

Can We Mention “I”? : An investigation of Author Exclusivity in Research Articles of Social Sciences

Akhtar Abbas¹, Tehseen Zahra²

¹ Assistant Professor, Department of English, Air University, Pakistan.
Email: asharabbas83@gmail.com

² Assistant Professor, Department of English, Air University, Pakistan.
Correspondence: tehsin.azhar@yahoo.com

Abstract

Employing author-exclusivity has become an academic writing experts’ mantra in settings of English for Research Purposes (ERP) in the specific context of English as an international lingua franca. This employment of author exclusive personal pronouns (e.g. I and we) has been interpreted variously such as *self-display*, *self-projection*, *observers*, *recounters*, *critics*, *participants*, and *arguer* by many scholars in recent two decades (Ädel, 2006; Hyland, 2012; Hyland & Guinda, 2012; Shehzad, 2007; Swales & Feak, 2004). These studies along with several others have contributed substantially in this regard in the fields of applied linguistics and discourse studies. However, in more contexts of ESL (such as Pakistan), employment of self-mentioning needs to be explored to offer significant insights with special reference to English as a global phenomenon. Therefore, the frameworks of author-exclusivity such as Ädel’s (2006) need to be tested for revealing more layers of self-mentioning in research discourses. The current study attempts to explore discourse functions of singular author exclusive pronoun i.e. *I* by applying Ädel’s framework (ibid) in research articles of social sciences published in Pakistan by the local authors. The corpus of 20 research papers each from the disciplines of English, History, and Education was built and analysed quantitatively and qualitatively. We found 45 instances of first-person pronoun i.e. *I* used metadiscursively in the corpus. The study identified a few more discourse functions also other than those proposed by Ädel (ibid). Instead of shunning the use of *I* in academic writing generally, we suggest teaching its use metadiscursively.

Keywords: self-display, I, metadiscourse, exclusive pronouns, stance, voice

1. Introduction

Pragmatics of author-exclusivity employed in discourses in general and research discourses, in particular, have been investigated through various lenses of discourses. For example, on the one hand, it is considered a mark of informality in academic writing (Hyland & Jiang, 2017). On the other hand, its multifarious formal functions have also been explored as *identity maker* (Hyland, 2002b; Ivanič, 1998), *self-display* (Hyland, 2002a), *stance* (Karahana, 2012), *self-promotion and projection* (Harwood, 2005a), *interpersonal relationship* (Kuo, 1999) and *metadiscourse* (Ädel, 2006). Moreover,

according to Hyland (2012), some other terms such as *footing*, *positioning*, *personal stamp*, *signature*, *observers*, *critics*, *participants*, *recounters*, *academic arguer*, and *interpreters* have also been associated with author-exclusivity.

Self-mentioning in discourses in general and research discourses, in particular, is usually considered a mark of informality and subjectivity. All the manuals of research writing do not encourage the employment of self-mentioning, especially through first-person author's exclusive pronouns i.e "I, and we" in informal writings such as academic writing (Swales & Feak, 2012). Nevertheless, the text producers are always present in their texts either covertly and/or overtly as Mauranen (1993) argues against the notion of subjectivity that the writers are 'ridiculously obvious' in their writings making the text naturally dialogic.

This *ridiculous obviousness* of the writers' presence has been investigated by several researchers (Clark & Ivanic, 1997; Deveci & Nunn, 2014; Harwood, 2005a, 2005b; Hyland, 2002a; Karahan, 2012; Sato, 2014; Tang & John, 1999). These studies demonstrate the foci of the author's exclusive pronouns from the perspective of discourse and pragmatics. However, all of these functions of the author's exclusive pronouns are general and include both the metadiscursive and non-metadiscursive orientations of author-exclusivity. Moreover, the employment of first-person singular pronoun i.e "I" has not been focused on yet in detail in research discourses especially. Besides, Pakistani research discourses have not been explored yet from this perspective of self-mentioning. Therefore, the current study aims at exploring the employment of metadiscursive first person singular pronoun i.e *I* in research articles of Education, English, and History published in recognized research journals of Higher Education Commission, Pakistan.

