English Language Teaching through the Lens of Experience

English Language Teaching through the Lens of Experience

Edited by

Christoph Haase and Natalia Orlova

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing

English Language Teaching through the Lens of Experience

Edited by Christoph Haase and Natalia Orlova

This book first published 2019

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN (10): 1-5275-3718-8
ISBN (13): 978-1-5275-3718-7

CONTENTS

PREFACE

The focus of this volume in our ongoing series has shifted from the technological advances that were the topic of numerous papers in the previous volume (ELT: New Horizons in Theory and Application, CSP 2018) to more rigorous and empirical research, especially in the linguistics and methodology section. While the former is represented with a majority of papers, methodology still manages to surprise with new findings in often-overlooked areas, for example, how to address impairments in ELT. Two contributions in this volume concern this issue, the papers by Pavla Máchová on teaching hearing-impaired students as well as the one on gestures by Natasha Janzen Ulbricht and Monika Michalak, with a study on gestures. The linguistics section starts out with Monika Maňáková's look at academic ELF (English as a *lingua franca*) practices of authors to self-refer. It is informed by corpus queries and at the same time introduces the family of ELF corpora as a subset of the academic English corpora toolbox. In the same vein, a novel academic corpus, CUJOE, and its implications for the teaching of English for Academic Purposes (EAP), is introduced in the contribution by Christoph Haase. Non-native varieties and their significance for English language teaching are the topics of Xiaofang Duan for Chinese speakers and by Johnny George for the perspective from Japan. While Duan works mainly empirically, George's paper, though data-based, is more analytic and falls more within sociolinguistic varieties studies, as does the article by Dunlop Ochieng and Susanne Mohr. However, Tanzanian English is not a non-native variety and the treatment by Ochieng and Mohr includes a look at language policies.

On the other hand, the English spoken by Norwegian learners is non-native and their use of discourse markers in their written output is the topic of Oleksandr Kapranov's extensive study. Martha Lampropoulou offers a classical cognitive-linguistic study in her assessment of the network-like conceptualization of *open*. A bridge to methodology is provided by Gabriela Zapletalová's technologically-driven view on MOOCs (Massive Open Online Courses) while Adam Pluszczyk bridges linguistic pragmatics with the cultural studies section in applying hedging to media discourse in a TV show.

Two phonetic and phonological treatments conclude the linguistics section. Kateřina Šteklová has used software for analyses of samples from her original corpus of English spoken by Czech bilinguals in the UK. Dušan

Melen and Monika Hřebačková provide the cross-language perspective on diphthongs.

In the methodology section, Eric Koenig and Katherine Guertler try to answer the question how to support weaker students in cases when proficiency in the EFL classroom is unevenly distributed. Markéta Bilanová reviews digital resources for us in a helpful categorization and Jana Pavlíková attempts something similar in designing scenarios in and for ELT. Ivana Šimonová's contribution addresses the (in SLA studies) controversial question of the influence of one second language on another.

The compact literary section correlates with the diversity inherent in the field and concern ethnic writing in Diana Židová's look at its inclusion in teaching, and similarly, indigenous storytelling in Canadian literature by Jana Marešová. An interesting diversion is Lora Tamošiūnienė's take on animality in a piece by Lord Dunsany. The section closes more generally with the elaborations of Zinaida Chemodurova on postmodernist fiction.

Finally, the book review this time is contributed by Natalia Orlova with a look on a recent publication by Komorowska & Krajka.

We wish that this new collection of research papers will bring topics and approaches to the attention of a wide spectrum of practitioners – newcomers and veterans – as an impetus and inspiration.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This time, we would like express out gratitude to Joel Cameron Head for his invaluable help and meticulous proofreading of the entire manuscript. Šarlota Fuchsová provided essential consistency checking in all bibliographic matters throughout the volume.

