

SHOWING EXPLICIT PRESENCE IN ENGLISH RESEARCH ARTICLES: VARIATION ACROSS INDONESIAN AND BRITISH AUTHORS

(MENAMPILKAN KEHADIRAN EKSPLISIT DALAM ARTIKEL ILMIAH: VARIASI LINTAS PENULIS INDONESIA DAN INGGRIS)

Adelia Januarto

Pos-el: januartoadelia@gmail.com

Tofan Dwi Hardjanto

Pos-el: deha@ugm.ac.id

Abstrak

Tidak seperti penelitian sebelumnya yang berfokus pada disiplin ilmu dan genre yang menampilkan keteraturan dalam hal temuan, penelitian terbaru yang meneliti perbedaan budaya dalam kehadiran penulis, bahkan dalam bahasa dan konteks yang sama, menunjukkan temuan yang kontradiktif. Dengan demikian, Hal itu menekankan pentingnya penelitian lebih lanjut untuk menjelaskan variasi penutur jati dan nonjati bahasa Inggris dalam menunjukkan kehadiran secara terbuka dalam teks mereka. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengeksplorasi cara kehadiran penulis Indonesia dan Inggris secara linguistik ditampilkan dalam artikel penelitian linguistik terapan, dan meneliti peran penanda linguistik dari kehadiran penulis dalam konteks langsungnya. Dengan menggunakan data dari dua kelompok penulis akademis, kami menunjukkan bahwa penulis penutur jati bahasa Inggris secara umum cenderung lebih terlihat secara eksplisit daripada rekan nonjati mereka dalam artikel ilmiah berbahasa Inggris dan menunjukkan preferensi yang lebih kuat untuk menampilkan sikap ramah pembaca dengan menunjukkan kehadiran saat memberi tanda dan memberikan panduan eksplisit kepada audiens mereka.

Kata kunci: kehadiran penulis eksplisit, artikel ilmiah, penulis Indonesia dan Inggris.

Abstract

Unlike previous studies focusing on disciplines and genres displaying regularities in terms of findings, recent studies investigating cultural differences in authorial presence, even in the same language and context, suggest contradictory findings. Thus, they emphasize the importance of further research to clarify native and non-native English-speaking authors' variation of showing presence overtly in their texts. Herein, we aim at exploring how Indonesian and British authorial presence is linguistically shown in applied linguistics research articles (RAs), and investigating the roles of the linguistic markers of authorial presence in their immediate context. Using data from the two groups of academic authors, we demonstrate that the native English-speaking authors in general tend to be more explicitly visible than their non-native English peers in English RAs and indicate a stronger preference for displaying reader-friendly attitude by showing presence when signposting and providing explicit guidance to their audience.

Keywords: explicit authorial presence, research articles, Indonesian and British authors.

1. Introduction

Despite its pervasive studies, how authors present themselves explicitly or implicitly in academic writing has continued to gain scholarly attention in applied linguistics and language teaching. Historically, academic authors show their presence implicitly via impersonal style to focus on the object or the process under study, and this implicit authorial presence is commonly manifested by the use of agentless passives and inanimate subjects. One common reason for this impersonal style of scholarly writing lies on the positivist assumption that academic writing should be kept away from the subjective involvement of the authors in order “facts to ‘speak for themselves’” (Livnat, 2010, p. 105), and thus, first-person pronouns as the linguistic means to explicitly indicate the presence of research agents become less relevant and should be diminished from texts. This also explains that implicit presence was generally more favorable in empirical studies, and even considered as the main feature of scientific writing. However, recent diachronic studies (e.g. Hyland & Jiang, 2016, 2017) indicate that scholarly authors begin to show their presence explicitly in their texts in the past four decades. It implies that there is a moving trend of academic prose from an object-oriented (impersonal) mode of writing to a more author-oriented (personal) style.

Recent corpus-based studies have not only shown the gradual shift of academic writing style but also variations of academic prose in terms of explicit authorial presence across social aspects such as academic genres (El-Dakhs, 2018; Kawase, 2015), disciplinary fields (Hyland, 2005; Khedri, 2016; McGrath, 2016), and cultures (Carciu, 2009; Dontcheva-Navrátilová, 2013; Xia, 2018). Among these aspects, cultures seem to be more problematic than others because even in the same language, that is, English as the academic lingua franca, the extent to which expert authors choose to be explicitly presented and what the presence discursively serves are diverse. In general, the studies suggest that explicit authorial presence in native and non-native English authors may either more or less explicit, depending on which culture is being compared to native English in general, and thus the findings seem to be conflicting from

one study to another. For example, Dontcheva-Navrátilová (2013) working on expert writing in linguistics found a contrast of explicit authorial presence in native English and Czech research articles whereas Xia (2018) revealed relatively similar use of explicit authorial presence markers in native English and Chinese linguistics research articles. On the contrary to cultures, the different extent of presence in academic genres and disciplines can be explained uniformly by the more competitiveness of one genre over others (e.g. research articles vs. PhD theses; see Kawase, 2015) and by the epistemological belief of a discipline (see Hyland, 2005). Put differently, unlike working with genres and disciplines, previous studies working with cultures, i.e. native and non-native English, albeit in the same language and discipline, can exhibit inconsistent findings.

