

The Journal of Teaching Language Skills (JTLS)

5 (1), Spring 2013, Ser. 70/4

ISSN: 2008-8191. pp. 91-110

Stripped of Authorship or Projected Identity? Iranian Scholars' Presence in Research Articles

R. Rezvani*

Assistant Professor, TEFL

Yasouj University

email: rezvanireza@gmail.com

T. Mansouri

M.A., TEFL

Yasouj University

email: t.mansouri.rat@gmail.com

Abstract

Research Article (RA) genre has been a significant area of research in academic writing over past decades. However, authors' identity in RAs has not received much attention, especially in soft sciences like applied linguistics. This paper reports a corpus analysis of Iranian writers' authorial presence markers in RAs in the field of applied linguistics. The corpus comprised 30 RAs (200,000 words) from three peer-reviewed journals published in Iran. This study was carried out in two phases. Initially, the corpus was content-analysed for exclusive instances of authorial presence markers and then, frequency of each authorial indicator was calculated. Content analysis revealed various authorial markers used by Iranian scholars to manifest themselves in their writings, for instance, personal pronouns, self-citations, and other self-mention terms. Authorial markers varied in terms of frequency in single-authored and multiple-authored articles. Personal pronouns were found to be the most salient authorial markers. Furthermore, authors in the corpus employed authorial markers for different promotional purposes such as pursuing uniqueness in their studies and regarding themselves as prominent figures in the field. The results of this study underline the need for further research into the identities adopted by writers in their works and the whys and wherefores behind using particular identity markers rather than others. This study would be of benefit to academic writers and teachers of writing courses since it helps them discern the linguistic choices available to non-native speakers of English to manifest themselves in their writings and to gain acceptance in the discipline community.

Received: 9/15/2012

Accepted: 02/03/2013

* Corresponding author

Keywords: authorial identity markers, academic writing, personal pronouns, self-citation, self-mention terms, research article, iranian writers

1. Introduction

Genre analysis has represented remarkable theoretical and practical changes in educational and scholastic settings during the past twenty years. Scholars in the area of English for Specific Purposes have carried out a multitude of investigations on written genres to recognise and evaluate their structures. Corpus-based genre studies have witnessed extensive diversities both across dissimilar disciplines (Moore, 2002; Peacock, 2002) and across dissimilar genres in the same discipline (e.g. Isik Tas, 2008). Apart from corpus-based genre analysis, contrastive genre analysis studies demonstrated large variations across manuscripts written by professional and beginner writers specifically in terms of stylistic facets of academic writing such as authorial identity markers and references (Isik Tas, 2010). This movement has generated a considerable literature in English on a range of academic genres; including, for instance, abstracts, theses, term papers, dissertations, and research articles, among which the genre of research articles has been given considerable attention owing to "its importance for the circulation of academic knowledge" (Peacock, 2002, p. 480). In this regard, Swales (2004) asserts that an awareness of the genre specific characteristics of research articles is indispensable for acquiring acceptance into the community of a specific academic discipline.

Studies on research articles (RAs) are an increasingly important area in the field of genre analysis since research articles are one of the important types of academic writing (e.g. Peacock, 2002). Academic writing is not simply a linguistic practice but also a socio-political one (Casanave, 2003) - in which writers strive for acknowledgement in the community they write for. Therefore, academic writing involves indications of identity. In other words, writers do not merely narrate their findings or opinions devoid of personal, context-specific traces. They make use of the rhetorical sources agreed upon for writing in a specific genre and community. The choices an individual makes from among the alternatives, when attempting to convince or influence the readers, may indicate who he or she is.

Regarding the use of authorial identity markers, it was long held that academic writers distance themselves from their findings by not using personal pronouns. More recently, however, this view has been refuted based on an analysis of more recent corpuses (Harwood, 2005; Ivanic, 1998, among others). It is partly because catching the attention of the readership has become more challenging these days (Isik Tas, 2010). As a result, using personal pronouns as overt authorial identity markers has grown rapidly, to

the extent that authors are concerned about the degree to which they can cite themselves in their writings with the intention of making their presence evident to their target readers.

As regards the above-mentioned issues, many scholars have addressed authorial presence markers employed by academic writers. Ivanic (1998) defined *authorial self* or *authorial identity* as a tool for writers to present themselves in their writings; hence, claiming responsibility for the content and offering an indicator of their views. She has also widely discussed the ways authors signify themselves in their writings. She suggests that there exist four types of identities which act together in writing including *autobiographical identity*, *discoursal identity*, *authorial identity*, and *possibilities for self-hood*. More specifically, as she delineates, autobiographical identity is concerned with the writer's life history; discoursal identity denotes the voice that authors project in their writings; authorial identity manifests the degree to which authors introduce their authorial presence in their works; and possibilities for self-hood relates to the fact that authors build an identity within an array of possibilities offered by their social context.