The editors, May 2019

SECTION 1:

APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

THE USE OF AUTHOR-REFERENCE PRONOUNS IN ACADEMIC ELF

MONIKA MAŇÁKOVÁ
OSTRAVA UNIVERSITY

This paper addresses the issue of expressing authorial presence in academic writing. It focuses on the use of author-reference pronouns in the SciELF corpus, which is a collection of second-language written scientific communications. By means of corpus analysis, it investigates the frequency of author-reference pronouns and possessive adjectives used in articles in the natural sciences, social sciences and humanities. The study draws on research within the ELF framework and research on authorial presence in texts in general and in academic texts in particular. The research focus is not only to establish the frequency of use of the above-mentioned means of expressing authorial presence but also to establish whether the use varies according to the first author's L1 and/or the discipline. However impersonal academic writing is believed to be, the use of first person expressions is not scarce in texts. The findings also show that there is a dependency between the frequency of use of author-reference pronouns and certain variables - the first author's L1 and discipline represented here by the domain the article belongs to.

Introduction

English has become the language of academic and scientific communication and its use as the lingua franca of academic and scientific publication has been studied by a growing number of scholars (Mauranen, 2012; Jenkins, 2007; Seidlhofer, 2011) around the world. Research so far has mainly focused on spoken data as it is in this form of communication where development seems to be the most turbulent and palpable. Authorial presence and the role of personal pronouns have been widely studied in a variety of texts (c.f. Hyland, 2017; Thompson, 2001; Martin and White, 2005; Harwood, 2005; Kuo, 1999); however, it has not, to my knowledge, been studied in the academic ELF environment.

This study aims to address this gap by establishing the frequency of use of author-reference pronouns in the SciELF corpus as the means of expressing authorial presence but it also aims to establish whether the use varies according to discipline and/or cultural background. Cultural background, represented in the corpus as the first author's L1, shall be understood as the authors' affiliation to their academic background, university.

When studying authorial presence in texts, we are met with a certain variation in the theoretical framework which discusses evaluation (Hunston and Thompson, 1999), metadiscourse (Hyland and Tse, 2004; Hyland, 2005), appraisal (Martin, 2000; Martin and White, 2005), and stance (Biber and Finegan; 1989, Biber et al., 1999). In its theoretical background, this study falls back on Hyland's division of authorial presence in the text – metadiscourse meaning "the linguistic resources used to organize a discourse or writer's stance towards either its content or the reader" (Hyland and Tse, 2004, p. 157). Despite variations in the theoretical framework, there are two main forms of an author's involvement in the text that they agree upon. They are described by Hyland (2005) as stance, meaning the author's involvement in the argument, and engagement, meaning how the authors relate towards and engage with the reader. These in turn can be represented by a variety of means.

The quantitative study focuses on the frequency of self-mentions (stance) referred to hereafter as author-reference pronouns in the SciELF corpus. A corpus based analysis is used to identify the frequency of occurrence of the author-reference pronouns in these academic texts written in English by speakers of various L1s who use English as a lingua franca. The research questions that this study aims to answer are how frequent is the use of author reference pronouns in the academic texts in this corpus, does the use of author-reference pronouns depend on discipline and does the use of author-reference pronouns depend on the first author's L1.

Based on these research questions three hypotheses have been formulated. With respect to the frequency of use of author-reference pronouns, recent research (Hyland and Jiang, 2017; Dontcheva-Navratilova, 2013) has shown the frequency of use to be in the range of 5.6 (Hyland and Jiang, 2017) and 7.3 (Dontcheva-Navratilova, 2013) per 1,000 words. The hypothesis, therefore, is that the frequency of use is also in the SciELF corpus in the range of 5.6 - 7.3 per 1,000 words. With respect to author-reference pronoun use depending on the discipline, Hyland and Tse (2004), Hyland (2017), Dontcheva-Navratilova (2013) all agree that the soft sciences are more prone to the use of author-reference pronouns, therefore the hypothesis is that in the SciELF corpus the use of author-reference

pronouns will also be dependent on the discipline. And finally, with respect to the dependency of use of author-reference pronouns on first author's L1, Dontcheva-Navratilova (2013) in her contrastive study pointed out that the frequency did not vary according to the L1 of the speakers, but rather that the pronouns were used differently. Therefore, the hypothesis here is also that the frequency of use does not depend on the first author's L1.