2. Literature Review

2.1 General Norms of Self-Mentioning in Academic Discourse

Academic writing, generally, embedded with self-mentioning through person pronouns is considered an informal style (Hyland & Jiang, 2017) of writing. Biber's (1995) multidimensional analysis also encompasses person pronouns a feature of spoken language within the *narrative domain*. Being the prototypical component of the spoken register, personal pronouns are generally marked with informality in academic writing (Paltridge & Starfield, 2007). This *markedness* associated with personal pronouns in academic writing is usually supported by a few of the classical norms of writing. Firstly, according to classical style, the writer should be absent from writing as the presence of the writer makes the writing subjective. However, this notion does not cater to several *discursive* and *extra-discursive* circumstances properly for consideration of writing norms. For example, it is purely based on a prescriptive approach which seems to be in

confrontation with the recent norm of descriptivism in discursive circumstances. Moreover, the situations outside the world of discourses are also part of discourses in this modern time of knowledge industry. Therefore, discourse itself has become a product now and *discourse producers* would prefer marketization/projection of themselves to *discourse consumers* being important contributors to the knowledge economy of the industry. Hence, Mauranen (1993) mocks the idea of the absence of the writer altogether from writing and believes in the obviousness of the writer whether the presence is explicit or implicit.

2.2 General Norms of Self-mentioning in Other Discourse

It is important to mention here that self-mentioning not only has been explored in academic discourse but the other discourses such as law (Gibbons, 2014), media (Breeze, 2015; Vis et al. 2012), marketing (Escalas, 2007; Sela et al. 2012), and medicine (Skelton et al. 2002), have also been investigated through the semantic and pragmatic lens of self-display. For instance, the impact of first-person pronouns on doctor-patient interpersonal relations to cater to health issues of patients through care consultations has been investigated by Skelton et al. (2002) who found the positive face of the doctors even in this different power relationship. Moreover, *de se attitude* i.e negative face of the doctors has also been observed in some studies such as Hinzen (2015). Similarly, Escalas (2007) and Sela et al. (2012) examined the person pronouns in marketing discourse and observed a strong positive effect on interpersonal marketing communication. And media discourse has also been the centre of investigation with respect to functions of personal pronouns, for example, Vis et al. (2012) found in a diachronic study on newspapers that Dutch media has been noticed to have more freedom of expression as time passed. This conclusion was drawn based on more employment of first-person pronouns referring to the free voice of the journalists.

2.3 Voice and Self-mentioning

It is the concept of voice which as a maker of stance through lexico-grammatical features and author's exclusive pronouns especially have been considered a significant problem of an investigation by researchers in discourse studies. Voice, generally, in academic writing has been found a tricky concept for analysis. It has been a highly debatable and widely discussed topic among academic discourse analysts. One of the reasons for this debate is the multifarious nature of this concept which makes it possible to be viewed from various vantage points. For instance, the voice carries various literary, aesthetic, and metaphorical overtones because of the "range of meanings ascribed to it" (Tardy, 2012, as cited in Hyland & Guinda, 2012)

Therefore, owing to its multidimensional nature of meaning, voice has been discussed from various viewpoints by different researchers. The role and power of voice in academic writing have provided the foundation for much scholarly dispute and dialogue. Hence, it seems a mantra of academic writing experts. The first step to this understanding of the voice is the understanding of the “Dimensions of Voice” as discussed by Tardy (2012, as cited in Hyland & Guinda, 2012). She proposes three broad dimensions i.e. “Individual aspects, social aspects, and voice as dialogic”. This classification can help us understand better the dimensions of voice, thus, leading to a sound conceptualization of voice itself which would ultimately help to schematize the conception of voice in academic discourse. Before Tardy, Prior (2001) has also talked about these dimensions dividing them into “personal and social” ones. Similarly, Petric (2010, as cited in Lorés-Sanz, Mur-Dueña, & Lafuente-Millán, 2010) identifies three distinct views i.e. “individualized voice, writer’s choices and writer’s interaction with others”. Thus, if the voice is viewed from these perspectives and dimensions, it can make way for a robust analysis.