At the heart of our understanding of authorial identity markers lies the issue that by what means authors project themselves in their works. In academic writings, authorial identity can be demonstrated by using numerous linguistic markers including, for example, personal pronouns and metadiscourse indicators. Personal pronouns have a fundamental role in helping authors to communicate with their addressees and to build their authorial self. Outcomes of investigations analysing beginner and professional authors' use of first-person pronouns have indicated that professional authors frequently employ first-person pronouns for stimulating their works (see for example Isik Tas, 2010). Beginner writers, however, either do not opt for personal pronouns or exploit them for purposes hardly used by professional writers (Isik Tas, 2010).

It was said earlier that different kinds of presence markers (for instance, personal pronouns and meta-discourse indicators) enable authors to form a proper authorial identity and to present themselves as competent and original members of their discourse communities. The most evident and explicit authorial indicators are first person pronouns (*I, me, we, us*) and their possessives (*my, our*). The review of literature on the existence of first person pronouns in academic texts has revealed that personal pronouns are present in academic writings and that they are well-known as an influential source for building an authorial identity by means of their manifestations in different functions (Kuo, 1999; Tang & John, 1999). A number of these writers, predominantly Tang and John (1999), and Hyland (2001) have

underscored the significance of first person pronouns in building the author's identity, since first person pronouns uncover the way in which authors situate themselves in academic communities. They argue that first person pronouns support the construction of the author's identity by highlighting the author's contributions while conveying implications of authority. Tang and John (1999) overtly support this view adding that languages do not function only as a tool to show a self that individuals already have, but function as a source for building that self.

As Kuo (1999) asserts, authorial markers are utilized to perform a diverse range of functions. Likewise, several corpus-based investigations have demonstrated that *I* and *we* can be used for an array of functions in academic texts (e.g. Hyland, 2001, 2002b; Martí nez, 2005; Tang & John, 1999; Vassileva, 1998). These studies have illustrated that first person personal pronouns and possessive adjectives are used to acknowledge those individuals who contributed to the research study (Harwood, 2005), create a tenor of uniqueness for the researcher's writing (Harwood, 2005), describe methodology (Hyland, 2001), affirm their goal (Hyland, 2002b), share knowledge claims (Hyland, 2002b), help authors unify their writings and make their structure more organized to follow (Lafuente Millán, 2010), and express individual views (Tang & John, 1999). Over and above, first person personal pronouns and other identity markers are employed to construct the writers' identities in relation with their audiences and as a member of discourse community (Kuo, 1999).

Different taxonomies and typologies have also been proposed for classifying authorial markers into the different functions they present. For instance, Hyland (2002a) established a typology consisting of five discourse functions for identity markers in research papers, including stating a goal, claiming self-advantages, clarifying a process, explaining a dispute or an argument, and describing results or claims. Tang and John (1999) have also proposed a typology of six different authorial roles regarding personal pronouns in academic texts. Both Hyland (2002a) and Tang and John (1999) recognized that some functions like stating a goal and clarifying a procedure require a smaller degree of personal contact, whereas other categories include a greater degree of authorial manifestation.

Another obvious way researchers opt to demonstrate that they are worthy of being taken seriously is referring to their earlier studies through self-citation. In fact, Hyland (2001) discerned that self-citation occurred about 60% of all instances of authorial presence markers in multidisciplinary corpus he analysed. It is noteworthy that when scholars mentioned themselves in their texts, they were mostly discussing their own former studies.

As another line of investigation, scholars have elaborated on first person pronouns across diverse disciplines (e.g. Harwood, 2005; Hyland, 2001) and across writings by both native and non-native English speakers (e.g. Hyland, 2002a; Martínez, 2005). The way authors mark their authorial identity may alter according to the communal and epistemological norms of their respective disciplines (Hyland, 2002a, 2002b). It has further been illustrated by Hyland (2001) that self-reference markers exist more frequently in research articles belonging to the soft disciplines (e.g. social sciences) than the hard ones. He argues that in hard sciences, academic writers normally undervalue their individual role in their papers and instead focus on the phenomenon under study. He also maintains that using a reasonable degree of authorial identity markers establishes a key tactic to indicate attachment to a certain community of practice. Furthermore, by employing the norms of their communities, authors can acknowledge themselves as experienced and knowledgeable affiliates and, thus can obtain great credibility.