The corpus and procedure

The analysis was performed on the SciELF corpus (2015) at the University of Helsinki. The University of Helsinki's team led by Anna Mauranen embarked on an ambitious journey the aim of which was to compile an extensive database for the study of the use of English as a lingua franca. The project called English as a Lingua Franca in Academic Settings (ELFA) consists of two main parts, the ELFA corpus project and the SELF project. The database of written academic ELF (WrELFA) is part of the wider ELFA project. The SciELF corpus is but a part of the WrELFA and consists of unedited research papers. It was compiled and processed by Ray Carey and his team of colleagues and international partners between the years 2011 and 2015. The corpus consists of 150 papers written by authors with ten different L1 backgrounds. In cases where there are more authors, L1 describes the first author of the paper. It was vital for the project that the papers had not undergone any proofreading services, checking by a native speaker of English, or editing by a journal editor.

The corpus consists of a balanced sample of papers among the sciences (labelled 'Sci') and the social sciences and humanities (labelled 'SSH') which is dubbed here category (see Table 1).

Table 1: Distribution of the broad binary categories in the SciELF corpus (Source: SciELF, 2015, p. 2)

category	articles	words	% of total	words/article
Sci	78	326,463	43%	4,185
SSH	72	432,837	57%	6,012
Total	150	759,300		5,062

The first author's L1 and domain visible in Tables 2 and 3 are important variables for the subsequent statistical analyses performed in my study. The division between the two parts of the corpus – the Sci and SSH categories –

is even for the first author's L1 categories. Unfortunately, the same cannot be said for the domains, as is apparent in Table 3.

Table 2: Overview of the SciELF corpus by first author's L1 (Source: SciELF, 2015, p. 2)

L1	articles	words	% of total	words/article
Finnish	25	123,153	16%	4,926
Czech	22	109,173	14%	4,962
French	16	91,186	12%	5,699
Chinese	21	84,807	11%	4,038
Spanish	13	79,038	10%	6,080
Russian	13	71,376	9%	5,490
Swedish	13	60,060	8%	4,620
Italian	11	58,685	8%	5,335
Portuguese (Brazil)	12	56,625	7%	4,719
Romanian	4	25,197	3%	6,299
Total	**150**	**759,300**		**5,062**

Table 3: Overview of the SciELF corpus by category and domain (Source: SciELF 2015, own compilation)

category / domain	articles	words	% of total	words/article
Sci	78	326,463	43%	4,185
natural sciences	59	256,912	79%	4,354
medicine	16	59,059	18%	3,691
agriculture & forestry	3	10,492	3%	3,497
SSH	72	432,837	57%	6,012
social sciences	33	193,187	45%	5,854
humanities	23	148,494	34%	6,456
behavioural sciences	16	91,156	21%	5,697
Total	**150**	**759,300**		**5,062**

Table 4 shows internal division between single-authored and co-authored texts within the Sci and SSH categories. The division shows the Sci category being predominantly co-authored (3.75 authors per text) while the texts in the SSH category are predominantly single-authored (1.5 authors per text).

Table 4: Single- and co-authored texts in Sci and SSH categories of the SciELF corpus (Source: SciELF 2015, own compilation)

Sci (78 texts)		SSH (72 texts)	
Single-authored	co-authored	Single-authored	co-authored
16	62	45	27

AntConc 3.4.4. (2015) was used to analyse the data: the software provided occurrences of pronouns which needed to be further cleared of all those not relevant for the research. The final count of the author-reference pronouns was cross-referenced with the domain and first author's L1 to see if there was any relation between these variables. In order to determine the dependency, I used a statistical analysis, namely the Kruskal-Wallis test. The Kruskal-Wallis test is a variation of the ANOVA test which allows for finding dependency between a nominal (first author's L1, domain) and ordinal data (frequency of author-reference pronouns). The Kruskal-Wallis test was performed using statistical software SPSS Statistics (2017), IBM.

Further interpretation of the results also draws on more in-depth analyses of the functions of author-reference pronouns by Tang and John (1999), Kuo (1999), Harwood (2005), Hyland (2002) and Dontcheva-Navratilova (2013). The reasons for the use of the author-reference pronouns are numerous, e.g., to explain what was done, structure the discourse, show results, make a claim (Hyland, 2002) with various degrees of authority, including possible hedging (Dontcheva-Navratilova, 2013). This study merely used the various possible functions of author-reference pronouns to venture an explanation of their occurrences and frequencies.

