

Litera

Правильная ссылка на статью:

Han H., Dugalich N.M. Self-mention in Chinese linguistic MA novices' and experts' academic writing: A corpus-driven investigation of 'we' // Litera. 2024. № 4. DOI: 10.25136/2409-8698.2024.4.70516 EDN: TSJZST URL: https://nbpublish.com/library_read_article.php?id=70516

Self-mention in Chinese linguistic MA novices' and experts' academic writing: A corpus-driven investigation of 'we' / Средства указания на автора в научных текстах: корпусное исследование

Хань Хао

ORCID: 0009-0004-3832-6660

аспирант, кафедра иностранных языков филологического факультета, Российский университет дружбы народов имени Патриса Лумумбы

117198, Россия, г. Москва, ул. Миклухо-Маклая, 6

✉ 1042218192@rudn.ru



Дугалич Наталья Михайловна

ORCID: 0000-0003-1863-2754

кандидат филологических наук

заведующая кафедрой иностранных языков медицинского института Российского университета дружбы народов имени Патриса Лумумбы, доцент кафедры иностранных языков филологического факультета Российского университета дружбы народов имени Патриса Лумумбы

117198, Россия, г. Москва, ул. Миклухо-Маклая, 6

✉ dugalich_nm@pfur.ru



[Статья из рубрики "Лингвистика"](#)

DOI:

10.25136/2409-8698.2024.4.70516

EDN:

TSJZST

Дата направления статьи в редакцию:

16-04-2024

Дата публикации:

23-04-2024

Аннотация: Целью исследования является проведение сравнительного анализа средств указания на автора научного текста, в частности использования местоимения *we* 'мы', как средства убеждения в академическом дискурсе. Проводится сравнительный анализ научных текстов, выполненных магистрантами-лингвистами и китайскими учеными, для которых английский язык является иностранным. Средства, указывающие на автора научного текста, выполняют риторические функции убеждения. Для авторов, пишущих на неродном языке, овладение указанными риторическими функциями представляет собой продвинутый навык академического письма. Объект исследования – структурные элементы фраз, указывающих на себя как на автора научного текста. Цель исследования состоит в том, чтобы проанализировать характеристики средств указания на автора научного текста в научных статьях китайских лингвистов, опубликованных на английском языке в международных журналах, взятых из базы данных ILJA_C, и китайских магистерских диссертаций, выбранных из базы данных CLMA_C. Предмет исследования – сходства и различия в использовании средств указания на автора научного текста в ILJA_C и CLMA_C. В методологии исследования используется корпусный подход, дискурс-анализ (академический дискурс), сравнительный анализ на материале академического письма. Новизна данного исследования заключается в анализе коллокационных характеристик и особенностей употребления личных местоимений, прежде всего, местоимения *we* 'мы' в текстах баз данных CLMA_C и ILJA_C. Исследование позволяет оценить уровень корректности в использовании средств указания на автора научного текста авторами, которые пишут на английском языке как иностранном. Результаты показывают значительные различия в использовании рассматриваемых средств в научных работах, выполненных китайскими лингвистами и магистрантами: лингвисты отдают приоритет в использовании средств указания на автора научного текста для реализации контактоустанавливающей функции, выражения позиции и оценки; магистранты-лингвисты — преимущественно для описания выводов исследования; также обнаружены различия в сочетаемости рассматриваемых единиц. Анализ показал необходимость выделения структурных элементов фраз, указывающие на себя как на автора научного текста, как аспекта научного текста, который требует особого внимания в рамках обучения академическому письму.

