# First-Person Pronouns as Authorial Presence in Research Articles: A Cross-Linguistic Study of English and Indonesian

Tsabita Intan Tsaqifa*, Shafira Rahmasari
Universitas Gadjah Mada, Indonesia

*Corresponding Author: tsabita.i.t@mail.ugm.ac.id

## ABSTRACT

This paper is a corpus-based study that attempts to examine how first-person pronouns are used in English research articles in comparison to Indonesian research articles in the field of linguistics since Indonesian writers tend to avoid the use of first-person pronouns in academic writing. This study intends to identify the types of first-person pronouns used to express authorial presence in English and Indonesian research articles. It also explores the discourse functions of first-person pronouns that serve in English and Indonesian research articles. The source of the data consists of 40 research articles that are collected from reputable journals and analyzed using *AntConc*. This study employs the categorization of discourse functions proposed by Hyland (2002). The results show that *I*, *my*, *me*, *we*, *our*, *us*, and *the author(s)* are employed by the English authors and *kami*, *penulis*, and *peneliti* are used by the Indonesian authors. The pronoun *we* is the most frequently used by both English and Indonesian authors. The English authors tend to use the pronoun *I* rather than the Indonesian authors. The Indonesian authors hide themselves in the phrases of *the author(s)* and *the researcher(s)*. In addition, the results also identify that these first-person pronouns serve discourse functions in research articles.

**Keywords**: *academic writing, authorial presence, discourse functions, first-person pronouns, research articles*.

## INTRODUCTION

Academic writing has developed through many years of history. The history of academic writing spans many years. In the manner that science and knowledge have always progressed, this is inseparable from the contribution of research carried out in a particular area of study. Early academic writing started from letters that scientists sent to each other. Therefore, the first-person narrative was used (Kuo, 1999). Although it has been shown that self-representation was employed in early academic writing, some individuals did not consider it a well-known concept.

First-person pronouns are closely related to the authorial presence, where it has been used to refer to linguistic features that present the existence of the writer in the text (Dontcheva-Navrátilová, 2013; Hartwell & Jacques, 2014; Munoz, 2013; Poudat & Loiseau, 2005). Authorial presence has also been considered another interaction practice between the writer and the reader (Hyland, 2004, 2005, 2008). This perspective demonstrates that academic writing entails the use of language to acknowledge,

construct, and negotiate social relations in addition to representing an external reality (Hyland, 2005). In addition, the use of the first-person pronouns was used as a device to show self-representation in academic text, in which it is crucial for the author to promote a competent scholarly identity and gain accreditation for research claims (Hyland, 2001).

It is interesting to study the authorial presence in academic writing since it often suggests opposing viewpoints, particularly in academic writing in English and Indonesian. Thus, this study was worth conducting to fill the gap between the previous studies in comparing English research articles and Indonesian research articles. Therefore, this study applied Hyland (2002) to answer the following questions:

1. What are the types and the discourse function of first-person pronouns used to express authorial presence in English and Indonesian research articles?

2. How are first-person pronouns used in English research articles compared to Indonesian research articles in linguistics?

3. What factors contribute to the difference between the English and Indonesian research articles?

## LITERATURE REVIEW

Scholars have studied authorial presence in academic writing utilizing corpus to assist the analysis. Hyland has conducted studies scrutinizing authorial presence in academic writing producing several results showing the function and positions of the writer. Li (2021) scrutinized the authorial presence in the research abstract from four applied linguistics journals to see the changes from 1990 to 2019 and to identify the changes based on the discourse function of first-person pronouns proposed by Hyland. It showed that low-stakes functions (organizing text and describing methods) were more common and varied over time in co-authored abstracts even though there were no significant variations in single-authored abstracts. Besides, the high-stakes functions show opposite trends between co-authored and single-authored abstracts. A similar study was conducted by Azar & Hashim (2022) in which thirty-two review articles were observed to find out the type of self-mention that was frequently used in review articles and its frequency as well as to see the rhetorical function of self-mention in different sections of the articles. Utilizing Hyland's (2002) functional classification for personal pronouns, it was found that first-person plural pronouns were used more frequently than singular pronouns also the exclusive and inclusive pronouns appeared frequently close (Azar & Hashim, 2022). Azar & Hashim (2022) observed that inclusive pronouns were used not only as a politeness strategy and as a tool to seek the reader's agreement as well as to construct professional personas. Grigoriev & Sokolova (2019) conducted a similar study in which the discourse function of first-person pronouns was scrutinized. They also analyzed the key factors that determined the use of the pronoun as well as the differences made by non-native speakers in applying discourse and textual features since the data was taken from random project proposals written by Russian students.