In addition, Mastuda (2011) discusses voice on epistemological continuum comprising of *personal perspective* on one extreme of the pole and *constructionist perspective* on the other. Both of these are sandwiched by a *constructivist perspective*. Personal and social construction affect the voice as it is stated above with different perspectives. Voice can be interpreted through different dimensions. Individual and social dimensions should be taken into account because the individual voice is as important as the social voice. Therefore, it may be inferred that both dimensions are interconnected.

2.4 Identity and Self-mentioning

In addition to associating voice with self-mentioning, Ivanic (1998) explicated some major aspects of the writer’s identity. The first is the *discoursal self* and the other is the possibilities of *selfhood*. These two aspects of the writer’s identity emphasize also the social and multi-dimensional nature of the voice employed by the writers. Indeed, a writer does not have any other tool to show his/her identity and views but only language. So, in the written academic genre, there is the concept of stance and voice which writers preferably use to show their identities. *Discoursal self* is the “impression” of the writer that is often multiple and sometimes contradictory that the writer consciously or unconsciously tries to convey to his/her readers in particular writing. This is social as the writer includes all the discourse characteristics which a text must have to convey all the aspects, for example, values, beliefs, and power relations of the writer. This phenomenon can be observed in scientific research like scientific articles where the writer adopts the identity of a scientist. This is called stance in which a writer places him/herself in a particular position in a text to be known by the readers. While talking about these two

major identities of a writer, Ivanic (ibid) considers the *discoursal self* related to the individual writers, and possibilities of *selfhood* are believed to be the possibilities of the writings that are generally available to a writer to write something in a particular social context.

2.5 Negotiating Social Interaction and Self-mentioning

In addition to identity dissemination and assertion, writers, sometimes, choose certain discourses and align their contribution with the work of others. In this context, they negotiate social relations to establish social alignment through certain discursive practices such as grammatical structures. According to Hyland (2008), it shows the authors' choice of self-display and demonstrating stance also.

2.6 Previous Studies on Self-mentioning

Connecting the above discussion on voice, identity, and negotiation with person pronouns, Hyland (2002a) found that the L2 undergraduate writers use the author's exclusive pronouns and determiners as (I, me, my, we, us, our) tool of self-display in a text. Hence, according to several researchers such as Gea-Valor (2010, as cited in Lorés-Sanz, Mur-Dueñas & Lafuente-Millán, 2010), first-person pronouns (author's exclusive pronouns) are one of the major linguistic tools to show their presence in their texts.

Therefore, the debate of mentioning or not mentioning self in academic writing stimulated discourse analysts, especially those who then explored the discourse functions of personal pronouns within the context of *discursive* and *extra-discursive circumstances*. For example, Ivanic, (1998) marked these pronouns as an important tool for identity dissemination; Ädel (2006), Harwood, (2005a), Hyland (2002a), Karahan (2012), and Kuo (1999) associated the explicit presence of the authors in their writings with pragmatic functions of *self-display*, *self-promotion*, and *projection*, *interpersonal relationship*, *metadiscourse*, and *stance* respectively. These functions of author exclusivity may broadly be categorized into metadiscursive and non-metadiscursive both. For example, *structuring the essay*, *making a statement of value or beliefs guide through the essay*, and *Elaborating arguments* are metadiscursive functions of author-exclusivity (Clark & Ivanic, 1997). Whereas, *presenting personal experience*, *Methodological rigour: going the extra mile*, and *recounting of the research process* suggests the non-metadiscursive nature of these discourse functions. Another, important function of self-mentioning is *Self-projection through counterclaiming the existing arguments* identified by Harwood (2005a, 2005b).