Ключевые слова:

средства указания автора, сочетаемость, английский как иностранный, академическое письмо, магистерская диссертация, сравнительный анализ, научный текст, дискурс-анализ, личные местоимения, китайские магистранты

Introduction

Academic discourse serves as a crucial medium for knowledge dissemination and scholarly exchange. With the development of functional linguistics and the sociology of scientific knowledge, it has been increasingly recognized that academic discourse not only conveys scientific information and produces credible texts but also expresses rich interpersonal meanings (see: F. Jiang [\[12\]](#), K. Hyland [\[8\]](#), F. Jiang [\[13\]](#)). The credibility and acceptance of a paper depend not only on the reliability and validity of the research itself but also on the persuasiveness of the author's argumentation, namely academic persuasion. We should also consider the studies of Russian linguists V. V. Zueva [\[1\]](#) and I. Yu. Shchemeleva [\[2\]](#), devoted to the use of means of indicating the author of a scientific text. This is a relevant direction for theoretical and practical research, since English has become widespread as the

language of scientific communication.

The premise is that the presentation of viewpoints should adhere to academic discourse conventions to resonate with readers [12]. The process of persuasion and argumentation is most directly manifested when authors intervene in the discourse explicitly through linguistic means, organize text segments, evaluate discourse content, and guide readers in co-constructing discourse [11]. For example, the phrase 'we show that' compared to 'the results show that' highlights the author's involvement in the research findings, aiding readers in identifying the author's innovative contribution. Thus, self-mention serves as an important means of interactive persuasion and enhancing the author's visibility in academic discourse.

Self-mentions, such as 'I', 'my' and 'we', play crucial role in academic discourse, signaling the author's presence and fostering engagement with the reader. They serve as essential tools for establishing authorial identity and advancing persuasive arguments. Despite their growing importance in academic writing and knowledge construction [10], Chinese novice writers face challenges in utilizing self-mentions effectively to craft their academic texts and present coherent arguments (see: Y. Sun [19] and J. Wang & F. Jiang [22]). This difficulty is compounded by the limited emphasis on the lexical and grammatical aspects of self-mention in existing literature, which tends to focus more on their rhetorical functions (see: K. Hyland [7], F. Jiang [14], M. Walková [21]). Furthermore, traditional Chinese pedagogy often neglects the instruction of self-mention, with some educational materials even discouraging its use in academic writing (see: K. Bennett [3], F. Jiang & K. Hyland [15]), further hindering students' acquisition of effective self-referential techniques. M. Walková [21] suggests that rhetorical function is just one aspect of self-mention usage, and phrase structure pose greater obstacles for second language authors to master self-mention.

Hence, this research, utilizing self-compiled corpora of Chinese linguistic MA theses and international journal articles, compares the collocational and chunk features of 'we' usage between novices and experts, with the objective of offering insights and references for the comparative analysis of academic English writing instruction.

Therefore, this study primarily focuses on three tasks concerning the examination of self-mention 'we': firstly, extracting strong left and right collocates around 'we' and categorizing them from both disciplinary culture and semantic functional perspectives; secondly, utilizing corpus-driven methods to compute high-frequency chunks guided by 'we' in both corpora and summarizing the overall chunk characteristics in CLMA_C and ILJA_C; and finally, conducting a comparative analysis of the collocation features and chunk characteristics between Chinese learners and international journal authors.

Based on these three tasks, the research methodology of this study primarily employs a corpus-driven approach and academic discourse analysis. The examination of chunk characteristics of self-mention 'we' necessitates a bottom-up corpus-driven approach, while the comparison of collocation features of self-mention 'we' between Chinese linguistic MA novices and experts requires detailed analysis. Understanding the differences between the two groups relies on the application of academic discourse analysis.

The object of this study is to perform a comparative analysis of self-mention 'we' between Chinese linguistic MA novices and linguistic experts. The subject of this investigation is to examine the resemblances and disparities in the collocational patterns and chunk structures

of self-mention 'we' within the academic discourse of these two groups.