Jasim Al-Shujairi (2020) compared two different journals in applied linguistics where the self-mention markers proposed by Hyland (2002) were examined to find out the most frequent and the most common realization in both journals. Hryniuk (2018) examined how writers from two different cultural regions utilized the first-person pronouns and determiners in representing themselves in academic writing. Zhao (2023) also made corpora from two different journals to compare research article abstracts in Chinese-language and English-language in the field of Finance and Accounting to investigate, particularly, the first-person plural pronoun.

The first-personal plural pronoun especially, we, was observed. Wang et al. (2021) investigated the use of first-person we in the abstract and conclusions of electrical and electronic engineering papers. Meanwhile, Solsun and Akbaş (2022) analyzed the use, distribution, and discourse function of we as the first-person plural pronoun. Solsun and Akbaş (2022) also scrutinized the article in the field of engineering and technology but only took the result and discussion section.

Işık-Taş (2018) investigated the frequency and discourse function of first-person pronouns in research articles written by native English speakers and Turkish to find out how they present the authorial identity. Işık-Taş (2018) utilized the theory proposed by Hyland (2002) and Tang and John (1999). Isler (2018) examined and compared the use of first-person pronoun and their function in creating authorial self in academic writing applying Ivanič's (1998) and Tang and John's (1999) theories. Hardjanto (2022), on the other hand, only applied Tang and John's (1999) theory to investigate how professional authors construct their authorial identities in English research articles. Three different disciplines, which were biology, linguistics, and medicine published by native and non-native authors were taken as the source of the data. A similar study was conducted by Cheung and Lau (2020), where they took 80 research articles in the field of computer science and 80 research articles to compare the way the writers use first-person pronouns. Particularly, Cheung and Lau (2020) attempted to find out how different disciplines emerged in the use of first-person pronouns and their function in each field. The same theory proposed by Tang and John (1999) was also utilized by Januarto and Hardjanto (2020) in comparing the frequency of authorial presence written by native and non-native English scholars in their research articles. Two Scopus-indexed journals were taken as the source of the data.

Walková (2018) compared 3 different groups of writers in representing themselves in linguistics research papers as individuals or as a part of a society and as participants or non-participants of the given communicative exchange. Walkova (2018) took articles written by Anglophone and Slovak and made them into corpora which were a corpus of Anglophone writing (native English), a corpus of Slovak, and a corpus of non-native English texts written by Slovak authors. Applying Biber's (1999), it was found that English academic culture is more individualistic while Slovak academic culture tends to be more collectivist. It was observed also that Slovak writers transmitted this culture into their writing in English in particular for local audiences.

On the other hand, Wang and Hu (2023) attempted to find out the diachronic changes in the use of self-mention and its three sub-categories in English research articles published from 1970 to 2019 and to observe the difference in the use of self-mention throughout those years. It took 1200 research articles from 4 disciplines to observe the use of first-person, third-person, and abstract subjects by utilizing a theory proposed by Liu (2011). Wang and Hu (2023) found that a certain discipline affects the changes in using self-mention and its three sub-categories through the years. It was observed that in the soft science field, self-mentions and first-person pronouns are fewer than in the hard science field. They rather use third-person pronouns and abstract subjects. The writers in the hard science field tend to use first-person pronouns more frequently to present themselves directly and the use of third-person and abstract subjects is decreasing through the years. Reviewing the previous study intrigued us to investigate how English writers and Indonesian writers utilized first-person pronouns in presenting themselves in their academic writing.

## THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Pronouns in English are categorized into two major categories, deictic pronouns and anaphoric pronouns (Huddleston & Pullum, 2002). Personal pronouns belong to the deictic pronoun category which it "contains the 1st and 2nd person pronouns, associated with speaker and addressee roles in the utterance-act" (Huddleston & Pullum, 2002, p. 426) According to Biber et al (1999), personal pronouns are a category of words that help "to refer succinctly to the speaker/writer, the addressee, and identifiable things or persons other than the speaker/writer and the addressee" (p. 328).

In academic writing, including scientific research articles, the researchers present themselves throughout their writing by using the first-person pronouns as a form of self-mention to deliver their ideas, opinions, as well as their contributions to their research. Hyland (2001, pp. 215–217) stated that pronouns are the most salient forms of self-mention, in which the first-person pronouns take part "to assist authors to make a personal standing in their texts and to demarcate their own work from that of others." The usage of first-person pronouns could help researchers to distinguish their own ideas with others, which would also help them to get approval

for their originalities. This is a part of representing the authorial presence.

According to Tang and John (1999) and Ivanic (1994), authorial presence gives the author a right to control or command others in giving knowledge in a particular field as a maker of meaning. Therefore, authors "choose to make themselves visible in their texts through self-reference have considerable rhetorical importance, indicating the kinds of commitments writers are willing to make and the information they are prepared to give about their beliefs as individuals" (Hyland, 2002, p. 1098).