Concerning discipline diversity, Slocombe (2011), for instance, analysed a collection of essays taken from a university ESP Academic Writing Course. The essays were mainly in the humanities and social sciences disciplines. It was revealed that a predictable pattern exists to the occurrence and meaning of authorial presence markers in academic texts both across and within particular disciplines. Molino (2010) investigated the differences between English and Italian research articles in the field of linguistics and it was found that personal forms of references are less common in Italian linguistics RAs, whereas impersonal forms of references exist at the same rate in both English and Italian RAs. What emerged additionally from Molino's study was that some differences exist in accordance with the discourse functions implied by the use of identity markers in the writings of natives and non-natives. More specifically, impersonal forms of identity markers were more common in Italian texts for certain uses like referring back to the writing, whereas impersonal forms were more frequently used in English in cases like demonstrating one's data.

As mentioned above, a significant number of studies have been done on the multicultural and cross-cultural authorial identity mentions in different genres (e.g. Breivega, Dahl, & Flbøttum, 2002; Sheldon, 2009; Vassileva, 2000). It was generally shown that authorial identity markers vary across different cultures regarding both the rate of recurrence and variety of usages. Hence, personal authorial markers can be investigated to reveal ethnic identity references in academic texts of different nations and languages. Iranian writers, likewise, as an ethnic group have their own distinct cultural and linguistic norms projected, one way or another, in their academic

discourses (both written and spoken). Only a paucity of research related to the genre of RAs has been carried out by Iranian researchers (e.g. Habibi, 2008; Jalilifar, 2010) and notoriously none of them was on authorial identity markers employed by Iranian writers. While it is strongly held that self-manifestation is central for non-native authors who prepare research papers for publication (Harwood, 2005; Hyland, 2002a), unfortunately, no investigation into the use of authorial markers by Iranian researchers has thus far been carried out to see whether or not it holds true for Iranian writers. Therefore, this paper, as the first of its kind, attempted to explore Iranian writers' authorial presence markers in Iranian published research articles.

2. Method

2.1 Corpus

The corpus of the study consisted of 30 research articles written in English by Iranian writers sampled from 3 scholarly journals in the field of Applied Linguistics published in Iran. All scholarly applied linguistics journals were identified first (N=15) through the website www.sid.ir and then three of them (*The Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics (IJAL)*, *The Journal of Teaching Language Skills (JTLS)*, *Journal of English Language and Literature Society of Iran (TELL)*) were selected on a random basis. That is, 10 articles (five multiple-authored and five single-authored articles) from each journal were selected through simple random sampling. As time period might have an impact on the choice of the authorial markers (Isik Tas, 2010), only articles published from 2005-2010 were selected. As it is commonly practiced, the abstracts, footnotes, endnotes, tables, and reference lists of the articles were deleted. The electronic corpus included approximately 200,000 words. It should be noted that the texts were available online at the moment of the corpus construction, except for 10 articles that were scanned for digitalization.

2.2 Data Analysis

This study was carried out in two phases. In the first phase, all the texts were content-analysed and all instances of authorial markers including personal pronouns, self-citations, and other self-mention terms were extracted. Then, the corpus was analysed a second time using WordPilot 2000 software in order to calculate the frequency of each authorial marker. Percentages were determined in relation to different kinds of authorial markers and different types of articles (multiple-authored vs. single-authored). It should be noted that all instances of identity markers were examined in the context of papers in order to make sure that they referred to the authors of the papers (known

as exclusive identity markers) and not to anyone else. In agreement with Hyland (2005b), inclusive identity markers, performing as "engagement markers", are interpreted as satisfying a very different rhetorical function from exclusive ones and should be accordingly omitted. Therefore, in the present study, all the occurrences of inclusive pronouns (e.g. *I*, *We*) and inclusive possessive adjectives (e.g. *Our*, *My*) along with those involved in quotations or examples were excluded since they do not directly refer to the authors of papers (Lafuente Millán, 2010). In order to increase and ensure the intra-rater reliability of the analyses, one of the current researchers examined the corpus for a second time after a three-week interval and then Phi coefficient of correlation was calculated. The correlation was 0.95, indicative of a robust relationship between the two codings. To insure the inter-rater reliability, 10 per cent of the corpus was randomly selected and the researchers and an assistant (holding an M.A. in Applied Linguistics) with knowledge in conducting corpus-based study, independently coded it. The comparisons between the assistant's coding and that of the main researchers revealed a Phi coefficient correlation of 0.92, which is quite high.

3 Findings and Discussion

3.1 Forms and frequencies of authorial presence markers

Overall, there were 234 cases of authorial markers. Multiple-authored articles were found to include a larger number of identity markers than single-authored ones (56.8% vs. 43.1%, respectively) (see Table 1).

Table 1. Frequency and percentage¹ of different kinds of authorial identity markers

Type	Total frequency & percentage	Frequency and percentage in single-authored articles	Frequency and percentage in multiple-authored articles
Personal Pronouns ²			
First person plural	95 40.5%	24 23.7%	71 53.3%
First person singular	28	28	0

¹ In showing percentage figures in tables, the first decimal were rounded.

