-applied disciplines). Therefore, the findings of this research also need to be tested on recent review articles from other disciplines, challenging sciences, so that EAP or ESP instructors can take advantage and they may use findings in their 'research project' classes for hard science postgraduate students or the practitioners.

REFERENCES

- Ädel, A. (2022). Writer and reader visibility in humanities research articles: Variation across language, regional variety and discipline. *English for Specific Purposes*, 65, 49-62. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2021.09.001>
- Azar, A. S., & Azirah, H. (2014). Towards an analysis of review article in applied linguistics: Its classes, purposes and characteristics. *ELT*, 7(10), 76-88. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v7n10p76>
- Azar, A. S., & Azirah, H. (2017a). Analysing the macro-organizational structure of the review article genre in applied linguistics. *Issues in Language Studies*, 6(1), 1-28. <https://doi.org/10.33736/ils.471.2017>
- Azar, A. S., & Azirah, H. (2017b). A genre-based analysis of thematic units in review articles in applied linguistics. *ESP World*, 53, 1-26.
- Azar, A. S., & Azirah, H. (2019). The impact of attitude markers on enhancing evaluation in the review article genre. *GEMA Online: Journal of Language Studies*, 19(1), 153-173. <https://doi.org/10.17576/gema-2019-1901-09>
- Biber, D., & Finegan, E. (1989). Styles of stance in English: Lexical and grammatical marking of evidentiality and affect. *Text*, 9(1), 93-124. <https://doi.org/10.1515/text.1.1989.9.1.93>
- Bondi, M. (2012). Voice in textbooks: Between exposition and argument. In K. Hyland & C. S. Guinda (Eds.), *Stance and voice in written academic genres* (pp. 101-115). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137030825_7
- Chen, R. (2020). Single author self-reference: Identity construction and pragmatic competence. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 45, 203-214. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2020.100856>
- Crismore, A. (1989). *Talking with readers: Metadiscourse as rhetorical act*. Peter Lang.
- Diani, G. (2009). Reporting and evaluation in English book review articles: A cross-disciplinary study. In K. Hyland & G. Diani (Eds.), *Academic evaluation* (pp. 87-104). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230244290_6
- Gosden, H. (1993). Discourse functions of subject in scientific research articles. *Applied Linguistics*, 14(1), 56-75. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/14.1.56>
- Grant, M. J., & Booth, A. (2009). A typology of reviews: An analysis of 14 review types and associated methodologies. *Health Information & Libraries Journal*, 26(2), 91-108. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-1842.2009.00848.x>
- Groom, N. (2009). Phraseology and epistemology in academic book reviews: A corpus-driven analysis of two humanities disciplines. In K. Hyland & G. Diani (Eds.), *Academic evaluation* (pp. 122-139). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230244290_8
- Harris, Z. S. (1959). The transformational model of language structure. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 1(1), 27-30.
- Harwood, N. (2005a). 'I hoped to counteract the memory problem, but I made no impact whatsoever': Discussing methods in computing science using I. *English for Specific Purposes*, 24, 243-267.
- Harwood, N. (2005b). 'We do not seem to have a theory... The theory I present here attempts to fill this gap': Inclusive and exclusive pronouns in academic writing. *Applied Linguistics*, 26(3), 343-375. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/ami012>

- Hyland, K. (1994). Hedging in academic writing and EAF textbooks. *English for Specific Purposes*, 13(3), 239-256. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0889-4906\(94\)90004-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0889-4906(94)90004-3)
- Hyland, K. (1998). *Hedging in scientific research articles*. John Benjamins.
- Hyland, K. (1999). Disciplinary discourses: Writer stance in research articles. In C. Candlin & K. Hyland (Eds.), *Writing: Texts, processes and practices* (pp. 99–121). Longman.
- Hyland, K. (2000). *Disciplinary discourses: Social interactions in academic writing*. Longman.
- Hyland, K. (2001). Bringing in the reader addressee features in academic articles. *Written communication*, 18(4), 549-574. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088301018004005>
- Hyland, K. (2002a). Academic argument: Induction or interaction? *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses*, 44, 29-45.
- Hyland, K. (2002b). Authority and invisibility: Authorial identity in academic writing. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34, 1091-1112. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(02\)00035-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00035-8)
- Hyland, K. (2005a). *Metadiscourse*. Continuum.
- Hyland, K. (2005b). Stance and engagement: A model of interaction in academic discourse. *Discourse Studies*, 7, 173-192. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445605050365>
- Hyland, K. (2008). As can be seen: Lexical bundles and disciplinary variation. *English for Specific Purposes*, 27(1), 4-21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2007.06.001>
- Hyland, K. (2010). Community and individuality: Performing identity in applied linguistics. *Written Communication*, 27(2), 159-188. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088309357846>
- Hyland, K. (2011). The presentation of self in scholarly life: Identity and marginalization in academic homepages. *English for Specific Purposes*, 30(4), 286-297. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2011.04.004>
- Hyland, K., & Jiang, F. K. (2018). “In this paper we suggest”: Changing patterns of disciplinary metadiscourse. *English for Specific Purposes*, 51, 18–30. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2018.02.001>
- Ivanič, R. (1998). *Writing and identity*. John Benjamins.
- Ivanič, R., & Camps, D. (2001). I am how I sound: Voice as self-representation in L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10(1-2), 3-33. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(01\)00034-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(01)00034-0)
- Kaplan, R. B. (2002). *The Oxford handbook of applied linguistics*. Oxford University Press.
- Khedri, M. (2016). Are we visible? An interdisciplinary data-based study of self-mention in research articles. *Poznan Studies in Contemporary Linguistics*, 52, 403-430. <https://doi.org/10.1515/psicl-2016-0017>
- Khedri, M., & Kritsis, K. (2020). How do we make ourselves heard in the writing of a research article? A study of authorial references in four disciplines. *Australian Journal of Linguistics*, 40(2), 194-217. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07268602.2020.1753011>
- Kopple, W. J. V. (1985). Some exploratory discourse on metadiscourse. *College Composition and Communication*, 36(1), 82–93. <https://doi.org/10.2307/357609>