Hyland (2002) proposed the categorizations across discourse functions of authorial presence:

a.    *Expressing self-benefits*

This function was added to various departmental rubrics to give the learning process a more reflective element, but it is absent from professional research texts. This calls for a personal statement, typically found at the conclusion, in which the author can present themselves in a way that stays true to their identity while taking on a less menacing role than the idea creator or result interpreter.

b.    *Stating a purpose*

This kind of framing highlighted a relatively low risk writer role, essentially guiding readers through the text, while also helping to clarify the direction of the research and the argument's schematic structure.

c.    *Explaining a procedure*

One of the report's most important components was the capacity to organize and execute a workable and suitable research methodology, showcasing the ability to apply professional skills, overcome obstacles, and lay out protocols. The significance of achieving this goal was acknowledged by the writers, and many of them were eager to share their first-hand experiences in detail.

d.    *Elaborating an argument*

Although it would seem that one of the main goals of academic writing is to lay out a line of reasoning, first-person accounts are typically reserved for professional academics who choose to stake their claims on their arguments. Instead of using the range of grammatical options to indicate agreement, disagreement, or interest in a position, they preferred to avoid the potentially problematic role of writer-as-thinker, a role that carries accountability for the propositions expressed.

e.    *Stating results/claims*

This, once again, contrasts sharply with professional uses of self-reference because it is the most self-assured and possibly the most face-threatening use of it. The most obvious example of the explicitly persuasive use of self-mention in expert discourses is the writers' decision to identify themselves when they make a knowledge claim. By employing the first person to express their special contribution to creating a tenable explanation for a phenomenon, authors established a personal authority founded on assurance and mastery of their arguments.

## METHODS

This research used the data that were collected from a corpus of English research articles and Indonesian research articles in the linguistics discipline, which were published in reputable journals indexed in Scopus for the English research articles and Sinta 2 for the Indonesian research articles. We chose a total of 40 research articles, consisting of 20 English research articles written by authors affiliated to English speaking countries, 10 research articles from the *Journal of English Linguistics* and 10 research articles from *Journal of Linguistics*, which later referred to as English research articles sub-corpus, and 20 Indonesian research articles written by authors affiliated to Indonesian institutions, 10 research articles from *Ranah: Jurnal Kajian Bahasa* and 10 research articles from *Sawerigading*, which later referred to as Indonesian research articles sub-corpus. The general selection of the research articles was based on qualifications: a) the research articles must be the primary research which reports empirical results, b) it must be indexed in Scopus (https://scopus.com/) for the English research articles and Sinta (https://sinta.kemdikbud.go.id/) for the Indonesian research articles, c) the most recently published.

The overall sections of the RAs were used as the data sources by excluding the headers, footnotes,

graphics, tables, etc. Thus, a corpus of 265,526 words in total, consisting of 177,522 words in English sub-corpus and 88,004 words in Indonesian sub-corpus, was obtained.

In answering the questions mentioned before, the selected research articles will be analyzed quantitatively by the assistance of a concordance program called *AntConc* (Anthony, 2023) to discover the frequency and distribution of authorial presence in the research articles. The concordance program showed the data of first-person pronouns used to express the potential authorial presence in the research articles by searching each pronoun (*I, my, me, we, our, us, kami*) and its lexical expression (*the author, the authors, penulis, peneliti*). The data was then filtered to eliminate unrelated expressions in the concordance program. After eliminating the unrelated expression, the final concordances were saved to *Microsoft Excel* (.xlsx) to ease the analysis. The analysis was done qualitatively based on the existing models of discourse functions of first-person reference (Hyland, 2002).

The data were presented in raw frequency and normalized frequency (frequency per 10,000 words) to "indicate the prevalence of a type in terms of a proportion of the total number of tokens within the text" (McEnery & Wilson, 2001, p. 82). A normalization has to be conducted to recalculate the number of instances for both sub-corpora since both sub-corpora are different in size.

A questionnaire was also distributed to seek the factors that contribute to the differences between the English and Indonesian research articles in employing first-person pronoun. In particular, it only targeted the Indonesian writers since studies suggest that non-native English speakers tend to not use first-person pronouns frequently compared to the English speakers. Hence, a questionnaire was the tool to discourse the underlying reason of the Indonesian writers in using and not using the first-person pronouns. The questionnaire targets participants with undergraduate degrees, master's degrees, and doctoral degrees, both those who are currently undergoing and those who have graduated. Moreover, the questionnaire contains some questions regarding how Indonesian students and academicians present themselves in their academic writing to compare with the results of first-person pronouns used in the Indonesian sub-corpus.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### First-Person Pronouns in Research Articles

The total first-person pronouns obtained from the corpus of research articles are presented in Table 1 below in raw frequencies and frequencies per 10,000 words of the texts.