² All papers in the corpus comprised at least one first person pronoun.

	11.9%	27.7%	0%
Third person	10 4.2%	8 7.9%	2 1.5%
Self-citation	12 5.1%	8 7.9%	4 3%
Other self-mention terms	89 38%	33 32.6%	56 42.1%
Total	234 100%	101 43.1%	133 56.8%

Table 1, which presents the frequencies and percentages for each type of authorial marker, clearly supports the idea that though academic writing was regarded earlier as a wholly faceless prose (Lester, 1993), a considerable number of research conducted over the last decade (Ivanic, 1998; Hyland, 2001; Harwood, 2005) show that it is not essential for academic texts to be free from an authors' identity. There are abundant instances of author-reference to propose that authors have obvious promotional and interactional aims. In what follows, we will elaborate on the different types of authorial presence markers found in the corpus. Furthermore, differences between single-authored articles and multiple-authored articles as far as the use of authorial markers is concerned will be described.

3.2 Personal pronouns

Findings regarding personal pronouns are completely in line with those of Harwood (2005) and Hyland (2001). Personal pronouns were the most salient authorial markers in the texts constituting 56.6% of the whole occurrences. Three types of pronouns were discerned in the analysis: first person singular pronouns, first person plural pronouns, and third person pronouns (see Table 1). As a whole, first-person plurals (*we*, *our*, *us*) were the most commonly used pronouns (77%). First-person singular pronouns were the second most frequent type of pronouns (27.7%) and third-person pronouns were the least frequent (only 9.4%). A comparison of first person singular pronouns and plural ones indicated that first person plurals were the largest category of authorial markers in the whole corpus while first person singulars were the third most frequent group of authorial presence markers (see Table 1).

Tables 2 and 3 present the frequencies and percentages for each type of personal pronouns in single-authored and multiple-authored papers. These tables further classify personal pronouns according to their positions in the sentence: subject position, possessive position, and object position. As it is evident in Table 3, first person singular is non-existent in multiple-authored

articles as it is logically expected; however, first-person plurals were used in papers with single authors abundantly. 23.7% out of the whole 43.1% authorial markers occurring in single-authored papers were first-person plural pronouns. This could be due to three main reasons: First, the choice of using *we* in articles with single author is commonly believed to show the intent to lessen the degree of personal credits, though it is not always supposed to be a self-effacing marker (Pennycook, 1994). Another reason behind using first-person plurals in single-authored texts might be the separation effect conveyed by using plurals as they produce a short-term dominance by providing authors a right to declare themselves with authority (Hyland, 2001). The last but not the least important reason is that in Persian, it is common for an individual to refer to himself/herself as (*we* (/ma:/ ما)).

Table 2. Frequency of personal pronouns in single-authored articles

Single-authored articles	Instances of subject position	Instances of possessive position	Instances of object position	Total
First person singular	I: 13 46.4%	My: 12 42.8%	Me: 3 28%	28 27.7%
First person plural	We: 17 70.8%	Our: 5 20.8%	Us: 2 8.3%	24 23.7%
Third person pronoun	She/he: 5 62.5%	Her/his: 1 12.5%	Herself/himself: 2 25%	8 7.9%

Table 3. Frequency of personal pronouns in multiple-authored articles

Multiple-authored articles	Instances of subject position	Instances of possessive position	Instances of object position	Total
First person singular	I: 0 0.0%	My: 0 0.0%	Me: 0 0.0%	0 0.0%
First person plural	We: 55 77.4%	Our: 11 15.4%	Us: 5 7.04%	71 53.3%
Third person pronoun	She/he: 2 100%	Her/his: 0 0.0%	Herself/himself: 0 0.0%	2 1.5%

Concerning the position of personal pronouns in sentences, it is interesting to note that a large number of personal pronouns occurred in subject position (69.1%). In English, personal subject pronouns are crucial to recognize the agent of a certain process (Molino, 2010). Several researchers considered personal subject pronouns as extreme forms writers

use to make their role as authors prominent (Clark & Ivanic, 1997; Molino, 2010; Vergaro, 2011). Thus, it might be argued that Iranian researchers utilize this authorial marker to enhance their role as authors. Personal pronouns were also discerned in non-subject positions in the sentences, including possessive position (21.8%) and object position (9.02%). Employing these two last positions, authors take a less self-threatening and prominent role than they take when mentioning themselves by using pronouns in subject position as argued by Molino (2010).