Previous research has identified various functions of self-mention in academic persuasion. K. Hyland [8] found that self-mention enhances the persuasiveness of academic discourse through five main functions: stating research objectives, introducing research processes, explaining arguments, presenting research results, and expressing personal contributions. R. Tang & S. John [20] argued that the persuasive function of self-mention constructs different academic identities for authors, such as 'guide', 'recounter', and 'opinion-holder', thereby influencing readers' acceptance of viewpoints. Additionally, disciplinary differences and author groups can also influence the use of self-mention. K. Hyland [7] and F. Jiang [12] found that self-mention is significantly less frequent in natural sciences compared to humanities and social sciences. However, recent studies indicate a significant change in this trend, with a notable increase in the use of self-mention in natural sciences, primarily in the form of 'we' (see: F. Jiang & K. Hyland [15]). Regarding differences in the author groups using self-mention, M. Walková [21] and X. Yang [23] found that second language learners tend to use self-mention less frequently compared to native speakers, thereby downplaying their personal knowledge contributions. K. Fløttum [6] suggests that this covert presentation contradicts the English writing culture, which emphasizes explicit presentation of key information. J. Wang and F. Jiang [22], and X. Yang [23] found instances of underuse and misuse of 'we' in Chinese students' academic writing, suggesting that differences in self-mention usage between students and experts warrant further systematic investigation.

The majority of previous studies in this area have primarily focused on identifying various rhetorical functions of self-mention, with minimal attention paid to collocational phrase structures. In fact, for second language (L2) writers, mastery of rhetorical functions represents an advanced writing skill, which cannot be achieved without a proficient command of the structural aspects of self-mention phrases.

Given this context, the present study employs a corpus-driven approach to contrast the collocational and chunk features of the use of the self-mention pronoun 'we' between Chinese linguistic MA novices and linguistic experts. Through this analysis, the aim is to gain insights into how novice scholars construct discourse, present knowledge, express academic stances, and establish interpersonal interaction when utilizing self-mention 'we' in academic writing. Therefore, the research questions are: (1) What are the collocation characteristics and chunk features of self-mention 'we' in Chinese linguistic MA theses and international linguistic journal articles? (2) Concerning these collocation characteristics and chunk features, what are the similarities and differences between them? And what are the reasons?

Research methodology

This study uses two corpora: the self-built Chinese Linguistic MA Theses Corpus (CLMA_C) and the International Linguistic Journal Articles Corpus (ILJA_C). The CLMA_C contains 804,935 words and contains 50 English Master of Arts theses written by Chinese postgraduate students in linguistics. The ILJA_C contains 802,490 words and contains 100 articles written by established linguistic experts. The research methodology involves the following steps:

1. Utilizing the GraphColl feature of the LancsBox 6.0 [5] software to calculate strong left and right collocates around the pronoun 'we' and categorizing them based on disciplinary culture and semantic functional perspectives.

2. Employing the N-grams feature of LancsBox 6.0 to compute high-frequency chunks within both corpora, and summarizing the overall chunk characteristics associated with the use of 'we' in CLMA_C and ILJA_C.
3. Conducting a comparative analysis of the collocation features and chunk characteristics between Chinese learners and authors of international journal articles.

Analysis and discussion

1. Overall collocation characteristics of 'we' in CLMA_C and ILJA_C

In this section, LancsBox 6.0 was utilized to calculate the frequency of left and right collocates of 'we' in the CLMA_C and ILJA_C corpora respectively. These frequencies were then sorted by MI3 score, a metric designed to rebalance the Mutual Information (MI) score by assigning greater importance to frequent words and lesser importance to infrequent ones [17]. This approach is influential for identifying strong collocates of a given search item. The detailed data concerning the left collocates of 'we' are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Left collocates of 'we' in CLMA_C and ILJA_C

CLMA_C			ILJA_C		
Collocates	MI3	Frequency	Collocates	MI3	Frequency
in	21.70	78	in	22.20	671
of	20.63	569	of	21.40	618
this	19.97	511	this	20.67	297
from	19.96	236	and	20.63	483
and	19.51	206	as	19.77	278
above	19.29	358	what	18.08	104
as	18.74	95	if	17.71	79
so	18.05	201	is	17.59	171
is	17.62	92	for	17.47	149
when	17.48	186	here	16.51	50

Notes: To facilitate the presentation and comparison of data analysis, the minimum threshold for MI3 is set to 16.