Table 1. First person pronouns across the corpus

| RAs | Raw Frequency | Frequency per 10,000 words |
|---|---|---|
| English | 1,089 | 61.35 |
| Indonesian | 73 | 8.3 |
| **Total** | **1,162** | **69.65** |

Based on Table 1, a total of 1,162 first-person pronouns were identified from a corpus of 265,526 words, consisting of 1,089 first-person pronouns (61.35 occurrences per 10,000 words) in English sub-corpus and 73 first-person pronouns (8.30 occurrences per 10,000 words) in Indonesian sub-corpus. The normalized frequencies of the two sub-corpora show a wide gap in the use of first-person pronouns between English research articles and Indonesian research articles.

Table 2. First-person pronouns in English research articles

| First-person pronouns | Raw frequency | Frequency per 10,000 words |
|---|---|---|
| *we* | 416 | 23.43 |
| *I* | 343 | 19.32 |
| *our* | 186 | 10.48 |
| *us* | 66 | 3.72 |
| *my* | 65 | 3.66 |
| *the author* | 6 | 0.34 |
| *the authors* | 4 | 0.23 |
| *me* | 3 | 0.17 |
| **Total** | **1,089** | **61.35** |

Table 2 presents the number of first-person pronouns identified in the English sub-corpus. The results in the English sub-corpus indicate that first-person plural pronoun *we* is the most frequently used in the overall research articles with a total frequency of 416 occurrences (23.43 occurrences per 10,000 words). Moreover, first-person singular pronoun I is also frequently used by authors in research articles with a frequency of 343 occurrences (19.32 occurrences per 10,000 words). These two pronouns are the dominant forms of first-person pronouns in research articles to display the self-identity of the authors. Aside from the two most highly found first-person pronouns, other pronouns such as our, us, my and me are also found in the sub-corpus. Despite the low frequencies, other lexical forms such as the author and the authors are also used as part of the way research articles' authors present themselves in their writing.

Table 3. First-person pronouns in Indonesian research articles

| First-person pronouns | Raw frequency | Frequency per 10,000 words |
|---|---|---|
| *peneliti* | 50 | 5.68 |
| *kami* | 16 | 1.82 |
| *penulis* | 7 | 0.8 |
| Total | 73 | 8.3 |

Moving on to Table 3, a total of three first-person pronouns have been successfully identified. These first-person pronouns consist of *kami* (we), *penulis* (the author(s)) and *peneliti* (the researcher(s)). The results of this sub-corpus differ from English sub-corpus in the use of first-person plural pronoun we, as this pronoun is not frequently used by the authors to represent themselves in their writing. However, the highest frequency of 50 occurrences (5.68 occurrences per 10,000 words) indicates that Indonesian authors tend to use lexical expression *peneliti* (the researcher(s)) in writing research articles.

## Discourse Functions of First-Person Pronouns

Based on the data found in two sub-corpora, we examine whether first-person pronouns serve particular discourse functions or not in academic writing specifically in research articles. The discourse functions of the first-person pronouns,

both singular and plural, are categorized based on the classification proposed by Hyland (2002a), which consists of five main functions: expressing self-benefits, stating a purpose, explaining a procedure, elaborating an argument, and stating results/claims.

Table 4. Discourse functions of first-person pronouns in English and Indonesian corpus

| Functions | English | | Indonesian | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Raw | Norm | Raw | Norm |
| Expressing self-benefits | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Stating a purpose | 340 | 19.15 | 12 | 1.36 |
| Explaining a procedure | 238 | 13.41 | 36 | 4.09 |
| Elaborating an argument | 227 | 12.79 | 14 | 1.59 |
| Stating results /claims | 284 | 16 | 11 | 1.25 |
| Total | 1,089 | 61.35 | 73 | 8.3 |

(Norm: normalized frequency or frequency per 10,000 words)

## Expressing self-benefits

According to Hyland (2002a), almost no expressing self-benefits function occurs in professional academic writing such as research articles. This discourse function contains authors' remarks on personal advantages they had obtained from the research. Thus, the results from the current research are in line with the mentioned statement since this discourse function is not found at all in the corpus, both English sub-corpus and Indonesian sub-corpus.

## Stating a purpose

This discourse function is identified to be the most highly used first-person pronoun function in English sub-corpus. Based on the results, authors in the English sub-corpus present themselves more in their writing to inform the reader about the purpose of the research and the structure of the article. However, this discourse function is positioned on the third lowest occurrences in Indonesian sub-corpus.

(1) In Section 2.3, I will further discuss the semantic differences associated with the word order alternation. (En)

(2) *Jenis persuasif pada data di atas, digunakan oleh* peneliti *untuk mengajak remaja yang mengalami . . .* (Id)

(The persuasive type in the data above is used by researchers to invite teenagers who experience…)

In the examples above, both the pronoun *I* and lexical expression *peneliti* (the researcher(s)) are used to refer to the author(s) of the research articles to give explanation on the structure of research article, as in (1), and tell the readers about the purpose of the research conducted by authors, as in (2). In short, this discourse function is employed by the authors to help the readers understand more on what they want to convey in their writing.