The analysis

The tokens searched for in the AntConc were defined as all first person singular and plural personal pronouns, possessive pronouns, possessive adjectives and reflexive pronouns. The average frequency of author-reference pronouns in the data is 22.8 per text which is 4.5 cases per 1,000

words in terms of a normalized rate. The number of occurrences of the author-reference pronouns ranged from 0 in 17 texts to 160 in text SSH11.

Table 5 shows the distribution of author-reference pronouns in the two categories of the SciELF corpus, the Sci and SSH. As the SSH category includes more single-authored texts than the Sci – 45 to 16 single-authored texts respectively – the significantly higher use of the first person singular pronoun in the SSH category is not surprising. In terms of the normalized rate per 1000 words, *I* earns a value of 0.76 in the SSH category versus 0.11 in the Sci one. Also in case of occurrence per text, the SSH category is a lot more productive yielding 7.3 cases of first person singular pronouns per text while in the Sci category it is only 2.3 cases. This corresponds with Hyland and Tse (2004) who claim that "the more 'soft knowledge' humanities and social science disciplines employed more metadiscourse overall" (p. 172). This was true even more so for what they call interactional features (stance), a category which incorporates author-reference pronouns.

As for the first person plural pronoun, the normalized rate in the Sci category is slightly higher than in the SSH one – 3.0 to 2.41 respectively. However, the occurrence of the pronoun per text is significantly higher in the SSH corpus (38.6 cases per text in the SSH category compared to 15.8 cases in the Sci).

Table 5: The use of author reference pronouns in Sci and SSH categories (Source: AntConc, own research)

Category / pronouns	**Sci (78 texts)**		**SSH (72 texts)**		**Total (150 texts)**	
	Raw no.	Norm. rate	Raw no.	Norm. rate	Raw no.	Norm. rate
I	37	0.11	330	0.76	367	0.48
me	0	0.00	47	0.11	47	0.06
my	3	0.01	148	0.34	151	0.20
mine	0	0.00	1	0.00	1	0.00
myself	0	0.00	3	0.01	3	0.00
we	980	3.00	1042	2.41	2022	2.66
us	34	0.10	149	0.34	183	0.24
our	334	1.02	306	0.71	640	0.84
ours	2	0.01	1	0.00	3	0.00
ourselves	0	0.00	9	0.02	9	0.01
Total	**1390**	**4.26**	**2036**	**4.70**	**3426**	**4.51**

Table 6 shows the distribution of author-reference pronouns per text according to the number of authors. It is clear from the table that while 89 percent of the authors used at least one author-reference pronoun in their texts, only 11 percent of authors did not use any author-reference pronouns in their texts.

Table 6: Author-reference pronouns according to number of authors (Source: AntConc, own research)

Number of authors	Single-authored		co-authored		Total	
	Raw no.	% of texts	Raw no.	% of texts	Raw no.	% of texts
I	27	44	3	3	30	20
me	9	15	0	0	9	6
my	24	39	0	0	24	16
mine	1	2	0	0	1	1
myself	3	5	0	0	3	2
we	49	80	75	84	124	83
us	24	39	32	36	56	37
our	43	70	62	70	105	70
ours	1	2	1	1	2	1
ourselves	5	8	2	2	7	5
Total	**57**	**93**	**76**	**85**	**133**	**89**

Special attention must be paid to the 80% of single-author texts that employ the first person plural. Also the use of the first person singular in co-authored articles is of interest. The total number of occurrences is 10 (see Table 7), and 8 of these cases occurred in text SSH08 in the description of a research process used in this study, which can be seen in the examples (1) – (2). The usage follows in close succession at the beginning of the text with one exception, which occurs in the conclusion – example (3). It is likely that had this paper undergone editorial correction, this personal pronoun would have been changed to the pronoun we. As it is usually one person writing

the text, it is understandable that this person might err and write in the first person singular.