However, each of the studies mentioned above has discussed the discourse functions of all the author exclusive pronouns which in our view have some serious

implications. For example, seeing all the pronouns in totality in one study may not justify the same interpretation for all the pronouns. Moreover, mentioning self through first-person singular pronoun “I” might serve a different purpose than first-person plural pronoun i.e ‘we’. Therefore, investigating an individual author’s exclusive pronouns especially first person singular i.e *I* needs serious attention of the researchers for some important reasons. Firstly, self-display through first-person singular pronoun is taken as a discursive act of face-threatening among some of the academic writing cultures as is ours. Secondly, it is also considered as discourse content replete with subjectivity. Furthermore, “I” in academic writing is marked generally with informality. However, it is interesting to notice that, despite having set strict guidelines regarding self-mentioning by academic writing experts, the embodiment of students’ writing with self-mentioning is increasing with time (Hyland & Jiang, 2017). Similarly, self-mentioning as explored by the researchers in research discourses has also become an important manifestation of English for research purposes.

Ädel’s (2006) work in this regard offers more opportunities of exploring the metadiscursive nature of individual authors’ exclusive pronouns. Her model of personal metadiscourse is based on Jakobson’s functions of language i.e *code/text*, *the writer* and *the reader* cover almost all the possible pragmatic axes of author-exclusivity. Therefore, the current study applies this model to Pakistani research discourses which makes the study the first of its kind in the local context of Pakistan. Moreover, though Ädel’s (ibid) framework was primarily designed for students’ writing but owing to its wider spectrum of pragmatic coverage we think the model, to a greater extent, applies to other genres including research articles. Therefore, the current study aims at exploring the *writer*, *reader*, and *participant*-oriented functions of author exclusivity (i.e. first person singular pronoun *I*) in research articles of social sciences produced in Pakistan. Through this exploration, resolve to mention or not to mention *I* may be achieved to some extent, especially for novice researchers.

Moreover, the current study provides a macro picture of disciplinary variation of self-display through first-person singular pronouns in the research discourses of Pakistan in the fields of social sciences including education, English, and History. Though the disciplinary norms of metadiscourse in academic discourse has been widely explored in research discourses, especially in both the L1 and L2 context (Hyland, 2010; Hyland, 2004; Lee & Casal, 2014) the writers’ attitudes of different academic tribes (Becher, 1989) towards self-display, especially through employment of *I*, needs more studies to be conducted so that this diatribe of mentioning or not mentioning *I* would come to some logical conclusion with respect to English for research purposes. The current study puts an effort in this regard by exploring the employment of self-mentioning through first-

person singular pronoun i.e *I* in research articles of social sciences published in Pakistani research journals.

3. Research Methodology

The corpus used for analysis in the current study consists of 60 research articles from the disciplines of English, History and Education. The research articles were published in the recognized research journals of the Higher Education Commission, Pakistan. Each of the research articles was single-authored. Quantitative analysis was done by identifying all the uses of metadiscursive first-person pronouns i.e *I* by using a corpus tool i.e *MetaPak* to assist metadiscourse analysis (Abbas, Shehzad & Ghalib, 2017).

As we are three authors of this study, the coding of the metadiscursive first-person pronoun *I* was done with mutual agreement. Though we did not measure the intercoder reliability which might be considered the limitation of the methodological procedures adopted the examples used in section 4.2 for qualitative analysis confirms our appropriate mapping of the metadiscursive first-person pronoun *I*.

Ädel's (2006) model of metatext was applied to the identified instances of metadiscursive *I*. Though the model was designed for analysing students' writing we prefer this model as it is based on Jakobson's interpersonal functions of language i.e *code/text*, *the writer* and *the reader* which covers all the possible orientations of text. Moreover, the model provides more robust discourse functional categories of first-person pronoun which convinced us to use this model as our theoretical framework (See Figure 1 below).

The occurrence of each of the metatext categories proposed by Ädel (2006) was calculated. Discourse functions as proposed by this model were identified and discussed. However, almost half of the instances of metadiscursive *I* could not be mapped according to this model. So, four new categories of discourse functions were identified and added to the existing model.