- Kuhi, D., & Behnam, B. (2011). Generic variation and metadiscourse use in the writing of applied linguistics: A comparative study and preliminary. *Written Communication*, 28(1), 97-141. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088310387259>
- Kuhi, D., Yavari, M., & Azar, A. S. (2012). Metadiscourse in applied linguistics research articles: A cross-sectional survey. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 3(11), 405-411.
- Kuo, C. H. (1999). The use of personal pronouns: Role relationships in scientific journal articles. *English for Specific Purposes*, 18(2), 121-138. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906\(97\)00058-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(97)00058-6)
- Kwan, B. S. (2006). The schematic structure of literature reviews in doctoral theses of applied linguistics. *English for Specific Purposes*, 25(1), 30-55. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2005.06.001>
- Martin, J. R. (2000). Beyond exchange: APPRAISAL in systems in English. In S. Hunston & G. Thompson (Eds.), *Evaluation in text: Authorial stance and the construction of discourse* (pp. 143–175). Oxford University Press.
- Martínez, I. A. (2005). Native and non-native writers' use of first-person pronouns in the different sections of biology research articles in English. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 14(3), 174-190. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2005.06.001>
- Molino, A. (2010). Personal and impersonal authorial references: A contrastive study of English and Italian linguistics research articles. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 9, 86-101. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2010.02.007>
- Moreno, A. I., & Suárez, L. (2008). A study of critical attitude across English and Spanish academic book reviews. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 7(1), 15-26. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2008.02.009>
- Motta-Roth, D. (1995). *Rhetorical features and disciplinary cultures: A genre-based study of academic book reviews in Linguistics, Chemistry, and Economics* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina.
- Myers, G. (1991). 2 stories and styles in two molecular biology review articles. *Applied Linguistics*, 10, 1-35.
- Noguchi, J. (2006). *The science review article: An opportune genre in the construction of science*. Peter Lang.
- Noguchi, J. (2009). Reviewing science in an information-overloaded world. In K. Hyland & G. Diani (Eds.), *Academic evaluation* (pp. 34-49). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230244290_3
- Ridley, D. (2008). *The literature review: A step-by-step guide for students*. Sage.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1990). Interactional troubles in face-to-face survey interviews: Comment. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 85(409), 248-250. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2289550>
- Schmitt, N. (2002). *An introduction to applied linguistics*. Arnold.
- Scott, M. (2012). *WordSmith tools 6* [Software package]. <https://lexically.net/wordsmith/version6/>
- Swales, J. (2004). *Research genres: Exploration and applications*. Cambridge University Press.
- Tang, R., & John, S. (1999). The 'I' in identity: Exploring writer identity in student academic writing through the first person pronoun. *English for Specific Purposes*, 18, S23-S39. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906\(99\)00009-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(99)00009-5)

- Thompson, P. (2009). Literature reviews in applied Ph.D. theses: Evidence and problems. In K. Hyland & G. Diani (Eds.), *Academic evaluation* (pp. 50-67). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230244290_4
- Tse, P., & Hyland, K. (2008). 'Robot Kung fu': Gender and professional identity in biology and philosophy reviews. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40, 1232-1248. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2007.02.002>
- Vassileva, I. (1998). Who am I/who are we in academic writing? A contrastive analysis of authorial presence in English, German, French, Russian and Bulgarian. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 8(2), 163-185.
- Vassileva, I. (2000). *Who is the author? A contrastive analysis of authorial presence in English, German, French, Russian, and Bulgarian academic discourse*. Asgard-Verlag.
- Walková, M. (2018). Author's self-representation in research articles by Anglophone and Slovak linguists. *Discourse and Interaction*, 11(1), 86-105. <https://doi.org/10.5817/DI2018-1-86>
- Walková, M. (2019). A three-dimensional model of personal self-mention in research papers. *English for Specific Purposes*, 53, 60-73. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2018.09.003>
- Wang, J., & Zeng, L. (2021). Disciplinary recognized self-presence: Self-mention used with hedges and boosters in Ph.D. students' research writing. *SAGE Open*, 11(2), <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211005454>
- Xia, G. (2018). A cross-disciplinary corpus-based study on English and Chinese native speakers' use of first-person pronouns in academic English writing. *Text & Talk*, 38, 93-113. <https://doi.org/10.1515/text-2017-0032>