(1) In this paper, **I** explain how to use film as an effective medium for teaching English language skills. **(SSH08)**

(2) Teaching materials that **I** use in class are: an accurate transcript of the film's dialogue, an mp3 **(SSH08)**

(3) **I** have learned that it is nearly useless to teach listening skills using auditory material alone. **(SSH08)**

The other two cases are sporadic and therefore even more likely to be put down to error. While the text SSH08 showed 8 occurrences of *I* and only one occurrence of *our*, the texts SSH33 and SSH57 proved to be a lot more fruitful regarding the use of plural forms of author-reference. The text SSH33 shows 77 occurrences of the first person plural and the only one of the first person singular and text SSH57 showed 37 occurrences of the first person plural and again one use of the first person singular. In examples (4) – (5) one can see the usage in texts SSH33 and SSH57.

(4) This layer proposes to give answer to the following questions: how trustworthy is information found on the semantic Web? How do **I** decide that it is trustworthy? In 2004, [6][7] defined three types of trust mechanisms: **(SSH33)**

(5) **I** will discuss St. Xenia's image in ROCA publications later in the text. **(SSH57)**

In example (3) it is questionable whether the use of *I* in this respect falls into the category of author-reference pronouns. It is my belief that the author used the first person singular in this instance intentionally to intensify the readers feeling of being alone when making this decision. The author was, in my opinion, involving the reader, searching for common ground with the reader, and at the same time showing the reader the difficulty of the situation. As an intentional interactional choice, the example would fall into the category of authorial voice use. Thompson (2001) calls this concept 'reader-in-the-text' and defines it as a set of interactional devices that aim to include "a voice in the text that is intended to be attributed to the reader" (Thompson, 2001, p.1).

Table 7 shows the use of author-reference pronouns per 1,000 words of text as was their occurrence in the single-authored and co-authored texts. Dontcheva-Navratilova (2013, p.17) suggests that the possibility to employ the author-reference pronoun *we* in its exclusive form leads to a higher number of personal structures. This seems to be the case in the SciELF

corpus as well because the single-authored texts show a lower use of author-reference pronouns than the co-authored texts (4.31 to 4.70 respectively).

It is clear from Table 5 that the SSH category, despite the fact that it consists of a greater number of single-authored texts, shows a higher rate of occurrences of author-reference pronouns. This would suggest that the domain the text belongs to has a greater importance in the number of usages of personal structures than the number of authors, assuming that the exclusive *we* was predominantly used in the co-authored texts.

Table 7: Author reference pronouns per 1000 words in single- and co-authored texts (Source: AntConc, own research)

Number of authors / pronouns	Single-authored		Co-authored		Total	
	Raw no.	Norm. rate	Raw no.	Norm. rate	Raw no.	Norm. rate
I	357	0.98	10	0.03	367	0.48
me	47	0.13	0	0.00	47	0.06
my	151	0.42	0	0.00	151	0.20
mine	1	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.00
myself	3	0.01	0	0.00	3	0.00
we	735	2.02	1,287	3.25	2,022	2.66
us	95	0.26	88	0.22	183	0.24
our	169	0.47	471	1.19	640	0.84
ours	1	0.00	2	0.01	3	0.00
ourselves	7	0.02	2	0.01	9	0.01
Total	**1,566**	**4.31**	**1,860**	**4.70**	**3,426**	**4.51**

If we look at the frequency of use of author-reference pronouns per 1,000 words in the two categories separately (Table 8), we find that in the Sci category the frequency of use of personal structures in single-author texts is higher than it is in the co-authored ones with the ratio of the normalised rate being 4.98 for the single-authored texts to 4.05 in the co-authored ones. In the SSH category the single-authored texts delivered a

lower frequency of use of the personal structures in comparison with the co-authored ones with the normalized rate being 4.14 to 5.85 respectively.