Code: Focus on language	Defining
	Saying
Text: Focus on Structure	Introducing topic
	Focusing
	Concluding
	Reminding
	Exemplifying
	Adding
	Arguing
	Contextualizing
Participant: Focus on writer and/or reader of current text	Anticipating Reader's Interaction
	Clarifying
	Aligning Perspective
	Imagining Scenarios
	Hypothesizing about R
	Appealing to the Reader

Figure 1. Functions of Personal Metadiscourse: Metatext (Adel, 2006: 60-61)

4. Analysis and Discussion

This section deals with a demonstration of the findings of the study based on quantitative and qualitative analysis. In section 4.1 below, the occurrence of the first-person pronoun *I* with reference to classificatory categories of *code*, *text*, and *participant* is presented. Four more categories i.e. *embedded introducing and focusing*, *contextualization of the writer/researcher*, *focusing on the study*, and *stance I* were added by us for the occurrence which did not perform the already identified functions proposed by Ädel (2006). And section 4.2 below presents and discusses the metadiscourse functions performed by all the metadiscursive examples of *I* in the analysed in the built corpus from the disciplines of English, Education, and History. This sub-section (4.2) discusses the disciplinary variation also with regard to explored metadiscursive nature of the first-person pronoun *I*.

4.1 Occurrence of First-Person Pronoun

As can be seen in Table 1 below, the total occurrence of personal metadiscourse (first person *I*) is 45 in 60 research articles on, Education, English, and History. This highly low occurrence indicates the academic tradition of *self-effacement* in Pakistani research discourses generally produced in social sciences. So, '*not to mention I*' is

appeared to be the widely accepted norm in the localized context of the study. This localized schema of avoiding explicit self-display may have been shaped under the influence of several factors including culture, gender, professional status, and qualification. However, the influence of these factors on *self-effacement* needs a rational probe further in future research.

Few of the reasons for this avoidance based on our assumptions are grounded in schematized cultural and academic norms of the local context of Pakistan. Voicing through first-person pronoun i.e *I* is usually associated with *egoism* and an act of *face-threatening* in Pakistani culture. For example, the category made by us *Stance I* was found to be used 6 times only in our analyzed data which witnesses the schema of avoiding *egoism* and incurring *face threatening* in research discourses of Pakistan. Moreover, ‘*to mention I*’ in academic writing is assumed by the local experts of academic writing to be a breach of the rule of maintaining objectivity in research. However, it is yet to be investigated whether this assumption is a myth or an academic reality. Perhaps, the explicit self-display is avoided by employing more *the researcher* in Pakistani research discourses. The presence of the author in the garb of a third person in the form of *the researcher* might have been schematized to present the author as a *researcher* which demonstrates the world view of objectivity.

Table 1
Occurrence of First-Person Pronoun

Moves	Steps	Education	English	History	Total
Code: Focus on language	Defining				
	Saying	01	-----	-----	01
	Code Total	01	-----	-----	01
Text: Focus on Structure	Introducing topic		03		03
	Focusing			01	01
	<i>Embedded Introducing & Focusing</i>	01		03	04
	Concluding			01	01
	Reminding		01	02	03
	Exemplifying				
	Adding				
	Arguing			01	01
	Contextualizing				
	Text Total	01	04	08	13
Participant: Focus on	Anticipating Reader's Interaction				

writer and/or reader of current text	Clarifying			
	Aligning Perspective			
	Imagining Scenarios			
	Hypothesizing about R			
	Appealing to the Reader	01		01
	Contextualization of Writer/Researcher	10	11	21
	Stance I	06		06
	Focus on the Study	03		03
	Participant Total	20	11	31
	Code, Text, Participant Total	22	15	08
			45	