In the following example, an attempt is made to exemplify as to how the author preferred to use first-person plurals instead of singular *I* and *my* in order to distance the limitations of his study from himself:

1 *{In this paper, **we** will limit **our** study comparing all the data with the initial data (JTLS, S3).}*

The example below also illustrates the authority-giving effect of *we* as suggested by Pennycook (1994):

2 *{Having explained the nature of desire, **we** can strongly suggest how Lacan deconstructs Eros (TELL, S5).}*

When first-person singular pronouns are used, it seems that they are intended mostly to express personal experiences or opinions; for instance,

3 *{Moreover, **I** found the Michigan Test not so difficult for the Iranian students (TELL, S4).}*

4 *{**I** remember once on a metro train two kids (one about 3 and the other around 8 years old) were next to **me** with a sheet of glass, framed in a metal bar, between **us**. While they were pushing their fingers through the narrow gap between the glass and the frame, **I** reached out **my** hand to touch theirs (TELL, S3).}*

Besides the first-person subjective pronoun, the possessive pronouns are likewise exploited to uphold the authors' contribution by linking them thoroughly with their writings. These structures functionally stress the writer's close participation in the investigation results or activities as illustrated by the following example:

5 *{For the purpose of **our** analysis, the frequency of occurrence of each move ... (IJAL, S1).}*

6 *{A tape recorder was used in **my** class playing the recited poem for the students while the students listened and followed along the text (TELL, S2).}*

Among the different positions that pronouns took, the first four positions that occurred most frequently were, respectively, subject position *we* (72), possessive position *our* (16), subject position *I* (13), and possessive position *my* (12).

Concerning third-person pronouns, only a negligible number of them (10 cases) were found in the corpus. All studies conducted so far have

focused on first-person pronouns (e.g. Hyland, 2001; Luzo'n, 2009; Tang & John, 1999, just to name a few) but the current study illustrated that writers might have a tendency to declare themselves in third person. The following example exemplifies the case where the writer refers to himself in third person:

7 {He also reported that gender did not have any role for the existing differences between ... (IJAL, M5).}

As regards what went above, the results of the current study are congruent with those of Harwood (2005), supporting the postulation that personal pronouns in academic texts are commonly the most obvious indicator of authorial presence. All in all, it can be noted that a degree of difference is present between single-authored and multiple-authored articles in the ways personal pronouns and possessives are employed as depicted in the literature (see for example Lafuente Millán, 2010). Further, similar to Lafuente Millán (2010) and Hyland (2002a), some single authors preferred to use exclusively plural pronouns and possessives rather than singular ones when referring to themselves or their writings. The following example illustrates this point:

8 {For the purpose of our analysis, the frequency of occurrence of each move and its constituent steps were tallied and summed (IJAL, S2).}

3.3 Other self-mention terms

Isik Tas (2008) in his examination of a corpus of Ph.D. dissertations and research articles found that some writers referred to themselves with terms other than personal pronouns like "this author". In the analysis of the present corpus, similar results were reached. Researchers used various terms to refer to themselves in their writings and to heighten the significance of their findings. Writers holding Ph.D. degrees in Hyland's (2010) study also used self-mention terms abundantly but when they were interviewed, they considered self-mentions as inadequate for beginner writers because beginner writers were not involved enough in academic writing to have a voice!

In the present corpus, self-mention terms were the second large category of author presence markers comprising 38% of the total markers. In this category, similar to personal pronouns category, multiple-authored articles outnumbered the single-authored ones by 1.6%. Sixty-three per cent of all the self-mention terms appeared in the multiple-authored papers while 38% of them occurred in single-authored writings. In Table 4, different terms used to refer to authors of the articles are presented with their respective percentages.

All cases of self-mentions were more numerous in multiple-authored papers than in single-authored ones (see Table 4). As it is apparent, the most common word used is *researcher*, comprising 61.1% of the whole self-mention words. The following examples illustrate how self-mentioning term *researcher* was employed in the papers.

9 {Three teachers out of all ten teachers of the program and **the researcher** had a session to discuss the weak and strong points of the e-Learning program (JTLS, M4).}

10 {Many of the in-house journals, to **the present researchers'** knowledge, are extremely fastidious and they regard non-citations as unacceptable and unconventional (JTLS, M3).}

Table 4. Frequency and percentage of different terms of self-mentions in articles

Self-mention terms	Total frequencies & percentages for each case	F. in Single-Authored Articles	F. in Multiple-Authored Articles
Researcher	55 61.1%	23	32
One	20 22.4%	9	11
Rater	7 7.8%	1	6
Author	4 4.4%	0	4
Investigator	1 1.1%	0	1
Designer	1 1.1%	0	1
Their	1 1.1%	0	1

Possibly for more than any other purposes, using this word proposes the conscious utilization of a strategy to make readers attentive of the author's role, that is his or her challenge to become a known member of his or her community of practice and to strive for acknowledgement in that community as a credible *researcher*.