### Explaining a procedure

The function of explaining a procedure reflects how the authors, as the ones who know well on the methodologies of their own research, describe the procedures of the research to the readers in research articles. This discourse function has the highest occurrences in Indonesian sub-corpus. Meanwhile, in the English sub-corpus, the function of explaining a procedure is in the third position of the most found discourse functions.

(3) We do this by examining two properties that are known to be true of filler–gap dependencies, . . . (En)

(4) *Kami kemudian membatasi lokasi penelitian pada wilayah utama subsuku tersebut, . . .* (Id)
(We then limited the research area to the sub-tribe's main region, . . .)

In example (3), the authors informed the readers about a procedure in data analysis. In example (4), the authors demonstrated the data collection in their research. This discourse function is mainly found in the methodology section of a research article.

### Elaborating an argument

The elaborating an argument discourse function is considered as the "high-risk function" (Hyland, 2002) which is usually identified in professional academic writing. In the English sub-corpus, the function has the second lowest occurrences compared to other functions. On the other hand, it is

the second most frequently used from overall discourse functions in the Indonesian sub-corpus.

(5) I believe that verb pairs like this DO exist in Choctaw – e.g. chalhaakachi 'rattle' (intr./tr.) – but so far . . . (En)

(6) *Penulis berpandangan, tiga yang terpenting dari Gooskens (2018) adalah kemiripan linguistik, . . .* (Id)
(In the author's view, the three most important of Gooskens (2018) are linguistic similarity, …)

These examples show that the authors have strong commitments to their arguments by presenting themselves in their writing. The use of the verb *believe* in example (5) indicates that the author is committed to a particular view of the research. This goes the same as example (6) where the author has strong argumentation towards a theory proposed by previous study.

### Stating results/claims

As pointed out by Hyland (2002) this discourse function is "the most face-threatening use of self-reference" (p. 1103) since the authors often use first-person pronouns as self-reference to support their knowledge claims. However, this function has the second lowest occurrences in the Indonesian sub-corpus compared to other discourse functions. In contrast, the function of stating results/claims has the second highest frequencies from overall functions identified in the English sub-corpus.

(7) Our findings thus support the relevant conclusions in Culicover & Jackendoff (2005: 248) and . . . (En)

(8) *Peneliti mengklaim gramatika Indonesia merupakan suatu sistem yang memasang hubungkan . . .* (Id)
(Researchers claim Indonesian grammar is a system that connects . . .)

In these examples, pronoun *our* and lexical expression *peneliti* (the researcher(s)) used by the authors to convey the function of stating results/claims in the research articles. In example (7), the authors state the results of their research to have supported the results of previous remarkable studies. As for example (8), the authors declare one of notable

claims from their research as part of novelty of knowledge.

## The Use of First-Person Pronouns in English and Indonesian Research Articles

The analysis shows that the way English writers used the first-person pronoun was varied compared to Indonesian writers. Both writers employed *we* to show the presence of the writer or to make themselves visible (Januarto & Hardjanto, 2020). It can be seen in the following clauses.

(9)    … change, this approach provides some crucial insights. In this paper, <u>we</u> have confirmed the importance of considering the folk taxonomies … (En)

(10)   *Kami kemudian membatasi lokasi penelitian pada wilayah utama subsuku tersebut, …* (Id) (We then limited the research area to the sub-tribe's main region…)

Those two examples show that English writers and Indonesian writers employed the exclusive *we*, which refers only to the speaker and excludes the addressers (Scheibman, 2004). It was applied to give an exact position where they were the ones who conducted the research. In addition, the use of exclusive we presented a distance between the researcher and the reader.

On the other hand, only the English writers were observed to utilize the inclusive *we*, which refers to both the speaker and the addresser (Scheibman, 2004). It can be seen through the following examples.

(11)   … with the embedded predicate (bought). If this manipulation was successful, <u>we</u> should see a significant effect for DISTANCE in the … (En)

(12)   the proportional model is to make concrete and testable predictions, <u>we</u> need to supplement it with a method for generating … (En)

Example (11) shows that the writers invite the reader to observe the effect after doing the experiment. Employing the modal should, it implies that the writer expects the reader to do what they wish to do since the modal should shows an obligation and it is categorized in median level (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004). Example (12) presents a similar structure where the inclusive *we* is employed and a modal follows it. The modal need to creates a nuance of an obligation that has to be followed by the readers. This is because the modal need to is classified at a high level (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004). These two clauses present that the writer suggests the procedural steps in conducting the research.