Regarding the similarities, in both sets of data, the words 'in', 'of', 'this', 'and', 'as' and 'is' are observed as collocates of 'we'. This indicates that these words are commonly used in association with 'we', whether by Chinese master's students learning English or by authors of international authoritative journals. These words are primarily utilized for constructing discourse structures and logic, as exemplified by phrases such as 'in this section, we...', 'as we have seen...' and 'is what we call...'.

In terms of their differences, four words appear exclusively in each set of data: 'from', 'above', 'so' and 'when' in CLMA_C, and 'what', 'if', 'for' and 'here' in ILJA_C. These words reflect different linguistic functions and styles. 'From', 'above', 'so' and 'when' are primarily used to express relationships such as source, context, causality, and time, as seen in phrases like 'from this perspective, we...', 'above all, we...', 'so we can conclude...' and 'when we...', which are exemplified in complete sentences (1) to (4). These collocations align with the hypothesis that Chinese master's students emphasize guiding readers through discourse structure and logic when using 'we'.

(1) From this perspective, we should interpret the features of human communications and social processes, symbolization of social structures, and the language process in which social members constitute social semiotics (CLMA_C).

Sentence (1) elucidates the purpose, which is to understand social semiotics, and subsequently delineates the steps that 'we' need to undertake.

(2) From above all we can conclude that conjunctive Adjuncts are not the constituents within Mood structure but they form a constituent on their own, which is the part of the clause (CLMA_C).

Sentence (2) highlights the shared journey of analysis 'we' have undertaken and presents the conclusion.

(3) So we can conclude that the source selection in the legal metaphors, to some extent, is subject to the already existing targets (CLMA_C).

Sentence (3) emphasizes the shared investigation 'we' are conducting and the resulting observation.

(4) However, when we move onto the next stage of Interpretation, we find that the authentic recording of the direct citing form definite news source is rather limited (CLMA_C).

Sentence (4) highlights the transition in the discussion 'we' are making and presents a challenge encountered.

In all four sentences, the use of 'we' creates a sense of a shared journey with the reader. The author guides the reader through their analysis or interpretation, making the thought process and reasoning clear. This reinforces the hypothesis that Chinese master's students might use 'we' strategically to enhance clarity and guide readers through the logic of their arguments.

While 'what', 'if', 'for' and 'here' are mainly used to express questions, hypotheses, purposes, and positions, as shown in phrases like 'what we propose...', 'if we assume...', 'for this reason, we...' and 'here we present...'. These collocations also align with the hypothesis that authors of international authoritative journals or disciplinary experts prioritize using 'we' to present their academic positions and innovations.

In academic writing, employing words such as 'what', 'if', 'for' and 'here' in conjunction with 'we' to express questions, hypotheses, purposes, and positions is crucial for showcasing academic positions and knowledge innovations for authors of international authoritative journals or disciplinary experts. The following are examples and their explanations:

(5) What we found was that Victoria was seemingly working through three central questions in her accounts of her L2 writing (ILJA_C).

In this example, 'what' introduces the content discovered by the authors, emphasizing the three central questions that Victoria appears to be addressing in her description of second language writing.

(6) If we assume that L2 speakers are much more likely than L1 speakers to face problems.

Here, 'if' introduces a hypothetical scenario where it is assumed that L2 speakers are much more likely than L1 speakers to encounter problems.

(7) For this reason, we might expect to find it in the informal written conversations that

occur in online environments.

In this instance, 'for' introduces the reason or justification behind an expectation, indicating that it is logical to anticipate finding something in informal written conversations that occur in online environments.

(8) Here, we present a conceptual model for studying adolescent L2 writers and their writing and we identify distinct vantage points for understanding and researching this population.

In this example, 'here' introduces the current location or context of the discussion, emphasizing that the authors are presenting a conceptual model for studying adolescent L2 writers and their writing, as well as identifying distinct vantage points for understanding and researching this population.

These examples demonstrate how using these key words in conjunction with 'we' can emphasize authors' academic positions, knowledge innovations, and research viewpoints. Such clear expression aids readers in understanding authors' perspectives and facilitates comprehension and evaluation of research results.

The calculated numerical data pertaining to the right collocates of 'we' in CLMA_C and ILJA_C are presented in Table 2, organized in descending order based on their MI3 scores.