The second most salient term was *one* comprising 22.4% of the self-mention terms. By examining all the instances of this word, a pattern emerged gradually. Academic writers used this word whenever they did tend to distance themselves from their findings or to express a generally accepted belief that they could not or did not want to support. Since this term has an essentially passive nature and does not directly refer to anything or anyone,

then writers felt safer to use it more freely. The examples below illustrate some of the uses of the term *one*:

11 *{Based on the results of this study, one may conclude that knowledge of semantics of a verb does not ... (IJAL, S5).}*

12 *{To prove this idea, first, one requires discussing the location of definiteness in Persian (JTLS, M2).}*

Other self-mention terms (*rater, author, investigator, designer, their*) did not amount to much. They comprised only 14% of the cases in total. This indicates that Iranian writers did not intend to diversify the terms creatively. They preferred to opt for a limited range of choices though the rest of the terms are equally accorded approval and normality.

3.4 Self-citation

The third category emerging from the analysis was self-citation that constituted only 5.1% of the total number of the authorial presence markers. It is noteworthy that as regards this category, single-authored articles outnumbered the multiple-authored papers by 2.6% (see Table 1). In fact, one of the most noticeable ways through which investigators can demonstrate that they are worthy of being taken seriously, is by referring, through self-citation, to their own former studies. In Hyland's (2001) multidisciplinary corpus self-citations made up around 60% of all types of authorial indicators. Thus, self-citations are regarded as powerful promotional devices for a writer (Harwood, 2005); however, self-citations were the smallest category in the current study. It seems that the writers, as far as this corpus is concerned, were not confident enough to project themselves through self-citations referring to their own works in their new writings. It might also be due to the possibility that the papers written by the researchers in the corpus were their first paper to be published (or at least the first on the subject under study). Thus, there might have been no room to cite themselves. The following extracts exemplify self-citations in the corpus:

13 *{Riahi³ and Maleki (2004) performed a piece of descriptive, qualitative research and concluded that students who... (IJAL, M5).}*

14 *{Jamshidi (1382/2003) conducted a case study using instrumental method on acoustic features of /bæle/. He found a relation between different beliefs and emotions as paralinguistic information and prosodic keys of duration, pitch level and pitch pattern and amplitude (JTLS, S3).}*

15 *{The data used for the present study are taken from a larger database audio-recorded and transcribed over a period extending from July to*

³ For the sake of confidentiality, the real names of the authors in the examples were changed to fictitious names.

October 2001 (for the detailed description of the data-base see Rasouli 2003) (IJAL, S1).}

An in-depth analysis of the self-mentions further revealed that the researchers mention their own work near the opening of the research articles and in the literature review to promote their authorship (see examples 13 & 14). Besides, in the above example (see example 14), the promotional effect intended by combining the pronoun and self-citation seems to function on at least two levels. On the one hand, if the readers of the article are new to Jamshidi's writings, their consciousness will be elevated to the same writer's other works. On another hand, Jamshidi is establishing that he is a reputable actor on the scene, with several published works by now in his hands. Harwood (2005) reported the same findings regarding the use of pronouns in combination with self-citations. As highlighted earlier, the promotional effect achieved by self-citation cannot be overlooked. Research, however, is lacking in the area of self-referencing or self-citing. Although the most obvious authorial identity markers investigated in the literature are personal pronouns and their possessives, Harwood (2005) suggested that writers be mindful of other rhetorical and stylistic choices, which would allow them to demonstrate an authorial self that would fulfil the requirements of the academic community. Therefore, concerning self-citation, further research is necessary so as to elucidate more clearly the path academic writers go through in using this stylistic device.

4. Conclusions and Implications

There are a multitude of strategies and linguistic markers at hand for the researchers to claim authority in their works. Different academic writers may opt for different sets of options at their disposal. The choices and why they are made have been a focus of attention in the literature. This paper likewise attempted to probe the Iranian researchers' use of authorial identity markers as a new area of research. The analysis of the present corpus revealed that Iranian researchers are not in sharp contrast to other researchers of the world in their use of authorial markers. Three categories of authorial presence markers were discerned in the current corpus analysis: personal pronouns, self-citations, and other self-mention terms. It was shown that authorial identity markers were not only stylistic options for writers but also self-promotional devices to help academic writers obtain an authorial voice.

The results of this investigation might be of value for those non-native writers seeking a strong authorial voice in their writings by raising their consciousness of various linguistic choices available to them when manifesting themselves in their writings. After all, this manifestation of self

is a significant technique of constructing a person's individual voice, of talking with power and authority, and of obtaining readers' support. Authorial presence markers are the main tools used to uphold a researcher's contribution to his or her academic community; therefore, Iranian researchers can acquire a place in their desired community of practice by using this rhetorical device.