The possessive adjective, us, that indicates ownership is also employed only by the English writers. The example can be seen through the following clauses.

(13)   this would suggest that <u>our</u> attempt to construct appropriate stimuli was not successful. (En)

(14)   … for backward sprouting, given the results of our experiment. Thus, <u>our</u> finding of a clear lack of sensitivity to islands. (En)

The writer through example (13) is stating their purpose. The use of the possessive pronoun our shows that the writers made themselves visible. A similar result can also be seen in example (14) where the clause is stated to present a result. This is in line with the previous study (Yuliawati et al., 2023) where the use of our is employed to present their interpretation and findings and writers build an assertive personal authority based on their arguments. In other words, both examples exhibit how the writers are confident enough to present themselves in bringing the intention and the outcome of their research.

The way writers are confident in presenting themselves is depicted in the use of *I*. The following examples present how the pronoun *I* is employed by the English writers.

(15)   … in the beginning of the first metron (see Section 5). I do not attempt to account for frequency differences between… (En)

(16)   The paper is structured as follows. In Section 1, I will explore the theoretical assumptions underlying the proportional model… (En)

(17)   … position roughly corresponds to the Res position in my analysis. I mainly disagree with Hu on the analysis of the… (En)

Examples (15), (16), and (17) indicate that the writers are showing themselves by positioning

themselves as the architect and the guide of the research (Asprillia & Hardjanto, 2020) which was based on (John & Tang, 1999). Example (15) shows that the writer knows what to do by stating that they do not attempt to do something. Thus, the writer is the architect of the research since they know and control the research. A similar pattern can also be observed in the example (17). The writer is the one who has control of the research and in this clause, it is depicted that the writer confidently states their opinion by showing themselves through the use of the pronoun *I* and employing the verb disagree. Since the writer is the "architect" of the research, they are able to guide the reader to understand the concept they brought. It can be seen in example (16) where the writer mentions a particular section and explains what they are going to do in that section. By stating that, the writer tries to guide the reader in understanding the research.

Those three examples implies that English writers are confident enough to present themselves as experts (Azabdaftari, 2016, in Azar & Hashim, 2022) unlike the Indonesian writers. The Indonesian writers are seen to hide themselves under the phrases *the author(s)* and *the researcher(s)*.

(18)  *… kelompok orang dari setiap kelompok suku yang diteliti. Selain itu, penulis berasumsi bahwa penting juga untuk memilih lebih dari satu …* (Id)

(… a group of people in every tribe group that was observed. Besides, the author assumed that it was important to choose more than one … )

(19)  *… yang mengalami insecure. Teknik pengumpulan data dilakukan meliputi tahapan; 1) observasi; peneliti melakukan observasi kepada remaja yang mengalami insecure, 2) wawancara; …* (Id)

(… who feel insecure about. There were some steps in collecting data; 1) observation; the research observed the teenagers who feel insecure, 2) interview; … )

Azabdaftari (2016, in Azar & Hashim, 2022) explained that the writers desire to be a part of the discussion or research group. In other words, the authors want to be seen as experts who work in the research group. They tend to be labeled for their position instead of showing themselves.

The survey was conducted to discover the reason for non-native English speakers, specifically Indonesian writers, tend to not employ first-person pronouns in their research article. One hundred respondents filled out the questionnaire from various educational backgrounds (bachelor's, and master's degrees) from Indonesia. They were asked one major question: when you write academic writing using Indonesian language, did you use first person pronouns I, we, writer(s), or researcher(s))? It is found that 82% of the respondents said yes while 14% said no. The 82% of the respondents agreed to the reasons proposed by Hyland (2002) where first-person pronouns are employed to present the identity of the author, to help and to guide the reader in understanding the structure of the research, to expose the procedure of the research, to state the opinion and the argument as well as to state and to claim the result. Furthermore, 3.6% out of 82% added another reason in which they use the first-person pronouns to replace their real name, follow the grammatical structure, and follow the academic writing structure. The findings indicate that the majority of the sample utilizes first-person pronouns following the reasons outlined by Hyland (2002).

On the other hand, 14% of the respondents stated that they do not utilize the first-person pronoun in their writing, because it makes it less academic, and less objective, it presents like an opinion article. In addition, they tend not to use the first-person pronoun since they want to hide the author's identity evidenced by the low frequency of stating results/claims discourse function, which is "the most face-threatening use of self-reference" (Hyland, 2002, p. 1103). Furthermore, the other reason for avoiding the use of first-person pronouns is to emphasize the object, also they follow the lesson taught in Indonesian courses. These reasons explain why Indonesian writers use first-person pronouns less frequently in academic writing than English writers. It highlights the significant influence of cultural background that influences their linguistic preferences (Yuliawati et al., 2023).