Table 2. Right collocates of 'we' in CLMA_C and ILJA_C

CLMA_C			ILJA_C		
Collocates	MI3	Frequency	Collocates	MI3	Frequency
can	24.18	568	be	21.54	599
see	21.99	199	have	20.43	276
find	21.32	197	can	19.86	181
be	20.37	459	see	19.66	147
will	20.22	163	will	19.14	113
have	20.10	234	find	18.33	95
know	19.69	91	believe	18.08	51
say	17.90	69	do	18.03	115
get	17.04	53	discuss	17.42	62
should	17.03	66	know	17.32	65
need	16.66	43	use	17.08	100
mention	16.63	42	argue	16.88	52
discuss	16.48	44	would	16.64	62
do	16.33	66	examine	16.61	53
conclude	16.20	32	observe	16.58	40
must	16.08	34	need	16.40	51
use	16.06	80	consider	15.99	48
analyze	15.93	50	present	15.88	42
go	15.77	33	focus	15.41	40
think	15.49	37	identify	15.11	38

Notes: To facilitate the presentation and comparison of data analysis, the maximum threshold for MI3 is set to 15.

Due to the predominance of verbs as right collocates in both corpora (exceeding 90%), we classify them based on their semantic functions as verbs, following D. Biber et al. [4]. The

specific categorization is illustrated in the Table 3.

Table 3. Semantic functions of the right collocates of 'we' in CLMA_C and ILJA_C

Semantic functions	CLMA_C	ILJA_C
State or attribute	be, have	be, have
Ability or possibility	can, will, should, must	can, will, would, should
Cognition or judgment	see, find, know, say, conclude, think	see, find, know, believe, argue, consider,
Action or process	do, discuss, use, get, mention, analyze, go	do, discuss, use, examine, observe, present, focus, identify
Necessity or purpose	need	need

From Table 3, it is evident that both Chinese master’s English learners and authors of international authoritative journals exhibit consistency in the classification of semantic functions. When paired with verbs, they generally reflect a scientific research status, demonstrating academic credibility and cognition, and describing academic research processes and purposes. Examples include phrases like ‘we have made a/an... analysis’, ‘we can assume’, ‘we see... as’ and ‘we discuss....’.

However, there are differences in the specific vocabulary choices for the semantic functions of ‘Cognition or judgment’ and ‘Action or process’. In the "Cognition or judgment" category, Chinese master’s English learners tend to use more cognition-oriented verbs such as ‘say’ and ‘conclude’ to describe their findings or conclusions. For instance:

(9) For example, when we say ‘by and large’, it only requires retrieving from the memory knowledge of the idiom (CLMA_C).

(10) We conclude that the reverse form ‘Ground-Figure’ in news headlines greatly contributes to the strong emphasis of certain information (CLMA_C).

On the other hand, authors of international authoritative journals tend to use verbs from the ‘judgment’ category to engage in subjective arguments, such as ‘believe’, ‘argue’ and ‘consider’. These verbs, when paired with ‘we’, indicate the authors’ stance and guide the reader on interpreting the presented information. For example:

(11) We believe that the observed pattern of use of boosters can be plausibly explained in terms of the nature of the supports that claims in empirical vs. non-empirical academic articles are typically based on (ILJA_C).

Sometimes, they also utilize verbs from the ‘possibility’ category such as ‘would’ to convey a certain degree of humility and caution, as exemplified by:

(12) We would argue that such a dialogue is important for at least two reasons (ILJA_C).

Moreover, Chinese master’s English learners tend to use more general action verbs (e.g., ‘do’, ‘get’) and ‘mention’ to introduce topics when paired with verbs from the “Action or process” category, reflecting their developing research skills. However, they also employ verbs like ‘analyze’, indicating deeper analysis. Examples include:

(13) Through analysis, we get that Chinese writers tend to employ more generic headings

than that of Canadian writers (CLMA_C).

(14) The second point we mention here is the features of metaphor (CLMA_C).