Although the knowledge gap on the influence of cultures on explicit authorial presence has been highlighted, it is not our intention to seek the general answer of why native English authors are more or less visible in comparison to their non-native counterparts due to infeasibility in data collection which requires us to include adequate samples of non-native English authors from various cultures. However, by continuing previous studies to examine linguistics research articles (henceforth, RAs), we aim to extend our understanding of how scholarly authors indicate their presence explicitly in the international publication which varies from one culture to another by involving Indonesian and British academic communities. In particular, we intend to understand the extent to which RA authors can make themselves present explicitly and the function of the explicit authorial presence in the RAs. The selection of expert writing is based on the fact that sufficient attention has been given to Indonesian (e.g. Susanti, Kurnia, & Suharsono, 2017, 2018) and British novice writing (e.g. Can & Cangir, 2019) on language-related fields, i.e. English education and literary studies, while scant interest on the expert academic writing. By involving these discourse communities, we could not only understand the different degree of explicit presence in international publications but also their positioning to their texts and audience. We could also get closer to a possibly general tendency of academic cultures concerning

explicit authorial presence. Furthermore, we here focus on Indonesian and British authors, not native English in general, due to the possibility of considerable internal variation such as across British and North American authors (e.g. see Ädel, 2008).

Authorial presence in academic writing is an author-oriented feature of stance which signals the projection of authorial self in texts (Hyland, 2008, p. 9). This projection of self can be achieved either implicitly or explicitly to indicate authors' position in the scholarly prose such as backgrounded or foregrounded research agents (e.g. see Seoane & Hundt, 2017). In academic English, there are limited resources available to show presence explicitly but this authorial presence in written academic texts is commonly associated with first-person pronouns as the direct reference to the authors. First-person pronoun itself in a speech act represents the speaker or the writer (Bhat, 2004), or in more general sense, someone who is taking turn in the moment of communication. Grammatically speaking, this linguistic device to represent the authorial presence can be further divided into cases and numbers (see Table 1) but unlike the singular form whose referent is clear, the English plural first-person pronoun is more complex in terms of interpretation in discourse. As we see on Table 1, English only has one form of first-person plural but this pronoun has multiple referents enabling authors to either include or exclude their audience. Alternatively stated, this single linguistic resource irrespective of its cases can depict a relationship between speech participants, especially authors and audience, i.e. audience-inclusive or audience-exclusive pronoun, and thus, the context where the pronoun is used is required to disambiguate or fully understand the referent of first-person plural.

Table 1. English First-person Pronouns (adapted from Endley, 2010, p. 25)

Cases	Number	
	Plural	Singular
Nominative	<i>I</i>	<i>we</i>
Accusative	<i>me</i>	<i>us</i>

Genitive	Dependent	my	our
	Independent	mine	ours
Reflexive		myself	ourselves

In addition to first-person pronouns as direct authorial references, some studies (e.g. Al-Shujairi, 2018; Hryniuk, 2018; Walková, 2018) have also given evidence on the use of lexical expressions (e.g. *the writer(s)*, *the researcher(s)*, and *the author(s)*) with reference to the authors in their scholarly texts. Dissimilar to non-human agents (e.g. *this research argues*) which position the authors' concern in the foreground, both first-person pronouns and self-referring terms situate research agents in the foreground, so who conducts the study and writes the report has a central role in the research and its reporting. What distinguishes these self-referring terms to first-person pronouns to show explicit authorial presence is the fact that dissimilar to first-person pronouns, self-referring terms albeit their indirectness still refer to the authors of the text because the authors position themselves as third-person or 'others' being talked in semantic sense (-authors -readers +others). In Indonesian pragmatic tradition, 'deictic reversal' (Purwo, 1984) is used to label this kind of authorial positioning which is common in Indonesian academic writing represented with *penulis* 'the author/writer'. The self-as-other positioning typically appears when the use of first-person pronouns is restricted so one possible option to show own authorial presence explicitly is through a third-person viewpoint (Thomas & Brubaker, 2001, p. 165). In a nutshell, two sets of options are available in English to establish explicit authorial presence in RAs, namely first-person pronouns and self-referring terms, in which the first group is considered a direct reference whereas the latter is an indirect reference to the authors.

Despite limited linguistic choices available in English, one linguistic marker of authorial presence can have multiple functions depending on the use of the linguistic resource and its selection in a text can also carry different impressions on the relationship of authors to their texts and audience. Regarding the discourse functions, several attempts in EAP studies have

been made to explain the multifunctionality of explicit authorial presence markers with two common terms, i.e. ‘authorial identity’ (Sheldon, 2009; Tang & John, 1999) and ‘discourse/rhetorical functions’ (Hyland, 2002; Walková, 2019; Xia, 2018). Their difference lies on the fact that unlike the latter which is more direct, the former term is more metaphorical in the sense that a linguistic marker is given human features (e.g. ‘representative’, ‘recounter’, or ‘guide’; see Sheldon, 2009; Tang & John, 1999), but both of them explain the same concept, that is, the role of a linguistic marker to explicitly establish authorial presence in discourse. The similarity among them might occur because the aforementioned models of ‘discourse/rhetorical functions’ originate from Tang and John’s (1999) authorial identity. We, therefore, reckon them the same and define ‘discourse function’ as the role of a linguistic marker of authorial presence in its immediate discourse context (Kuo, 1999, p. 130).

