Universidad Zaragoza

1542

Trabajo Fin de Máster

The Academia and I: A cross-cultural and a cross-disciplinary analysis of the use of authorial voice(s) in research articles

Autor/es

Héctor Soto Mugarza

Director/es

Rosa Lorés Sanz

The Academia and I:

A cross-cultural and a cross-disciplinary analysis of the use of authorial voice(s) in research articles

Héctor Soto-Mugarza

Supervisor:
Dra Rosa Lorés Sanz

Master in Textual and Cultural Studies in English
Master Thesis

December - 2015

ABSTRACT

Adopting a corpus-based study methodology, a thorough analysis of authorial academic voices in research articles is attempted, by means of a cross-cultural (English by native writers and English by non-native –Spanish– scholars) and cross-disciplinary (hard vs soft sciences) perspective. The focus of the present dissertation has been the use authors make of two metadiscoursal elements, *self-mentions* and *evidentials,* which serve the purpose of bringing the author's voice onto the text as well as the voice of the author's colleagues . The conclusions drawn cast light on the way the realizations of these voices may be influenced by the discipline and/or by the linguistic background of the authors, and they may also show aspects of the contribution that Spanish writers are making to English as a Lingua Franca.

Keywords: English as a Lingua Franca, authorial voice, academic voices, self-mention, evidentials, cross-linguistic analysis, cross-disciplinary analysis

RESUMEN

Siguiendo un tipo de metodología aplicada al estudio de corpus, se pretende llevar a cabo un análisis de las voces relativas al autor y a la academia mediante un enfoque intercultural (investigadores no nativos –españoles- escribiendo en inglés) e interdisciplinar (ciencias duras frente a ciencias blandas). En esta tésis, se ha prestado especial atención al uso que los autores hacen de dos elementos metadiscursivos, *self mentions* (menciones propias) y *evidentials* (citas)*,* que tienen como propósito representar en el texto tanto la voz del autor como la de sus colegas. Las conclusiones alcanzadas aportan luz sobre la influencia que pueden tener la disciplina o el trasfondo lingüístico del autor en la representación de dichas voces en el texto, mostrando además, aspectos acerca de la contribución que los escritores españoles hacen al inglés como Lingua Franca.

Palabras clave: Inglés como Lingua Franca, voz del autor, voces académicas, self-mention, evidentials, análisis interlingüístico, análisis interdisciplinar

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction

In the last decades the English language has become the international vehicular lingua for international research, sharing of ideas, and spreading of findings (Swales, 1987, 1997; Mur-Dueñas et al., 2010; Ferguson et al., 2011; Lorés-Sanz et al., 2014; Pérez-Llantada, 2015) It has been so to such an extent, that the use of English has become an essential part in the research in almost every discipline being published all around the world, As Swales already noted in 1990, this is due to the importance of the United States as the "growing monoculture", with "31% of all papers published in the world's leading journals emanated in the United States" (1990: 67) Ferguson (2007: 10), quoting Ammon (2003), reports that by 1995 English already accounted for 87.2% of journal publications in the natural sciences (e.g. biology, chemistry, physics, medicine and mathematics) and 82.5% of publications in the social sciences (e.g. sociology, economics, etc). What is more, according to 2002 data, over 90 percent of the information contained in influential databases (e.g., the Science Citation Index) is drawn from articles in English that are largely taken from English-medium journals (Trutchot, 2002 in Kirkpatrick (2009: 254). All this means that a certain proficiency of English has slowly but surely become a requirement for every researcher interested in taking part of important studies carried out internationally, either as audience or as an active member, avoiding being isolated in minor local areas in which English is not necessary (Belcher, 2007; Mur-Dueñas, 2010a). By using this common language, researchers from different linguistic backgrounds are able to participate in a common space where their contributions to the academic world can be exchanged and they are able to establish networks for their research purposes.

Several studies have been carried out in the light of this scenario and many authors have brought data that show the contribution of non-native speakers of English, n the

academic world is growing (St. John, 1987; Flowerdew, 2001; Gentil, 2005, among many others), and that their contribution has opened the possibility to do research in English for Academic Purposes (EAP) from an intercultural perspective.

Although already far from the "silencing" of non-native speakers contributors' works in mainstream centre journals, as Kramsch and Lam (1999: 71) pointed out, non-native speakers of English still need to overcome certain aspects when trying to put their results to the front and become part of the Academia. As far as these scholars are concerned, it can be understood the fact that writing in English is not likely to be an easy task, and some studies have already foreseen an extra exigency by editors and reviewers on possible divergent uses of the language by non-native English writers. The view that these divergent uses are inadequate to the conventions of native speakers academic texts seems to be very frequent (Mur-Dueñas, 2013).