(15) On the one hand, the interaction we discuss in this study is a sort of social interaction (CLMA_C).

Authors of international authoritative journals, on the other hand, tend to use action verbs that reflect more rigorous research activities like examining, observing, presenting, and identifying. Their process verbs focus on collaboration (e.g., 'discuss') and applying methods to reach focused conclusions. Examples include:

(16) In the second part, we examine themes that emerged across the various interviews (ILJA_C).

(17) We observe three discourse markers – you know, and, and right? (ILJA_C).

2. Overall chunk characteristics of 'we' in CLMA_C and ILJA_C

This section will present the chunk characteristics of Chinese linguistic MA novices' and experts' aided with LancsBox 6.0. I will examine the four-word chunks in patterns guided by 'we'.

Table 4. Four-word chunks characteristics guided by 'we' in CLMA_C and ILJA_C

CLMA_C		ILJA_C			
Frequency	Text span	4-word chunks	Frequency	Text span	4-word chunks
68	24	we can see that	12	10	We believe that the
28	14	we can find that	8	5	we were able to
26	13	we can see the	7	6	we would like to
22	9	we can say that	7	5	we would argue that
19	7	we find that the	7	6	we can see that
15	9	we can conclude that			
13	5	we are going to			
11	5	We can see from			
10	7	we can get the			
9	7	we can find out			
8	6	we can find the			
6	6	we know that the			

Notes: The chunks appear with a minimum frequency of 6 times, and the text span of chunks appears with a minimum frequency of 5 times.

According to K. Hyland [9], chunks or lexical bundles can be functionally categorized into three types: research-oriented, text-oriented, and participant-oriented. Research-oriented bundles assist writers in organizing their activities and experiences in the real world. Text-oriented bundles concern the organization of the text and its meaning as a message or argument. Participant-oriented bundles are used to establish a relationship between the author and the reader, expressing the author’s attitudes, evaluations, and positions. Based on these types, I have categorized the provided lexical bundles as Table 5.

Table 5. Functional categories of four-word chunks guided by ‘we’ in CLMA_C and ILJA_C

Types	CLMA_C	ILJA_C
Research-oriented bundles	we can find that, we can find the, we can conclude that, we can get the, we can find out	
Text-oriented bundles	we are going to, we can see from	
Participant-oriented bundles	we can see that, we can see the, we can say that	we can see that, we believe that the, we were able to, we would like to, we would argue that

In terms of similarities, both Chinese master English learners and international authoritative journal authors use research-oriented, text-oriented, and participant-oriented bundles to achieve discourse and interpersonal functions in academic papers.

Concerning their discrepancy, there are significant differences in the frequency and type of bundles used by the two groups. Chinese master English learners tend to use research-oriented bundles and text-oriented bundles, such as “we can find that”, “we can conclude that” and “we can see from”, mainly to describe research results and activities.

(18) By analyzing these processes, we can find that quotation marks are used in these processes for three times (CLMA_C).

International authoritative journal authors, on the other hand, tend to use participant-oriented bundles, such as ‘We believe that the’ and ‘we would argue that’, mainly to establish a relationship with the reader and express the author’s evaluation and position.

(19) We would argue that such a dialogue is important for at least two reasons (ILJA_C).

These similarities and differences may reflect the different purposes and styles of the two groups in academic writing. Chinese master English learners may focus more on presenting the research process and data, while international authoritative journal authors may pay more attention to presenting the research contribution and opinion. This is consistent with the findings of other studies (see: L. Sun [18], B. Lou [16]), indicating that Chinese master English learners use metadiscourse to construct their identity in academic English writing, with lower overall frequency, evaluator identity, and interlocutor identity compared to

international journal authors.

To enhance the level of academic English writing, Chinese master English learners can learn from the bundle usage patterns of international authoritative journal authors, appropriately increasing the frequency of bundle usage, especially participant-oriented bundles, to improve the persuasiveness and communicative effectiveness of academic papers.