Several criticisms have been addressed to Tang and John’s framework on the potential overlap between the guide-architect functions (Hyland, 2002, p. 1099) and the inadequacy of the model to explain self-reflexivity in soft sciences (Sheldon, 2009). First, one way to deal with the potential overlap addressed by Hyland is to look at the inclusivity and the exclusivity of a linguistic marker where the inclusive and exclusive markers are respectively used as audience-oriented (guide) and text-oriented function (architect). Second, it is possible to complement Tang and John’s (1999) with Sheldon’s (2009) reflexive ‘I’. In addition to this incorporation, we also see the need to retain Tang and John’s (1999) model, instead of Sheldon’s albeit alike because Sheldon’s model neglects the text-oriented function as an independent category from the reader-oriented. As a result, the combination of two models (Sheldon, 2009; Tang & John, 1999) can be seen below.

Table 2. Functions of Authorial Presence Markers

Labels	Functions
Guide	to navigate RA audience in the scholarly text

Representative	to speak on behalf of a community via generic first-person pronoun, e.g. we have gone through several stages of life
Architect	to organize the text, e.g. as we previously mentioned
Recounter	to recount a research process, e.g. we built the corpus
Opinion-holder	to express an opinion, e.g. I argue that
Originator	to state a result or a claim, e.g. we found
Reflexive	to show self-reflexivity in the research, e.g. we underwent difficulties to communicate with the patient.

As previously mentioned, the choice of linguistic markers in a scholarly text informs the authors’ relationship to readers and their own research. First-person pronouns, for instance, might indicate an authors’ attempt to build a friendly attitude to the audience (e.g. with audience-inclusive pronouns) and show direct personal involvement in the research process (e.g. with exclusive pronouns); however, self-referring terms as the avoidance of first-person pronouns could indicate the authors’ strategy to establish objectivity (Januarta & Hardjanto, 2020). Given the indirect reference to the authors to achieve objectivity, these linguistic resources seem to show self-detachment from academic texts. Positioning self-as-other, as we believe, is the authors’ strategy to maintain their less involvement or engagement to the research, and hence, they represent themselves as passive observers.

2. Methods

A specialized corpus was employed to understand academic English, especially in the field of applied linguistics. In addition to continuing previous studies, we considered this soft science because the writing style in this discipline, unlike in hard sciences seems to have a homogenous style, depends on language and culture (Duszak, 1997). Due to its sensitivity to language and culture where the text is composed, this discipline might have more variations. Besides, regarding samples, our corpus was drawn from applied linguistics RAs (40 texts with 244,704 words in total; see Table 3 for the detail)

from Indonesia-and UK-based journals, namely *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics* (INACOR) and *Applied Linguistics* (BRICOR), respectively, to illustrate the writing practices in each discourse community. These journals were chosen based on several criteria which were used to establish the homogeneity across (sub) corpora. First, the applied linguistics journals are peer-reviewed international publications in Indonesia and the UK. Second, the journals are accredited by Scopus to ensure the similar quality of the journals. Third, the journal editors do not prohibit authors to mention themselves in their RAs. After the data sources were chosen, the RA samples were gathered according to three criteria. First, the samples were only empirical research because its report tends to share more similar textual macrostructure (AIMRD) than, for example, theoretical ones. Second, the RAs were written by Indonesian and British authors who were identified based on the corresponding author's affiliated institution. The identification was required because in internationally reputable journals, albeit nation-based (e.g. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*), an RA could be written by multiple authors with heterogeneous cultural backgrounds. Following previous studies, we believe that this technique is reasonable because authors are familiar with the writing conventions in their affiliated institutions (see Mur-Dueñas, 2007, p. 147). Third, we also maintained the homogeneity within (sub) corpora by including an equal number of single (01-10) and multiple authors (11-20) to fairly accommodate both singular and plural forms. After RAs were selected, only the running texts were considered as authors only show their explicit presence here.

Table 3. Description of the corpus

Authors	INACOR		BRICOR	
	RA	Words	RA	Words
Single authorship	10	52,157	10	66,953
Joint authorship	10	53,521	10	72,073
Total	20	105,678	20	139,026
Mean		5,283.9		6,951.3

Data were collected by searching first-person pronouns and several hypothetical self-referring terms (i.e. *writer**, *researcher**, and *author**) as the keywords with the concordance feature of WordSmith Tools 5.0 (Scott, 2008). We also manually cross-checked the results of the automatic search to filter the linguistic devices, especially first-person pronouns, which were mistakenly identified by the software, from the abbreviation of the United States and the first Roman numeral. After the data were collected, they were analyzed independently with an external rater, and the manual coding was compared to ours to test the consistency of our analysis, resulting 93.58% for the inter-rater agreement value of the initial coding. The different identification across raters, moreover, were resolved by a discussion to accomplish the agreement for the final results. In the data analysis of the final coding, we firstly quantified the linguistic markers, and normalize each count per 100,000 words. The normalization of frequency enabled us to make each count of linguistic markers comparable across (sub) corpora. Second, a chi-squared test, which was informed by previous studies (Huang & Rose, 2018; Lorés-Sanz, 2011; Xia, 2018) to examine the discrepancy of frequencies across groups, was done to see the differences across Indonesian and British RAs. Third, we also computed and normalize the frequency counts of discourse functions of the explicit authorial presence markers. Here, the analysis of discourse functions was done by incorporating two frameworks (Sheldon, 2009; Tang & John, 1999).