Finally, the implication at this point for EFL (English as a Foreign Language) instructors is that one should be attentive of how exactly conventions of the academia lead learners towards adopting a particular authorial voice rather than others. Teachers of writing courses should also be sensitive to the problems that their student-writers face. Thus, EFL instructors have a main consciousness-raising mission to make sure learners and scholars are aware of the stylistic and rhetorical choices open to them and ensure that they completely know the consequences of using these choices for interactional intentions. This awareness and knowledge helps scholars and students become more capable of gaining control over their writings and achieving credibility in the scholarly community.

References

- Breivega, K. R., Dahl, T., & Fløttum, K. (2002). Traces of self and others in research articles. A comparative pilot study of English, French and Norwegian research articles in medicine, economics and linguistics. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 12 (2), 218-239.
- Casanave, C. P. (2003). Looking ahead to more sociopolitically-oriented case study research in L2 writing scholarship (But should it be called "post-process"?). *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12, 85-102.
- Clark, R., & Ivanic, R. (1997). *The politics of writing*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Harwood, N. (2005). 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, 1207-1231.
- Hyland, K. (2001). Humble servants of the discipline? Self-mention in research articles. *English for Specific Purposes*, 20, 207-226.
- Hyland, K. (2002a). Authority and invisibility: Authorial identity in academic writing. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34, 1091-1112.
- Hyland, K. (2002b). Options of identity in academic writing. *ELT Journal*, 56, 351-358.
- Hyland, K. (2010). Metadiscourse: Mapping interactions in academic writing. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 9 (2), 125-143.

- Isik Tas, E. E. (2008). *A corpus-based analysis of genre-specific discourse of research: The research article and the PhD thesis in ELT* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Middle East Technical University, Ankara.
- Isik Tas, E. E. (2010). Telling ELT tales out of school “*In this paper I will discuss...*”: Current trends in academic writing. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 3, 121-126. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.07.022
- Ivanic, R. (1998). *Writing and identity: The discursive construction of identity in academic writing*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Kuo, C. H. (1999). The use of personal pronouns: Role relationships in scientific journal articles. *English for Special Purposes*, 18 (2), 121-138.
- Lafuente Millán, E. (2010). ‘*Extending this claim, we propose...*’ The writer’s presence in research articles from different disciplines. *Ibérica*, 20, 35-56.
- Lester, J. D. (1993). *Writing research papers* (7th Ed.). New York: Harper Collins.
- Luzo’n, M. J. (2009). The use of *we* in a learner corpus of reports written by EFL Engineering students. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 8, 192-206. doi:10.1016/j.jeap.2009.04.001
- 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, 174-190. doi: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.
- Moore, T. (2002). Knowledge and agency: A study of “metaphenomenal discourse” in textbooks from three disciplines. *English for Specific Purposes*, 21, 347-366.
- Peacock, M. (2002). Communicative moves in the discussion section of research articles. *System*, 30 (4), 479-497.
- Pennycook, A. (1994). The complex contexts of plagiarism: A reply to Deckert. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 3 (3), 277-284.
- 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, 251-265. doi:10.1016/j.esp.2009.05.001
- Slocombe, J. (2011). Academic style, authorial identity and material design: An analysis of instructional model essays on an ESP academic writing course. *UGRU Journal*, 9, 1-11.

- Swales, J. M. (2004). *Research genres: Exploration and applications*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tang, R., & John, S. (1999). The "I" in identity: Exploring identity in student academic writing through the first person pronoun. *English for Specific Purposes*, 18 (Supplement 1): S23-S39.
- 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), 163-190.
- Vassileva, I. (2000). *Who is the author? A comparative analysis of authorial presence in English, German, French, Russian and Bulgarian academic discourse*. Sankt Augustin: Asgard Verlag.



Appendix A. Corpus contents
The Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics (IJAL)

Single-Authored Articles

1. Anani Sarab, M. R. (2008). 'Task-as-Workplan' and 'Task-as-Process': Reappraising the role of the teacher in task implementation. *Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 11 (2), 23-47.
2. Habibi, P. (2008). Genre analysis of research article introductions across ESP, psycholinguistics, and sociolinguistics. *Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 11 (2), 87-111.
3. Farjami, H. (2007). Picture production and picture perception: Comparing two modes of practicing concrete vocabulary. *Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10 (1), 1-14.
4. Sadeghi, K. (2008). Measuring reading comprehension: The judgmental validity of cloze procedure. *Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 11 (2), 115-130.
5. Marefat, H. (2006). The interface of syntax and semantics in L2. *Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 9 (1), 17-37.