Conclusion

Based on the research analysis conducted, it is evident that there are notable differences in the usage patterns of 'we' in Chinese linguistic MA theses (CLMA_C) and international journal articles (ILJA_C). In CLMA_C, where Chinese MA novices engage in academic discourse, 'we' is predominantly paired with collocates such as 'in', 'of', 'this', 'and', 'as' and 'is', indicating a focus on constructing discourse structures and logic. Additionally, unique collocates like 'from', 'above', 'so' and 'when' suggest a strategic emphasis on guiding readers through discourse structure and logic. Conversely, ILJA_C authors, presumed to be disciplinary experts, utilize 'we' with collocates like 'what', 'if', 'for' and 'here' to express questions, hypotheses, purposes, and positions, showcasing academic positions and knowledge innovations.

Further analysis of four-word chunks guided by 'we' reveals functional categorizations into research-oriented, text-oriented, and participant-oriented bundles. While both groups employ these bundles to achieve discourse and interpersonal functions, Chinese MA novices tend to use research-oriented and text-oriented bundles to describe research results and activities, whereas ILJA_C authors predominantly utilize participant-oriented bundles to establish a relationship with the reader and express evaluation and position.

These findings underscore the need for Chinese MA novices to enhance their academic writing skills by learning from the usage patterns of international authoritative journal authors. Increasing the frequency of bundle usage, particularly participant-oriented bundles, can improve the persuasiveness and communicative effectiveness of academic papers. Additionally, understanding the nuanced differences in usage patterns can aid in constructing a stronger academic identity and effectively communicating research contributions and opinions.

Библиография

1. Зуева В. В. Просодические особенности научных текстов // Филологические науки. Вопросы теории и практики. 2017. № 10–2 (76). С. 80–83.
2. Щемелева И. Ю. Местоимения как средство передачи авторской позиции в английском и русском научных текстах // Вестник Санкт-Петербургского университета. Язык и литература. 2013. № (4). С. 143–153.
3. Bennett K. English academic style manuals: A survey // Journal of English for Academic Purposes. 2009. № 8 (1). P. 43–54.
4. Biber D., Johansson S., Leech G. N., Conrad S., Finegan E. Grammar of Spoken and Written English. Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2021.
5. Brezina V., Weill-Tessier V., McEnery A. Lancsbox (6.0). 2020 [Software]. Режим доступа: <http://corpora.lancs.ac.uk/lancsbox/> (дата обращения: 5.12.2023).
6. Fløttum K. Language and Discipline Perspectives on Academic Discourse. Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 2007.
7. Hyland K. Humble servants of the discipline? Self-mention in research articles // English for Specific Purposes. 2001. № 20 (3). P. 207–226.
8. Hyland K. Authority and invisibility: Authorial identity in academic writing // Journal of

Pragmatics. 2002. № 8. P. 1091–1112.

9. Hyland K. As can be seen: Lexical bundles and disciplinary variation // English for Specific Purposes. 2008. № 27 (1). P. 4–21.

10. Hyland K., Jiang F. Academic Discourse and Global Publishing: Disciplinary Persuasion in Changing Times. London: Routledge, 2019.

11. Jiang F. Stance construction and interpersonal interaction of shell nouns // Modern Foreign Languages. 2016. № 4. P. 470–482+583.

12. Jiang F. Stance and voice in academic writing // International Journal of Corpus Linguistics. 2017. № 1. P. 85–106.

13. Jiang F. Corpora and EAP studies. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press, 2019.

14. Jiang F. A diachronic multi-dimensional investigation into the stylistic features in academic discourse // Foreign Language Teaching and Research. 2020. № 52 (5). P. 663–673+798.

15. Jiang F., Hyland K. Prescription and reality in advanced academic writing // Ibérica. 2020. № 39. P. 14–42.

16. Lou B. Exploration of Corpus Application in Teaching Academic English for Graduate Students // Degree and Postgraduate Education. 2020. № 7. P. 51–56.

17. Oakes M. P. Statistics for Corpus Linguistics. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1998.

18. Sun L. A Study on the Use of Metadiscourse and Identity Construction Features in Chinese Master's Academic English Writing // Journal of Xi'an International Studies University. 2020. № 28 (4). P. 28–33.