3. Finding and Discussions

3.1 Linguistic Markers of Explicit

Authorial Presence across INACOR and BRICOR

A comparison of authorial presence markers between Indonesian and British authors reveals considerable differences in the extent to which the authors show their visibility explicitly in their scholarly texts. Generally speaking, compared to their British counterparts in their RAs, Indonesian authors use nearly twice fewer linguistic markers of authorial presence

(257.39 vs. 533.71 cases per 100,000 words, $\chi^2 = 96.52$ $df = 1$, $p = 0.00$), meaning that they are much less pronounced in overtly showing their presence in comparison to the British authors. One contributing factor to the lower authorial presence in Indonesian RAs could be Indonesian academic writing instructions irrespective of disciplinary fields (e.g. see Laba & Rinayanthi, 2018; Rokhmansyah, Rijal, & Purwanti, 2018; Sari & Aini, 2019) which generally emphasize the object-oriented style of writing via passives. Because passives syntactically position the academic authors in the background, the authors become less prominent than the phenomenon being reported in the texts. Nevertheless, since the finding indicates that Indonesian authors also attempt to show their explicit presence, not as previously suggested by their academic writing manuals, the inconsistency of their academic writing instructions to their writing practices of showing presence explicitly might indicate that Indonesian authors adjust their own writing to Anglophone rhetorical style that is more typical in international publication. Due to the inconformity of the real to the suggested practice too, although it is not yet feasible to make a claim given the single publication context and non-diachronic nature of the current study, we can at least suspect that there is an objective to subjective style shift in Indonesian academic writing. On the contrary to the Indonesian case, the high frequency of authorial presence markers in British RAs is normal because previous

studies comparing linguistics RAs written by native English to those composed by Iranian (Abdi & Farrokhi, 2015) and Slavic authors (Dontcheva-Navrátilová, 2013; Walková, 2018) also report the similar results. Our finding consistent with previous studies, thus, might reveal that the inclination of the native English authors' rhetorical style to show their higher degree of presence in texts to indicate personal involvements to their research.

In addition to the comparison of overall frequencies, in particular, we can see on Table 4 that the subjective pronoun *we* is by far most widespread marker in both Indonesian and British RAs although the authorial presence marker is more frequently found in the British RAs (107.87 vs. 322.96 occurrences). The different use of the nominative pronoun across Indonesian and British groups, moreover, is statistically considerable ($\chi^2 = 107.38$, $df = 1$, $p = 0.00$). Dissimilar to the first-person plural *we* which is more prevalent in the British RAs, the linguistic markers *I* (44.47 and 36.9 occurrences) and *researcher** (*the researcher* and *the researchers*; 36.9 vs.12.23) are more mainly found in Indonesian RAs. Even though the first-person nominative pronoun ($\chi^2 = 0.70$, $df = 1$, $p > 0.40$) and the self-referring term ($\chi^2 = 12.38$, $df = 1$, $p = 0.00$) are more frequent in Indonesian RAs, they are not equally significant in the statistical sense. As seen on the *p*-values, the prior is insignificant whereas the latter is statistically considerable.

Table 4. Authorial presence markers across (sub)corpora

Linguistic Markers	INACOR		BRICOR		Total	
	Raw	Norm.	Raw	Norm.	Raw	Norm.
we	114	107.87	449	322.96	563	230.07
our*	28	26.50	183	131.63	211	86.23
I	47	44.47	36	25.89	83	33.92
researcher*	39	36.90	17	12.23	56	22.88
us	9	8.52	24	17.26	33	13.49
my	25	23.66	7	5.04	32	13.08
author*	0	0.00	20	14.39	20	8.17
me	4	3.79	2	1.44	6	2.45
writer*	4	3.79	0	0.00	4	1.63
ourselves	0	0.00	3	2.16	3	1.23

myself	2	1.89	0	0.00	2	0.82
mine	0	0.00	1	0.72	1	0.41
Total	272	257.39	742	533.71	1,014	414.38

Note: In corpus search, the wildcard (*) as in *writer** (*writer* and *writers*) serves as a replacement zero or more characters (e.g. see Kübler & Zinsmeister, 2015); Norm. = frequency per 100,000 words

The pervasiveness of the pronoun *we* in both (sub)corpora could pertain to the flexibility of the English first-person plural. Semantically speaking, this flexibility of the first-person plural facilitates Indonesian and British authors to exclude or include the audience (see Example 1 and 2, respectively). By excluding their audience, the authors as the only referent of *we* can be more explicitly visible to highlight their personal roles during the research process. The inclusion of the audience as in (2), by contrast, allows authors to draw engagement to their readers in the state of affairs, namely highlighting a knowledge gap. In the pragmatic ground, this audience involvement via *we* is associated with the notion of politeness (Myers, 1989) by involving their readers in their statement of knowledge gap to acknowledge the readers' role as audience and mitigating the face-threatening act of their criticism by lessening the particularity of the criticism target. In addition to this inclusion of audience, the first-person plural *we* (3) also enables authors to denote people in general in order to establish relevance of their work to a broader context so the authors can assist their readers in understanding the importance of their research topic. From this explanation, we aim to say that it is hardly surprising that the use of *we* predominates the linguistic markers of explicit authorial presence in both academic groups given the flexibility of the English plural *we* to denote which participants to include/exclude from the text (for the distribution of inclusivity/

exclusivity, see Table 5). Simply put, no matter authors wish to include or exclude, they formally have one choice only, not to mention the fact that single authors also have an option to use inclusive *we*.

(1) *We* [authors as researchers] had recorded a teacher by audio recording with her consent, and also her students in the class [...] (INACOR19)

(2) *We* [authors + disciplinary community] know very little about how ABE guidance is deployed in real-time interviews, and whether it hinders or facilitates evidence-giving in cases of sexual assault. (BRICOR17)

(3) Words are not the only means by which *we* [people in general] communicate with each other [...] (INACOR20).