## CONCLUSION

This research has been an attempt to meet two objectives: (1) to identify the types and the discourse

function of first-person pronouns used to express authorial presence in English and Indonesian research articles and (2) to examine how first-person pronouns are used in English research articles compared to Indonesian research articles. 40 articles which are 20 articles written by English writers and 20 articles written by Indonesian writers are taken as the source of the data. Using *AntConc*, it is observed that *I, my, me, we, our, us*, and *the author(s)* are employed by the English authors. On the other hand, *kami, penulis*, dan *peneliti* are used by the Indonesian authors. Those first-person pronouns serve discourse functions as expressing self-benefits, stating a purpose, explaining a procedure, elaborating an argument, and stating results/ claims. It is found that, in the English sub-corpus, the highest occurrence of discourse functions is stating a purpose and there is no occurrence of expressing self-benefits. Meanwhile, in the Indonesian sub-corpus, the highest number of discourse functions is explaining a procedure, also there is no occurrence of expressing self-benefits found in the corpus.

In relation to the second objective, it is found that *we* is the most frequent pronoun both in English and Indonesian authors and followed by *I* but only employed by the English authors. The use of *we* and *I* employed by the English authors exhibits that the authors are confident enough to present themselves and the result of the research. Besides, in Indonesian, only the pronoun *we*, the exclusive *we*, is utilized. The Indonesian authors tend to disguise themselves behind the phrase *the author(s)* and *the researcher(s)* rather than explicitly use the pronoun *I*. It is because they do not want to be seen personally, but they desire to retain their role as a researcher or the author.

Thus, we can conclude that English speaking authors tend to be more interactive with the readers in explaining the structure of the articles written by them as shown by the highest frequency found in the discourse function of stating a purpose. Furthermore, English speaking authors also tend to explicitly reveal their identity as the ones who have the claims to their research findings as evidenced by the frequency of the discourse function stating claims/results taking place in the second highest from overall functions. In contrast, as stated before, Indonesian speaking authors tend to hide themselves from claiming their research findings. The most used

authorial identity role in Indonesian sub-corpus is explaining a procedure, in which the authors tend to employ first-person pronouns more to explain the step by step of their research. This probably occurs as Indonesian authors avoid making a strong impression of the results and claims of their own research, unlike English authors who proudly present the outcomes from their research.

This study is only limited to the linguistics field, in which the size of the corpus is quite small. Thus, it suggests that further research needs a larger data set to determine the use of self-reference, especially in the Indonesian research articles. In addition, the limited number of authorial presence studies in comparing English research articles and Indonesian research articles could be considered as the main topic to be investigated in the future research. In addition, it is suggested to explore more on the cultural background that might influence the linguistic preferences through the lens of sociolinguistics or ethnolinguistics.

## REFERENCES

Anthony, L. (2023). AntConc (Version 4.2.4) [Computer software]. Waseda University. https://www.laurenceanthony.net/software.

Asprillia, A., & Hardjanto, T. D. (2020). Who Am I in Academic Writing?: The Study of Authorial Identity. *LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching, 23*(1), Article 1. 131-143. https://doi.org/10.24071/llt.v23i1.2481

Azar, A. S., & Hashim, A. (2022). Analysing authorial identity construction in the review article genre in Applied Linguistics. *Studies in English Language and Education, 9*(1), 94-114. https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v9i1.21898

Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., & Finegan, E. (1999). *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Pearson Education Limited.

Cheung, Y. L., & Lau, L. (2020). Authorial voice in academic writing: A comparative study of journal articles in English Literature and Computer Science. *Iberica 39*, 215-242. https://doi.org/10.17398/2340-2784.39.215

Dontcheva-Navrátilová, O. (2013). Authorial presence in academic discourse: Functions of author-reference pronouns. *Linguistica Pragensia, 23*(1), 9–30.

Grigoriev, I., & Sokolova, A. (2019). Corpus Based Analysis of First-Person Pronouns in Research Proposal Written by Rusian Students. *Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes*, *7*(4), 423-430. https://doi.org/10.22190/JTESAP1904423G

Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2004). *An introduction to functional grammar* (3rd ed). Arnold

Hardjanto, T. D. (2022). "However, we argue that ...": The Construction of Authorial Identities in English Research Articles. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 12*(8), 1525-1536. https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1208.08

Hartwell, L., & Jacques, M.-P. (2014). Authorial presence in French and English: "Pronoun + Verb" patterns in biology and medicine *Discours, 15*, 3-21. https://doi.org/10.4000/discours.8941

Hryniuk, K. (2018). Expressing authorial self in research articles written by Polish and English native-speaker writers: A corpus-based study. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching, 8*(3), 621-642. https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2018.8.3.5

Huddleston, R., & Pullum, G. K. (2002). *The Cambridge grammar of the English language*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316423530