19. Sun Y. An analysis of the genre structure patterns in the "Introduction" section of Chinese students' master's theses in English majors // Foreign Languages in China. 2010. № 7(6). P. 54–60+78.

20. Tang R., John S. The "I" in identity: Exploring writer identity in student academic writing through the first person pronoun // English for Specific Purposes. 1999. № 18. P. 23–39.

21. Walková M. A three-dimensional model of personal self-mention in research papers // English for Specific Purposes. 2019. № 53. P. 60–73.

22. Wang J., Jiang F. Stance construction in academic English writing by Chinese PhD students of science and engineering // Foreign Language World. 2019. № 3. P. 23–31.

23. Yang X. (Self-mention and authorial identity construction in second language academic writing // Foreign Languages and Their Teaching. 2015. № (4). P. 50–56

Результаты процедуры рецензирования статьи

В связи с политикой двойного слепого рецензирования личность рецензента не раскрывается.

Со списком рецензентов издательства можно ознакомиться [здесь](#).

Представленная на рассмотрение статья «Средства указания на автора в научных текстах: корпусное исследование», предлагаемая к публикации на английском языке в журнале «Litera», несомненно, является актуальной, ввиду обращения автора к исследованию проблемы авторства, которая стала важной в наши дни, ввиду порождения научных текстов в том числе искусственным интеллектом, а также развитого копирайтинга. Автор обращается к материалу англоязычного научного дискурса в рецензируемой работе.

Целью данного исследования является сравнительный анализ использования авторского 'my' китайскими магистрами лингвистики и специалистами в области языка.

Предметом данного исследования является изучение сходств и различий в

словосочетаниях и фрагментарных структурах самоупоминания "мы" в академическом дискурсе этих двух групп.

Практическим материалом исследования явился корпус магистерских работ по китайской лингвистике и статей в международных журналах на английском языке. В рецензируемой работе используются два корпуса: самостоятельно созданный корпус магистерских работ по китайской лингвистике (CLMA_C) и корпус статей в международных лингвистических журналах (ILJA_C). CLMA_C содержит 804 935 слов и 50 магистерских диссертаций на английском языке, написанных китайскими аспирантами в области лингвистики. ILJA_C содержит 802 490 слов и 100 статей, написанных признанными лингвистическими экспертами.

Статья является новаторской, одной из первых в российской лингвистике, посвященной исследованию подобной тематики в 21 веке. В статье представлена методология исследования, выбор которой вполне адекватен целям и задачам работы. Автор обращается, в том числе, к различным методам для подтверждения выдвинутой гипотезы. Для решения исследовательских задач в статье использовались как общенаучные методы, так лингвистические и статистические, в том числе методы сплошной выборки, основными методами явились лексико-семантический анализ и корпусные методы.

Исследование выполнено в русле современных научных подходов, работа состоит из введения, содержащего постановку проблемы, основной части, традиционно начинающуюся с обзора теоретических источников и научных направлений, исследовательскую и заключительную, в которой представлены выводы, полученные автором. В исследовании автор предлагает разработанную методику проведения текстовой экспертизы.

Библиография статьи насчитывает 23 источника, среди которых представлены труды как на русском, так и иностранном языках.

К сожалению, в статье отсутствуют ссылки на фундаментальные работы, такие как кандидатские и докторские диссертации.

Приведенные замечания нисколько не умаляют огромной работы, проведенной автором и не ухудшают общего положительного впечатления от рецензируемой работы. Опечатки, орфографические и синтаксические ошибки, неточности в тексте работы не обнаружены. Работа является новаторской, представляющей авторское видение решения рассматриваемого вопроса. Статья, несомненно, будет полезна широкому кругу лиц, филологам, магистрантам и аспирантам профильных вузов. Практическая значимость исследования определяется возможностью применения данных статьи в курсах по теории языка, текстологии, а также в практике преподавания академического письма. Статья «Средства указания на автора в научных текстах: корпусное исследование» может быть рекомендована к публикации в научном журнале.