Apart from the referential issue, the pervasiveness of *we* in the corpus, both in Indonesian or British RAs, could be further clarified by its syntactic position which permits *we* as an authorial presence marker to make authors more prominent than with *our* and *us*. The syntactic prominence of such pronoun enables the scholarly authors to foreground themselves to highlight their direct involvement as research agents, not just beneficiary (e.g. *they were recommended to us*) or patient (e.g. *the approach enables us*) in semantic sense. Therefore, the prominence of *we* to make readers more aware of authors' personal roles could partly explain the pervasiveness of such nominative pronoun.

Table 5. Clusivity of *We* across (Sub)corpora

Inclusivity/ Exclusivity	INACOR		BRICOR		Total	
	Raw	Norm.	Raw	Norm.	Raw	Norm.
Inclusive <i>we</i>	45	42.58	128	92.07	173	70.70
Exclusive <i>we</i>	69	65.29	321	230.89	390	159.38
Total	114	107.87	449	322.96	563	230.07

Note: Norm. = frequency per 100,000 words

In addition to the predominance of *we* in general (Table 4), we can see that the inclusivity/exclusivity of *we* in Indonesian and British RAs indicate a similar pattern: Both inclusive ($\chi^2 = 18.18$, $df = 1$, $p = 0.00$) and exclusive *we* ($\chi^2 = 92.59$, $df = 1$, $p = 0.00$) are consistently more infrequent significantly in Indonesian RAs. As the relative frequencies imply, British authors do not only indicate a stronger preference to use *we* to show their visibility overtly but also signal more attempt to increase the author-audience dialogic interaction in the RAs. This finding is hardly surprising since Dontcheva-Navrátilová's (2013, p. 23) has also shown the more prevalence of *we* to draw readers' involvement and indicate common knowledge in native English authors. From this consistent finding, it seems that this tendency reveals their reader-friendly or so-called 'writer-responsible' (Salski & Dolgikh, 2018) attitude because they facilitate readers with their better version of reading their RAs by providing more explicit guidance to their audience. Based on our results, British authors seem to perceive the pursuit of new knowledge as a collective work between the authors and their readers, and we can see that language, especially inclusivity/ exclusivity, is an important factor affecting the degree of presence.

Furthermore, Indonesian authors as previously mentioned are keener to show their presence via first-person singular *I* ($p = 0.00$) and *researcher** (including both *the researcher* and *the researchers*; $p = 0.00$) than their British peers. The pronoun *I* which is more frequently used in Indonesian RAs is mainly affected by the choice of Indonesian single authors to either use or avoid *I* for involving their audience. In the comparison, Indonesian single authors (44.47), slightly dissimilar to British (25.89), choose the option to employ *I* rather than, for example, *we*. This selection once again seems to reflect the lower interactivity to audience in non-Anglophone texts which has been discussed in the previous paragraph. Besides, even though being criticized for the vagueness of the linguistic marker (e.g. by American Psychological Association, 2010, p. 69; Carter, Guerin, & Aitchison, 2020, pp. 108-109), *the researcher* and *researchers* (see Example 4 and 5, respectively) are slightly more frequent in Indonesian than in British RAs (36.90

vs. 12.23). The more frequent use of *researcher** here might portray the common Indonesian academic writing instructions which suggest an object-focused style (e.g. see Sugihastuti & Saudah, 2016, p. 15; Wijana, 2008, p. 3) so this self-referring expression might be chosen to compensate to show their presence but still attempt to be neutral by distancing themselves as authors and as researchers. In short, still considering the insignificant difference of *researcher**, Indonesian authors are to some extent more likely than British to separate their roles (i.e. as the authors of their RAs and the researchers) so they can maintain a detached stance when reporting the research while still being visible despite not as direct as with first-person pronouns.

(4) In order to achieve the goal, *the present researchers* used three instruments to collect data: a questionnaire, an in-depth and an assessment of EFL speakers' utterances from the in-depth interview. (INACOR17)

(5) Participants were recruited by *the researcher* from undergraduate students (24) and staff (6) in accordance with the with the ethics procedures at Lancaster University. (BRICOR08)

Previous research (Hryniuk, 2018), moreover, has also reported this kind of finding when comparing Anglophone to non-Anglophone (Polish) applied linguistics RAs. She found that *researcher** is slightly more frequent in non-native than in native English writing (10.34 vs. 7.31 per 100,000)², especially in the Methods section. Relating to the previous study, while waiting for future studies, we can tentatively suspect *researcher** as a characteristic of non-native English writing in applied linguistics which tends to show authorial detachment.

3.2 Discourse Functions of Authorial Presence Markers across INACOR and BRICOR

First-person and self-referring terms do not only serve to indicate Indonesian and British authorial presence but also to fulfill various discourse functions in their immediate context. As we can see in Table 6, although Indonesian

and British authors show their presence for the similar purposes, these two groups have different tendencies as shown by the frequencies per 100,000. Both academic groups are sequentially distinct in structuring texts (ARC, 25.55 vs. 127.31; $\chi^2 = 67.74$, $df = 1$, $p = 0.00$), expressing personal opinions (OPI, 25.55 vs. 121.56; $\chi^2 = 62.66$, $df = 1$, $p = 0.00$), and providing an overt

guidance to audience (GUI, 40.69 vs. 94.23; $\chi^2 = 21.24$, $df = 1$, $p = 0.00$). Dissimilar to those functions which are more predominant in British RAs, it is also worth to note that signaling self-reflexivity –with which we explain that authorial presence also has a personal dimension– is more widespread in Indonesian RAs (REF, 28.39 vs. 360; $\chi^2 = 19.21$, $df = 1$, $p = 0.00$).