It can also be noticed in Table 1 above that almost 75.5% of instances of *I* cannot be classified under any subcategory of metatext as proposed by Ädel (2006). While, the subcategories of *Contextualization of Writer/Researcher*, *Stance I*, and *Focus on the Study* identified by us may also be considered as subclasses of the *participant* category of metatext. Major contributions to mapping these subcategories are the disciplines of English and Education. Research articles on History, contrary to the research articles on English and Education, appeared closer to *text-oriented* metadiscoursal use of first-person pronoun *I*. whereas, participant-oriented use of *I* is altogether missing from academic writing conventions of History. The overall occurrence of *I* shows *sharedness* of academic writing norms in the disciplines of English and Education, on the other hand, History looks to project its own identity different from the other two disciplines investigated in this study. In the overall picture of employment of first-person pronoun, *I* suggest writers' preference of *participant-oriented* use of metatext which is slightly more than 70%. Therefore, the writers' focus on language (*code*) and structure (*text*) through first-person pronoun *I* is considered the least significant in research discourses on Pakistan. In the end, the schema of *Contextualization of Writer/Researcher* is the most dominant cognitive pattern for employing the first-person pronoun *I*. The occurrence of only this category out of twenty categories of personal metadiscourse, as can be seen in Table 2 above, with a total value of 46.6% patently reveal the highly limited schematized cognitive pattern of self-display in Pakistani research discourses of social sciences. Moreover, the findings show that the writers of Education research articles employ maximum and the authors of History research articles use the minimum first-person pronoun *I*. It can be inferred from this difference that the academic writing norms of both the members of discourse communities are quite different from each other. And the members of the discourse community of Education appeared to believe in more self-display than the members of the English discourse community. And genre constraints on the writers of History research articles were found to be stricter regarding self-display through the employment of first-person singular pronoun i.e *I*.

4.2 Self-Display in Pakistani Research Discourse

As has been shown in the previous section, most of the metadiscourse functions, identified by Ädel (2006), of first-person pronouns are missing in the current investigation. For example, the writers of all the disciplines (Education, English, and

History) do not prefer focusing on language i.e *code* through the employment of the first-person pronoun *I*. Only one instance was found in Educations as can be seen below in (1).

1. *Accordingly, I can say an important factor that can affect the usefulness of CGW might be students' relation in the social.....*

Regarding focus on the *structure of the text*, very few examples of *introducing the topic* and *focusing* were found separately, however, we felt a need to make another category of *embedded introducing & focusing* based on the fused nature of the text performing discourse functions (See 2-4 below).

2. *Here, I will explain the concepts of nature, geometry, science and beauty with reference to the natural philosophy of Immanuel Kant (History)*
3. *Here, I am concerned with the intellectual exercise involving the establishment of various institutions in England, the appropriation of science (Education)*
4. *Here, I explore the ideas concerning nature, beauty, geometry and science incorporated in design pedagogy in England, which the colonial administrators (Education)*

In the above examples (2-4) the discourse marker *Here* clearly indicates the text-oriented function of *I*. whereas, the themes followed by *I will explain*, *I am concerned* and *I explore* seem to introduce the topic or main problem to be addressed. This pattern of employing first-person pronoun *I* reveals the implicit cognitive discourse strategy of the writers.

The participant-oriented discourse functions of the first-person pronoun *I* such as *Anticipating Reader's Interaction*, *Clarifying*, *Aligning Perspective*, *Imagining Scenarios*, *Hypothesizing about Reader*, *Appealing to the Reader* as proposed by Ädel (2006) were completely missing in the analysis of the current study. As there were 30 instances found in the current study which did not perform any of the participant-oriented functions proposed by Ädel, therefore, we propose three new metadiscourse functions of the first-person pronoun *I* which are *Contextualization of Writer/Researcher*, *Stance I*, and *Focus on the Study*.

The most dominant function found was the *contextualization of the writer/researcher* which according to us shows the writer's interest in projecting himself/herself as an objective entity (see 5-7 below). Furthermore, it also reveals the writers' schema of contextualizing themselves as direct doers in performing methodological procedures. This direct involvement of the writer/researcher in methodological procedures seems an effort to display his/her personae as a sound researcher. There were no examples of this contextualization in the research article of History which verifies that the discipline does not require methodological procedures as needed in the fields of Education and English particularly when the studies are experimental and survey-based.