Hyland, K. (2001). Humble servants of the discipline? Self-mention in research articles. *English for Specific Purposes, 20*(3), 207–226. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(00)00012-0

Hyland, K. (2002). Academic Argument: Induction or Interaction? *Revista Canaria De Estudios Ingleses*, *44*, 29-45. https://riull.ull.es/xmlui/handle/915/29774

Hyland, K. (2004). Disciplinary interactions: Metadiscourse in L2 postgraduate writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 13*(2),

133–151. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2004.02.001

Hyland, K. (2005). Stance and engagement: A model of interaction in academic discourse. *Discourse Studies, 7*(2), 173–192. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445605050365

Hyland, K. (2008). Disciplinary voices: Interactions in research writing. *English Text Construction, 1*(1), 5–22. https://doi.org/10.1075/etc.1.1.03hyl

Işık-Taş, E. E. (2018). Authorial identity in Turkish language and English language research articles in Sociology: The role of publication context in academic writers' discourse choices. *English for Specific Purposes, 49*, 26–38. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2017.10.003

Isler, C. (2018). The use of first person pronouns in master's theses written in English by Turkish authors. *JELE (Journal of English Language and Education), 4(*1), 12-20. https://doi.org/10.26486/jele.v4i1.382

Ivanič, R. (1994). *I* Is for Interpersonal: Discoursal Construction of Writer Identities and the Teaching of Writing. *Linguistics and Education, 6*(1), 3–15.

Ivanič, R. (1998). *Writing and Identity: The discoursal construction of identity in academic writing*. John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/swll.5

Januarto, A., & Hardjanto, T. D. (2020). Authorial Presence in English Research Articles by Native and Non-Native English Scholars. *LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching, 23*(2), 241-254. https://doi.org/10.24071/llt.v23i2.2473

Jasim Al-Shujairi, Y. B. (2020). What, which and where: Examining self-mention markers in ISI and Iraqi local research articles in applied linguistics. *Asian Englishes, 22*(1), 20–34. https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2018.1544699

John, S., & Tang, R. (1999). The 'I' in identity: Exploring writer identity in student academic writing through the first person pronoun. *English for Specific Purposes, 18*, S23–S39.

https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(99)00009-5

Kuo, C.-H. (1999). The use of personal pronouns: role relationships in scientific journal articles. *English for Specific Purposes, 18*(2), 121–138. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(97)00058-6

Li, Z. (2021). Authorial presence in research article abstracts: A diachronic investigation of the use of first person pronouns. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 51*, 1-14. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2021.100977

Liu, S. (2011). Self-mention and authorial identity construction in Chinese and English research article abstracts. *Contemp Rhet, 166*(4), 85–88.

McEnery, T., & Wilson, A. (2001). *Corpus Linguistics: An Introduction*. Edinburgh University Press.

Munoz, M. C. (2013). The "I" in interaction: Authorial presense in academic writing. *Revista de Lingüística y Lenguas Aplicadas, 8*, 49–58. https://doi.org/10.4995/rlyla.2013.1162

Poudat, C., & Loiseau, S. (2005). Authorial presence in academic genres. In E. Tognini-Bonelli & G. Del Lungo Camiciotti (Eds.), *Studies in Corpus Linguistics* (Vol. 19, pp. 51–68). John Benjamins Publishing Company. https://doi.org/10.1075/scl.19.05pou

Scheibman, J. (2004). Inclusive and Exclusive Patterning of the English First Person Plural: Evidence from Conversation.

Solsun, A., & Akbaş, E. (2022). Establishing authorial presence by the exclusive-we: A functional approach to self-mentions in engineering research articles. *Participatory Educational Research, 9*(3), 281-295. https://doi.org/10.17275/per.22.66.9.3

Walková, M. (2018). Author's Self-Representation in Research Articles by Anglophone and Slovak Linguist. *Discourse and Interaction, 11*(1), 86-105. https://doi.org/10.5817/DI2018-1-86

Wang, H., & Hu, Z. (2023). Changes in the ways authors refer to themselves: A diachronic study of self-mention in English research articles. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications, 10*(1), 1-10. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-023-02099-7

Wang, S., Tseng, W.-T., & Johanson, R. (2021). To We or Not to We: Corpus-Based Research on First-Person Pronoun Use in Abstracts and Conclusions. *SAGE Open, 11*(2), 21582440211008893. 1-18. https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211008893

Yuliawati, S., Mawarrani, E., & Kurniawan, E. (2023). A corpus-based study of authorial identity in Indonesian writers' research articles. *Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences, 44*(3), 959–964. https://doi.org/10.34044/j.kjss.2023.44.3.34

Zhao, N. (2023). A corpus-based comparison study of first-person pronoun we in English-language abstracts. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 63*, 1-10. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2023.1