Table 6. Distribution of discourse functions across (sub)corpora

Functions	INACOR		BRICOR		Total	
	Raw	Norm.	Raw	Norm.	Raw	Norm.
Representative	22	20.82	40	28.77	62	25.34
Guide	43	40.69	131	94.23	174	71.11
Architect	27	25.55	177	127.31	204	83.37
Recounters	103	97.47	158	113.65	261	106.66
Opinion-holder	27	25.55	169	121.56	196	80.10
Originator	20	18.93	62	44.60	82	33.51
Reflexive	30	28.39	5	3.60	35	14.30
Total	272	257.39	742	533.71	1014	414.38

Note: Norm. = Frequency per 100,000 words

Based on the results, showing presence for structuring/organizing texts across groups where the function is more likely to appear in the British RAs indicates the most considerable difference. This difference seems to highlight the idea of author-responsible attitude (Salski & Dolgikh, 2018) for the clarity of the British texts. In our corpus, this function is indeed present in Indonesian and British RAs but British authors, unlike their Indonesian counterparts, signal their presence overtly to provide backreferences (see 6) and explain the sequence of data presentation (7). The linguistic markers might suggest that British authors to some extent show more attempts for textual organization than the Indonesian authors. As previous studies (Hinds, 2001, p. 65; Salski & Dolgikh, 2018) point out, English is characterized by positioning speakers as agents who take responsibility for the understandability of the message, e.g. by providing more linking devices to connect ideas, so the frequent use of organizing texts might signal the role of English, especially as the native language of British authors, in influencing the extent of use.

(6) *We* have stated above that one of the

benefits of developing a local grammar is that it acts as a heuristic—a way of paying close attention to all instances of a given set of patterns. (BRICOR13)

(7) Before turning to the current study, *we* will take a closer look at how non-idiomatic, corpus-derived formulaic sequences such as lexical bundles, collocations, and binomials are thought to be acquired and processed. (BRICOR18)

Besides, it is also important to see the predominance of text-oriented function together with the more pervasive function of guiding audience in British RAs given that these two functions can serve to enhance the understandability of texts. Along with guiding audience, British authors do not only pay more attention to their organization of texts but also provide more explicit guidance to their readers such as suggesting how to read and interpret the data (8) and what immediate action should be done (9). Here, given the presence of data reading in Indonesian RAs too, we need to emphasize that what distinguishes Indonesian and British RAs is not the strategies for guiding the readers but only the overall frequency of

guiding readers: The frequency difference might highlight our explanation of the more predominance of inclusive *we* in British RAs as a reader-friendly character of Anglophone texts. The pervasiveness of text and audience-oriented function seem to underline Anglophone view of science as a collaborative work between authors and their audience in British RAs.

(8) What *we* can infer from the data is that some indicators showed the students had high motivation [...] (INACOR01)

(9) For that, *we* need to start looking towards an individual-level analysis using, for example, a stimulated recall methodology [...] (BIRCOR06)

Concerning expressing personal opinions, let us consider authorial presence markers such as *we assume* and *we argue* (10 and 11), which involve so-called ‘cognitive’ and ‘verbal process’ in SFL tradition. Although Indonesian authors also show their presence when expressing personal opinions, their presence is considerably lower than their counterparts, and they do not tend to reluctant to take a strong position with, for example, *argue* or *contend*. Indonesian authors instead typically exploit *assume* as in (11) or *found X ADJ*.

(10) *We* assume this difference is due to the different class, in which her study observed students in Geography [...] (INACOR19)

(11) The semantically labelled constructions, *we* argue, can be applied to the development of resources for language teaching and may have further applications to the automatic processing of text. (BRIT13)

Furthermore, the frequencies of functions in Indonesian RAs as previously mentioned are fewer than those in British RAs, except the frequency of showing self-reflexivity. The self-reflexivity is typically signaled by providing personal background relevant to the research topic to link the author to the research (12) and showing personal engagement during the research process (13) in Indonesian (sub)corpus are unexpected. As Sheldon (2009) has revealed, this discourse function is more frequently found in Anglophone RAs to indicate authors’ positioning during the research process. This

surprising finding could be explained by the fact that this discourse function only appears in one Indonesian RA, INACOR06.

(12) However, what *I* experienced at the beginning of *my* first year of study was completely different from what *I* had initially anticipated. (INACOR06)

(13) After she spoke honestly of her speaking challenges with her classmates, *I* became curious to know how she managed the situation. (INACOR06)

From this point, this finding might suggest an idiosyncrasy of INACOR06 in using authorial presence markers to signal self-reflexivity, and cannot be a reliable representation of how Indonesian authors in the applied linguistics community demonstrate their reflexivity. Although this finding is ungeneralizable to the Indonesian community, it might still partly support the claim that author’s personal background (e.g. experience or seniority) can affect the role of authorial presence in texts (see Hyland, 2010).