5. *I examined the friends and non friends discourse. My analysis here builds on three episodes (Education)*

6. *I am informed that the most significant factor for transforming public sector schools is winning the trust of teachers. (Education)*
7. *For this, I take three examples from the larger data set first example is the pair work between two non-friend participants. (English)*

There were 6 occurrences only when the writers voiced their stance through first-person pronoun (see 8-9 below). This low use of *I* to convey stance suggests *situated prototypicality* of avoiding projection of self through first-person pronoun *I*. Moreover, this self-effacement may also leave the impression of the writer as an escapist while supporting your stance. This phenomenon also indicates the imposition of strong constraints of genre practitioners on the genre of a research article. The *stance I* was altogether absent in research articles on History and English; however, the community of remaining disciplines of Education appears to voice by using the first-person pronoun. Thus, both the quantitative and qualitative analysis reveals the relatively more authoritative attitude of the writers of Education towards their standpoints.

8. *I believe that inquiry based pedagogy include the entire element that make student teachers observer, thinker and examiner of science phenomena. (Education)*
9. *I think student teachers learn when they are given an insight to look at things themselves (Education)*

5. Conclusion

Quantification and qualitative investigation of the use of first-person pronoun *I* in 60 research articles from the disciplines of English, Education, and History written in the Pakistani context by Pakistani writers/researchers reveals *self-effacement* which perhaps is due to some academic writing norms grounded in local discourse community membership arena. The Ädel's (2006) framework was utilized and it was found that almost 23% of metafunctions of the first-person pronoun *I*, were performed accordingly. Whereas, some new metafunctions of *I* i.e *embedded introducing & focusing, a stance I, contextualization of the writer/researcher, and focusing on the study* were discovered which indicate different schema of cognitive patterns of self-display as proposed by Ädel (ibid). In sum, the following model (see Figure 2) of metatext emerges which is based on schematic cognitive patterns of the researchers from the disciplines of English, Education, and History. We suggest the employment of the following model (see Figure 2) for future investigations of other disciplines of social sciences, arts and humanities, and hard sciences in a local context to reveal a more generalizable pattern of self-display in research discourses in L 2 context.

Code: Focus on language	Defining
Text: Focus on Structure	Saying
	Introducing topic
	Focusing
	<i>Embedded Introducing & Focusing*</i>
	Concluding
	Reminding
	Exemplifying
	Adding
	Arguing
	Contextualizing
Participant: Focus on writer and/or reader of current text	Anticipating Reader's Interaction
	Clarifying
	Aligning Perspective
	Imagining Scenarios
	Hypothesizing about R
	Appealing to the Reader
	<i>Contextualization of Writer/Researcher*</i>
	<i>Stance I*</i>
	<i>Focus on the Study*</i>

Figure 2. Proposed Classification of Personal Metadiscourse: Metatext

* new added metadiscourse functions

References

- Abbas, A., Shehzad, W., & Ghalib, H. (2017 March-April). *MetaPak: an exclusive corpus tool for metadiscourse analysis*. Paper presented at Metadiscourse across Genres, North Cyprus.
- Ädel, A. (2006). *Metadiscourse in L1 and L2 English* (Vol. 24). John Benjamins Publishing.
- Becher, T. (1989). *Academic tribes and territories: Intellectual enquiry and the cultures of disciplines*. UK: The Society for Research into Higher Education and Open university press.
- Biber, D. (1995). *Dimensions of register variation: A cross-linguistic comparison*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Breeze, R. (2015). "Or so the government would have you believe": Uses of "you" in Guardian editorials. *Discourse, Context & Media*, 10, 36-44.
- Clark, R., & Ivanič, R. (1997). *The politics of writing*. Psychology Press.