Table 8: Author-reference pronouns in Sci and SSH categories (Source: AntConc, own research)

Category	Sci		SSH		Total	
	Raw no.	Norm. rate	Raw no.	Norm. rate	Raw no.	Norm. rate
Single-authored	360	4.98	1,206	4.14	1,566	4.31
Co-authored	1,025	4.03	830	5.85	1,855	4.68
Total	**1,385**	**4.24**	**2,036**	**4.70**	**3,421**	**4.51**

Table 9 is a summary of the use of author-reference pronouns in the corpus. It stands out that the use of the plural form of the author-reference pronouns is much higher than the use of the singular form. Out of a total use of author-reference personal pronouns (3,426 cases), 83% of these uses was due to the plural form. Even in the single-author texts, the percentage of use of author-reference pronouns is largely in favour of the plural pronouns (64 to 36 %).

Table 9: Author-reference pronouns in single-authored and co-authored texts summarized (Source: AntConc, own research)

Number of authors	Single-authored		co-authored		Total	
	Raw no.	Norm. rate	Raw no.	Norm. rate	Raw no.	Norm. rate
1st person sg.	559	1.54	10	0.03	569	0.75
1st person pl.	1,01	2.77	1,85	4.67	2,86	3.76
Total	**1,57**	**4.31**	**1,86**	**4.70**	**3,43**	**4.51**

Table 10 shows the number of occurrences of author-reference pronouns according to the first author's L1. It also shows the statistical median and normalized rate, which is again the number of occurrences per 1000 words. The data in Table 10 are ordered according to the median, starting with the lowest value. The median was chosen because it represents the true middle

value of the number of occurrences per text as the data tended to have the typical bell-shaped structure.

Table 10: First author's L1 and the use of author-reference pronouns (Source: AntConc, own research)

First author's L1	First person total	No. of articles	Median	Norm. rate
Swedish	108	13	3	1.8
Romanian	36	4	5.5	1.43
Czech	596	22	9	6.6
Portuguese	213	12	10	3.76
Finnish	444	25	11	3.61
Chinese	273	21	12	3.22
Italian	472	11	19	8.04
French	502	16	21.5	5.51
Spanish	438	13	25	5.54
Russian	546	13	38	7.65

A statistical test was performed to confirm or reject the hypothesis that the occurrence of author-reference pronouns does not depend on the first author's L1. In order to perform the Kruskal-Wallis test, a null hypothesis had to be formulated. The null hypothesis stated that the distribution of the number of author-reference pronouns does not vary depending on the category the first author's L1. This hypothesis was then tested at the significance level 0.05. This basically means that in 95% of the cases the test would yield the same results. The null hypothesis was rejected with a high 0.002 asymptotic significance level. The performed test therefore shows that there is dependency between the category of the first author's L1 and the use of author-reference pronouns.

Similarly, the occurrences of author-reference pronouns were studied depending on the domains (for the values refer to Table 11). Unfortunately, the division between the domains is not as even as in the case of the first author's L1.

Table 11: Domain and the use of author-reference pronouns (Source: AntConc, own research)

Domain	First person total	No. of articles	Median	Norm. rate
agriculture and forestry	48	3	4	4.57
natural sciences	1,091	59	6	4.25
social sciences	705	33	12	3.65
medicine	245	15	13.5	4.15
behavioral sciences	406	16	16.5	4.45
humanities	925	23	29	6.23

To test the hypothesis that the use of author-reference pronouns depends on the discipline, a statistical analysis was performed. A null hypothesis had to be formulated stating that the distribution of the number of author-reference pronouns does not vary depending on the domain. This hypothesis was tested at the significance level 0.05. The null hypothesis was rejected with a high 0.018 asymptotic significance level. The performed test therefore shows that there is dependency between the category domain and the use of author-reference pronouns.

The results of the statistical analyses show that there is a statistically significant dependency of the variable first author's L1 and the frequency of use of author-reference pronouns as well as the variable domain and the frequency of use of the author-reference pronouns.

Conclusion

The aim of this study was to establish the frequency of use of the author-reference pronouns in the SciELF corpus as a means of expressing authorial presence. The study also aimed to establish whether the use varied according to discipline and/or cultural background. As a first step of the research, a corpus based analysis was performed. The data were then used in a statistical test in order to determine the dependency of the variables of the first author's L1 and the frequency of use of author-reference pronouns on one hand and the domain and the frequency of use of the author-reference pronouns on the other.