4. Closing

4.1 Conclusion

In conclusion, our research has attempted to investigate how native and non-native English authors in international publications show their presence explicitly by focusing on the linguistic markers to signal the presence and the roles of the linguistic markers in scholarly texts. Using Indonesian and British RA samples from applied linguistics, we demonstrated that the native English-speaking authors in general tend to be more visible than their non-native English peers in English RAs, and indicate a stronger preference for displaying reader-friendly attitude by making themselves explicitly visible when leading readers throughout their RAs and providing signposts for improving the understandability of their texts. By comparing native and non-native writing, however, the variation of authorial presence is not meant to evaluate, for example, the shortcoming of the non-native English authors’ writing but it is simply to highlight the non-universality of rhetorical style in academic English.

We so far have demonstrated that the ways two groups of academic authors use linguistic markers to manifest their authorial presence suggest that background of individual authors (e.g. INDO06) could be a contributing factor to the overall results, especially on the functions of presence markers, yet what personal background and to what extent individual authors' background influences the overall Indonesian-British cross-cultural differences remain a problem.

4.2 Suggestion

Furthermore, considering the inconformity of writing practices and academic writing manuals in the Indonesian case, a further investigation can be done to analyze whether this inconformity only occurs in international context where Indonesian authors need to adjust their writing to Anglophone style or also in their national publications. By doing this, we can clarify whether there is *indeed* an objective-

subjective shift in their academic writing practice, not just an adoption of the style. Last, as we have shown, language features (i.e. the flexibility of *we* and the syntactic prominence of *we*) also contribute to the selection of authorial presence markers. Therefore, it might be worthwhile to research authorial presence with regard to a specific language, L2, and English to see not only the cross-linguistic and cross-cultural variation but also the extent to which L1 influences authorial presence.

Notes

¹ Relative frequencies were added because Dontcheva-Navrátilová (2013) does not normalize the total frequencies across academic groups.

² Hryniuk (2018, p. 635) states that the frequencies of *the researcher(s)* in Anglo-American and Polish RAs are equal (14 vs. 14) but when normalized per 100,000 words, the frequencies are distinct.

References

- Abdi, J., & Farrokhi, F. 2015. "Investigating The Projection of Authorial Identity through First Person Pronouns in L1 and L2 English Research Articles". *International Journal of Language and Literature*, 3(1), 156—168. doi: 10.15640/ijll.v3n1a21.
- Ädel, A. 2008. "Metadiscourse across Three Varieties of English: American, British, and Advanced Learner English". In U. Connor, E. Nagelhout & W. V. Rozycki (Eds.), *Contrastive Rhetoric: Reaching at Intercultural Rhetoric* (pp. 45—62). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Al-Shujairi, Y. B. J. 2018. "What, Which, and Where: Examining Self-Mention Markers in ISI and Iraq" Local Research Articles in Applied Linguistics. *Asian Englishes*, 1—15. doi: 10.1080/13488678.2018.1544699.
- American Psychological Association. 2010. *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th ed.). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Bhat, D. N. S. 2004. *Pronouns*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Can, T., & Cangir, H. 2019. "A Corpus-Assisted Comparative Analysis of Self-mention Markers in Doctoral" Dissertations of Literary Studies Written in Turkey and The UK." *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 42, 100796. doi: 10.1016/j.jeap.2019.100796.
- Carcu, O. M. 2009. "An Intercultural Study First-personal Plural References in Biomedical Writing". *Ibérica*, 18, 71—92.
- Carter, S., Guerin, C., & Aitchison, C. 2020. *Doctoral Writing: Practices Processes and Pleasures*. Singapore: Springer.
- Dontcheva-Navrátilová, O. 2013. "Authorial Presence in Academic Discourse: Functions of Author-Reference Pronouns". *Linguistica Pragensia*, 23(1), 9—30.

- Duszak, A. 1997. "Cross-cultural Academic Communication: A Discourse Community View". In A. Duszak (Ed.). *Culture ale Style ic Academrse Discourse* (pp. 11—39). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- El-Dakhs, D. A. 2018. "Why are Abstracts in PhD Theses and Research Articles Different? A Genre-specific Perspective". *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 36, 48—60. doi: 10.1016/j.jeap.2018.09.005.
- Endley, M. 2010. *Linguistics Perspectives on English Grammar: A Guide for EFL teachers*. Charlotte, NC: Information Are Publishing.
- Hinds, J. 2001. "Reader versus Writer Responsibility: A New Typology". In T. Silva & P. K. Matsuda (Eds.), *Landmark Essays on ESL Writing* (pp. 63—72). New York: Routledge.
- Hryniuk, K. 2018. "Expressing Authorial Self in Research Articles Written by Polish and English Native-speakers Writers: A Corpus-based Study". *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 8(3), 621—642. doi: 10.14746/sslit.2018.8.3.5.
- Huang, Y., & Rose, K. 2018. "You, Our Shareholders: Metadiscourse in CEO Letters from Chinese and Western Banks". *Text & Talk*, 38(2), 167—190. doi: 10.1515/text-2017-0041.
- Hyland, K. 2002. "Authority and Invisibility: Authorial Identity in Academic Writing". *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34, 1091—1112. doi: 10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00035-8.
- Hyland, K. 2005. "Stance and Engagement: A Model of Interaction in Academic Discourse". *Discourse Studies*, 7(2), 173—192. doi: 10.1177/1461445605050365
- Hyland, K. 2008. "Disciplinary Voices: Interactions in Research Writing". *English Text Construction*, 1(1), 5—22. doi: 10.1075/etc.1.1.03hyl.
- Hyland, K. 2010. "Community and Individuality: Performing Identity in Applied Linguistics". *Written Communication*, 27(2), 159—188. doi: 10.1177/0741088309357846
- Hyland, K., & Feng Jiang. 2016. "Change of Attitude? A Diachronic Study of Stance". *Written Communication*, 33(3), 251—274. doi: 10.1177/0741088316650399
- Hyland, K., & Feng Jiang. 2017. "Is Academic Writing Becoming More Informal?" *English for Specific Purposes*, 45, 40—51. doi: 10.1016/j.esp.2016.09.01.
- Kawase, T. 2015. "Metadiscourse in The Introductions of PhD Theses and Research Articles". *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 20, 114—124. doi: 10.1016/j.jeap.2015.08.006
- Khedri, M. 2016. "Are We Visible? An Interdisciplinary Data-base Study of Self-mention in Research Articles". *Poznań Studies in Contemporary Linguistics*, 52(3), 403—430. doi: 10.1515/psicl-2016-0017.
- Kübler, S., & Zinsmeister, H. 2015. *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistically Annotated Corpora*. London: Boomsbury.
- Kuo, C.H. 1999. "The Use of Personal Pronouns: Role Relationships Scientific Journa Articles". *English for Specific Purposes*, 18(2), 121—138. doi: 10.1016/S0889-4906(97)00058-6.
- Laba, I. N., & Rinayanthi, N. M. 2018. *Buku ajar Bahasa Indonesia Berbasis Karya Tulis Ilmiah*. Sleman: Deepublish.
- Livnat, Z. 2010. "Impersonality and Grammatical Metaphors in Scientific Discourse. The Rhetorical Perspective". *Lidil. Revue de linguistique et de didactique des langues* (41), 103—119.
- Lorés-Sanz, R. 2011. "The Construction of The Author's Voice in Academic Writing: The Interplay of Cultural and Disciplinary Factors". *Text & Talk-An Interdisciplinary Journal of Language, Discourse & Communication Studies*, 31(2), 173—193.
- McGrath, L. 2016. "Self-mentions in Anthropology ary History Research Articles: Variation between and within Disciplines". *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 21, 86—98. doi:

10.1016/j.jeap.2015.11.004.

- Mur-Dueñas, P. 2007. “‘I/we focus on...’: A Cross-cultural Analysis of Self-mentions in Business Management Research Articles”. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 6(2), 143—162. doi: 10.1016/j.jeap.2007.05.002.
- Myers, G. 1989. “The Pragmatics of Politeness in Scientific Articles”. *Applied linguistics*, 10(1), 1—35. doi: 10.1093/applin/10.1.1.
- Purwo, B. K. 1984. *Deixis dalam Bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta: PN Balai Pustaka.
- Rokhmansyah, A., Rijal, S., & Purwant. 2018. *Bahasa Indonesia untuk Perguruan Tinggi*. Semarang: Unnes Press.
- Salski, Ł., & Dolgikh, O. 2018. “Reader versus Writer Responsibility Revisited: A Polish-Russian Contrastive Approach”. In M. Chitez, C. I. Doroholschi, O. Kruse, Ł. Salski & D. Tucan (Eds.), *University writing in Central and Eastern Europe: Tradition, transition, and innovation* (pp. 89—102). Cham: Springer.
- Sari, E. M. P., & Aini, . (219). *Writing for academic purpose: A blended learning handout*. Ponorogo: Myria Publisher.
- Scott, M. 2008. *WordSmith Tools Version 5*. Liverpool: Lexical Analysis Software.
- Seoane, E., & Hundt, M. 2017. “Voice Alternation and Authorial Presence: Variation Across Disciplinary Areas in Academic English”. *Journal of English Linguistics*, 46(1), 3-22. doi: 10.1177/0075424217740938.
- Sheldon, E. 2009. “From One I to Another: Discursive Construction of Self-representation in English and Castilian Spanish Research Articles”. *English for Specific Purposes*, 28(4), 251—265. doi: 10.1016/j.esp.2009.05.001.
- Sugihastuti, & Saudah, S. 2016. *Buku Ajar Bahasa Indonesia Akademik*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Susanti, Y., Kurnia, F. D., & Suharsono. 2017. “Interactional Metadiscourse Markers in The Introduction on Dissertations: Differences across English Proficiency Level”. *A Journal of Culture, English Language, Culture & Literature*, 17(2), 270-291. doi: 10.24167/celt.v17i2.
- Susanti, Y., Kurnia, F. D., & Suharsono. 2018. “Authorial Presence in Indonesian Doctorate Student Dissertations”. *Proceeding Icon-ELite*, 1(1), 542-553.
- 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. doi: 10.1016/S0889-4906(99)00009-5.
- Thomas, R. M., & Brubaker, D.L. 2001. *Avoiding thesis and dissertation pitfalls: 61 cases of problems and solutions*. London: Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Walková, M. 2018. “Author’s self-Representation in Research Articles by Anglophone and Slovak Linguists”. *Discourse and Interaction*, 11(1), 86—105. doi: 10.5817/DI2018-1-86.
- Walková, M. 2019. “A three-Dimensional Model of Personel Self-mention in Research Papers”. *English for Specific Purposes*, 53, 60—73. doi: 10.1016/j.esp.2018.09.003.
- Wijana, I. D. P. 2008. *Bahasa Indonesia untuk Penulisan Ilmiah*. Yogyakarta: Araska Printika.
- Xia, G. 2018. A Cross-disciplinary Corpus-based Study on English and Chinese Native Speakers’ Use of First-persons Pronouns in Academic English Writing”. *Text & Talk*, 38(1), 93—113. doi: 10.1515/text-2017-0032.