- Deveci, T., & Nunn, R. (2014). Use of first-person plural pronoun to refer to single authors: Analyses of postgraduate theses. *Journal of English as an International Language*, 9(1), 1-16.
- Escalas, J. E. (2007). Self-referencing and persuasion: Narrative transportation versus analytical elaboration. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 33(4), 421-429.
- Gea-Valor, M. L. (2010). The emergence of the author's voice in book reviewing: a contrastive study of academic vs. non-academic discourse. In *Constructing interpersonality: multiple perspectives on written academic genres*, (pp. 117-137). Cambridge Scholars Publishing,
- Gibbons, J. (2014). *Language and the Law*. London: Routledge.
- Harwood, N. (2005a). 'Nowhere has anyone attempted... In this article, I aim to do just that': A corpus-based study of self-promotional I and we in academic writing across four disciplines. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37(8), 1207-1231.
- 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.
- Hyland, K. (2002a). Authority and invisibility: Authorial identity in academic writing. *Journal of pragmatics*, 34(8), 1091-1112.
- Hyland, K. (2002b). Options of identity in academic writing. *ELT Journal*, 56(4), 351-358.
- Hyland, K. (2004). *Disciplinary discourses, Michigan classics Ed.: Social interactions in academic writing*. Michigan: University of Michigan Press.
- Hyland, K. (2008). *As can be seen: Lexical Bundles and Disciplinary Variation English for Specific Purposes*. London: Routledge
- Hyland, K. (2010). Metadiscourse: Mapping interactions in academic writing. *Nordic Journal of English*. 9(2) 125-141
- Hyland, K., & Guinda, C. S. (Eds.). (2012). *Stance and voice in written academic genres*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hyland, K., & Jiang, F. K. (2017). Is academic writing becoming more informal?. *English for Specific Purposes*, 45, 40-51.
- Hyland, K. & Sancho G. (2012). *Stance and voice in written academic genres*. London: Palgrave.

- Ivanič, R. (1998). *Writing and identity: The discursual construction of identity in academic writing* (Vol. 5). John Benjamins.
- Karahan, P. (2012). Self-mention in scientific articles written by Turkish and non-Turkish authors. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 70, 305-322.
- Kuo, C. H. (1999). The use of personal pronouns: Role relationships in scientific journal articles. *English for specific purposes*, 18(2), 121-138.
- Lee, J. J., & Casal, J. E. (2014). Metadiscourse in results and discussion chapters: A cross-linguistic analysis of English and Spanish thesis writers in engineering. *System*, 46, 39-54.
- Matsuda, P. K. (2011, March). Conceptions of voice in writing assessment rubrics. In *American Association for Applied Linguistics Conference, Chicago, Ill.*
- Mauranen, A. (1993). Contrastive ESP rhetoric: Metatext in Finnish-English economics texts. *English for specific Purposes*, 12(1), 3-22.
- Paltridge, B. & Starfield, S. (2007). *Thesis and dissertation writing in second language*. UK. Routledge
- Petric, B. (2010) 'Students' conceptions of voice in academic writing.' In: Lorez-Sanz, Rosa, Mur-Duenas, Pilar, Lafuente-Millan, Enrique (eds.), *Constructing Interpersonality: Multiple Perspectives on Written Academic Genres*, (pp. 325-336). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Prior, P. (2001). Voices in text, mind, and society: Sociohistoric accounts of discourse acquisition and use. *Journal of second language writing*, 10(1), 55-81.
- Sato, S. (2014). "I think": Topic-marking in Spoken English Discourse. *Journal of English as an International Language*, 9(1), 56-77
- Sela, A., Wheeler, S. C., & Sarial-Abi, G. (2012). We are not the same as you and I: Causal effects of minor language variations on consumers' attitudes toward brands. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 39(3), 644-661.
- Shehzad, W. (2007). Explicit author in scientific discourse: A corpus-based study of the author's voice. *Malaysian Journal of ELT Research*, 3(1), 18.
- Skelton, J. R., Wearn, A. M. & Hobbs, F. D. R.. (2002). "I" and "we": A concordancing analysis of how doctors and patients use first person pronouns in primary care consultations. *Family Practice* 19(5), 484-8.
- Swales, J. M., & Feak, C. B. (2004). *Academic writing for graduate students: Essential tasks and skills* (Vol. 1). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

- Swales. J. M., & Feak, C. B. (2012). *Academic Writing for Graduate Students*. Cambridge: 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.
- Tardy, C. M. (2012). Current conceptions of voice. In *Stance and voice in written academic genres* (pp. 34-48). Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- Vis, K., Sanders, J., & Spooren, W. (2012). Diachronic changes in subjectivity and stance—A corpus linguistic study of Dutch news texts. *Discourse, Context & Media*, 1(2), 95-102.