The study showed that only 11% of the articles did not use any author-reference pronouns, the remaining 89% having an occurrence of at least one use in 8 different texts. The highest frequency of use of author-reference pronouns, 160 cases, is in the text SSH11. The plural forms of the author-reference pronouns are more frequent in the texts than the singular ones with the ratio 83 to 17%. This holds true for single-authored texts, where the ratio is 64 to 36% in favour of the plural forms.

Based on the research questions, three hypotheses were formulated. Regarding the frequency of author-reference pronouns the hypothesis researched expected the frequency to range between 7.3 and 5.6 per 1,000 words. The normalized rate of frequency of use in the SciELF corpus is 4.51 per 1,000 words and therefore less than was expected.

Regarding the dependency of the variable domain and the frequency of use, it was expected that the frequency of use would be dependent on the domain. The statistical Kruskal-Wallis test confirmed that there is dependency of the frequency of author-reference pronouns and the domain.

The last hypothesis stated that there would be no dependency between the frequency of the author-reference pronouns and the first author's L1. The Kruskal-Wallis test rejected this hypothesis and confirmed a dependency of the frequency of author-reference pronouns and the first author's L1.

These findings would indicate that the domain is not the only variable having influence on the frequency of use of the author-reference pronouns. The same is true for the first author's L1. The results could also suggest that the use of author-reference pronouns is a matter of the writer's idiolect being affected by more than just the domain the writer belongs to.

Acknowledgement

This article is an outcome of the Student Grant Competition grant, project no. SGS09/FF/2018 *Komunikace napříč kulturami: lokální a translokální rysy žánrů online i offline II - Communicating Across Cultures: Local and Translocal Features of Genres in Online and Offline Environment II.*

Článek vyšel s finanční podporou Studentské grantové soutěže specifického vysokoškolského výzkumu, grant č. SGS09/FF/2018 s názvem *Komunikace napříč kulturami: lokální a translokální rysy žánrů online i offline II.*

References

Biber, D. & E. Finegan. (1989). Styles of stance in English: Lexical and grammatical marking of evidentiality and affect. American Journal of Educational Research, 9(1), 93-124.

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

Dontcheva-Navratilova, O. (2013). Authorial presence in academic discourse: functions of author-reference pronouns. Linguistica Pragencia, 23(1), 9-30.

Harwood, N. (2005). 'We do not seem to have a theory... The theory I present here attempts to fill this gap': Inclusive and exclusive pronouns in academic writing. Applied Linguistics, 26(3), 343-375.

Hunston, S. & G. Thompson. (Eds). (1999). Evaluation in text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hyland, K. (2002). Options of identity in academic writing. English Language Teaching Journal, 56(4), 351-358.

Hyland, K. (2005). Stance and engagement: a model of interaction in academic diskurse. Discourse studies, 7(2), 173-192.

Hyland, K. & P. Tse. (2004). Metadiscourse in Academic Writing: A Reappraisal. Applied Linguistic, 25(2), 156-177.

Hyland, K. & K. Jiang. (2017). Is academic writing becoming more informal? English for Specific Purposes, 45, 40-51.

Jenkins, J. (2007). English as a lingua franca: attitude and identity. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kuo, C. (1999). The use of personal pronouns: Role relationships in scientific journal articles. English for Specific Purposes, 18(2), 121-138.

Martin, J. (Eds). (2000). Beyond Exchange: APPRAISAL Systems in English in S. Hunson and G. Thompson. Evaluation in Text. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Martin, J. & P. White. (2005). The Language of Evaluation. Appraisal in English. London: Palgrave.

Mauranen, A. (2012). Exploring ELF: academic English shaped by non-native speakers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

SciELF 2015. The SciELF corpus. Director: Anna Mauranen. Compilation manager: Ray Carey. Retrieved from http://www.helsinki.fi/elfa/scielf.html.

Seidlhofer, B. (2011). Understanding English as a lingua franca. Oxford: Oxford University Pres.

Tang, R. & S. John. (1999). The ‘I’ in identity: Exploring writer identity in student academic writing through the first person pronoun. English for Specific Purposes, 18, 23-39.
Thompson, G. (2001). Interaction in Academic Writing: Learning to Argue with the Reader. Applied Linguistic, 22(1), 58-78.