Multiple-Authored Articles

1. Abbasian, F., & Tahririan, M. H. (2008). The discursal and formal analysis of e-mails: A cross disciplinary genre analysis. *Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 11 (2), 1-20.
2. Keshavarz, M. H., & Ashtarian, S. (2008). The relationship between Iranian EFL learners' gender and reading comprehension of three different types of text. *Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 11 (1), 97-113.
3. Rahimi, M., Amal Saleh, E., & Saadat, M. (2008). A discursive representation of the winner and loser: The case of sports reports. *Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 11 (1), 115-140.
4. Farhady, H., & Hessamy, Gh. R. (2005). Construct validity of L2 reading comprehension skills. *Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 8 (2), 29-53.
5. Riazi, A., Sadighi, F., & Zare, S. (2005). The effect of EFL students' L2 proficiency and age on their overall pattern of vocabulary learning strategy use. *Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 8 (2), 87-106.

The Journal of Teaching Language Skills (JTLS)
(Previously *Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities*)

Single-Authored Articles

1. Payandeh, H. (2009). Teaching literary criticism to Iranian university students: Some cultural obstacles. *The Journal of Teaching Language Skills*, 1 (1), 37-48.
2. Gorgan Roodi, G. S. (2009). Lord Byron's allusions to Persia. *The Journal of Teaching Language Skills*, 1 (1), 61-73.
3. Alinezhad, B. (2010). A study of the relationship between acoustic features of "bæle" and the paralinguistic information. *The Journal of Teaching Language Skills*, 2 (1), 1-25.
4. Jalilifar, A. (2010). Research article introductions: Sub-disciplinary variations in applied linguistics. *The Journal of Teaching Language Skills*, 2 (2), 29-55.
5. Rahimi, M. (2010). Iranian EFL students' perceptions and preferences for teachers' written feedback: Do students' ideas reflect teachers' practice?. *The Journal of Teaching Language Skills*, 2 (2), 75-98.

Multiple-Authored Articles

1. Pirnajmuddin, H., & Shahpoori Arani, F. (2010). Pygmalion in conversation with Pierre Bourdieu: A sociological perspective. *The Journal of Teaching Language Skills*, 2 (2), 57-73.
2. Rezai, M. J., & Jabbari, A. A. (2010). The acquisition of definiteness feature by Persian L2 learners of English. *The Journal of Teaching Language Skills*, 2 (2), 123-154.
3. Shooshtari, Z. G., & Jalilifar, A. R. (2010). Citation and the construction of subdisciplinary knowledge. *The Journal of Teaching Language Skills*, 2 (1), 45-66.
4. Bagheri, M. S., Yamini, M., & Riazi, A. (2009). Motivational and learning strategies of Iranian EFL learners exposed to an e-learning program. *The Journal of Teaching Language Skills*, 1 (1), 1-35.
5. Pourgiv, F., Ghasemi, P., & Hashemi, M. (2009). Paranoia vs. anti-paranoia in Gravity's Rainbow. *The Journal of Teaching Language Skills*, 1 (1), 49-60.

Journal of English Language and Literature Society of Iran (TELL)

Single-Authored Articles

1. Abbasian, Gh. R. (2009). ELT educational context, teacher intuition and learner hidden agenda (a study of conflicting maxims). *Journal of English Language and Literature Society of Iran*, 3 (9), 65-97.
2. Moradan, A. (2006). The miraculous power of poetry as a language teaching device in EFL classes. *Journal of English Language and Literature Society of Iran*, 1 (1), 105-123.
3. Makoui, M. (2007). The element of fear in Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone. *Journal of English Language and Literature Society of Iran*, 1 (3), 109-118.
4. Rezaee, A. A. (2006). University students' test-taking strategies and their language proficiency. *Journal of English Language and Literature Society of Iran*, 1 (1), 157-186.
5. Ahmadzadeh, Sh. (2007). The study of desire: A Lacanian perspective. *Journal of English Language and Literature Society of Iran*, 1 (2), 133-143.

Multiple-Authored Articles

1. Akbari, R., Ghafar Samar, R., & Tajik, L. (2010). Developing a classroom observation instrument based on Iranian EFL teachers' attitude. *Journal of English Language and Literature Society of Iran*, 3 (10), 1-20.
2. Mirhassani, S. A., & Fatahipour, M. (2008). Improving productive vocabulary knowledge through writing. *Journal of English Language and Literature Society of Iran*, 2 (8), 1-21.
3. Jahangiri Aghdam, K., & Jabbari, A. A. (2007). Fossilization in inflectional morphemes by Persian learners of English. *Journal of English Language and Literature Society of Iran*, 1 (4), 29-49.
4. Soodmand Afshar, H., Ketabi, S., & Tavakoli, M. (2010). An investigation into good and poor Iranian EFL majors' vocabulary learning strategies. *Journal of English Language and Literature Society of Iran*, 3 (10), 45-74.
5. Fallahi Moghimi, M., & Mobasher, A. (2007). Genre analysis of introduction section of English and Persian articles in Mechanics. *Journal of English Language and Literature Society of Iran*, 1 (2), 59-73.