1.1 Cross-cultural research and English as a Lingua Franca

There is extensive cross-cultural research that has been carried out contrasting English by Anglophone writers and English by Spanish scholars, to highlight the divergent uses of English in different academic genres. The basis of the comparison was the different uses of rhetorical, discoursal and linguistic uses made in research articles (Carciu, 2009; Lorés-Sanz, 2011a; Mur-Dueñas, 2007, 2010b, 2011; Sheldon, 2011); abstracts (Martín Martín, 2003, 2005; Martín Martín and Burgess, 2004; Lorés-Sanz, 2006, 2009a; Bellés-Fortuño and Querol-Julián, 2010) and also bookreviews (Moreno and Suárez, 2008, 2009; Lorés-Sanz, 2009b), But it has only been in recent years, and in order to approach this situation from a more encompassing perspective, that the concept of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) has come to be used to try to define this new reality in the academic world, being understood as "any use of English among

speakers of different languages for whom English is the communicative medium of choice, and the only option" (Seidlhofer 2011: 7). This concept, in contrast to previous definitions, also takes into account the participation of speakers of English as a native language as they are also an active part of the global communication in English with speakers from different linguistics background (Mur-Dueñas, 2010a). Another interesting perspective of this concept is the acknowledgement of the contribution of non-native English scholars to the English language used worldwide in the academic world and considered "legitimate users who may influence and shape this international language" (Mur-Dueñas, 2013: 318) due to the proportion of these participants in relation to the total amount of scholars writing in English worldwide (Seidlhofer 2001, 2011; Llurdá, 2004; Mauranen, 2012, among others).

Some researchers have mainly focused on the transfer processes (Lorés-Sanz, 2011b; Mur-Dueñas, 2009; Murillo-Ornat, 2012; Sheldon, 2011). The research being presented here, on the other hand, aims to concentrate on the instances of certain metadiscursive elements under analysis. In the present research, the focus is not so much on how Spanish scholars write in English for academic purposes but what their contribution may be to the use of English as a Lingua Franca with respect to the use of *self mentions* and *evidential,* taking into account that other similects (Mauranen 2012) are also making contributions to ELF.

1.2 Variation across disciplines

As Charles (2009: 152) points out, writers "can be distinguished and manifest themselves differently in different disciplines and genres" due to the different methods they use. It is of spread knowledge that there is substantial variation among the academic discourses underlying research articles (RA hereafter) in

different disciplines, and, therefore, among the rhetorical and linguistic manifestations of specific academic discourses. Metadiscourse, as the most relevant discoursal feature in academic language, has made possible to concentrate on more specific aspects of the academic discourse.

There is evidence which shows the differences in the writing by authors in pure sciences and humanistic sciences, specifically in the authorial representation, which is what this research concentrates on (Hyland, 2001, 2002a, 2002b; Harwood, 2005a, 2005b; Lafuente-Millán, 2010; among others). Taking the Humanities by way of example, it seems to be the case that they show certain characteristics among their subdisiciplines which make them step away from other disciplines (Soto, manuscripts[1]). A deeper study of these cross-disciplinary differences may lead to a better understanding of the methodological procedures followed by the authors, their level of implication in the work, their reader's expectations, and/or the level of influence authors may project on readers depending on the disciplinary community they both belong to.

1.3. Voice and Metadiscursive elements

The notion of voice representation in RAs has been widely researched (Halliday, 1985; Hinds, 1987; Ivanic & Camps, 2001; Hyland, 2001, 2002a, 2002b, 2005, 2008; Fløttum & Dahl, 2006; Belcher, 2007; Afros and Schryer, 2009; Lafuente-Millán, 2010, Lorés-Sanz 2011a, 2011b; Mur-Dueñas, 2010a). Voice representation in the

---

1 Course assignments for two subjects of the Master: "Academic voices: A comparative study on the use of *hedges*, *boosters* and *evidentials* in the humanities research articles" (Soto, manuscript) for the subject How to write a Research Paper: Theoretical and applied insights to disciplinary writing, and "Academic voices: A comparative study on the use of *self mentions* and *evidentials* in applied linguistics and literature research articles" (Soto, manuscript) for the subject Metalinguistic resources in English academic texts.

RAs refers to the way in which writers express themselves and project their presence in the text It is an essential aspect of interpersonality, which is basically defined as "the complex interplay of the writer and their readership as projected in the text, as well as how this projection is influenced by and influences the writers' position in relation to their own texts and the texts of others" (Mur-Dueñas, et al., 2010: 83). In the genre of the RA, more importance is given to the display of results and procedures rather than of personal views; that is why the study of the presence of authorial voice can yield interesting results when comparing different types of articles in a corpus. Hyland already noted that voice "is not an optional extra but an aspect of how we position ourselves in relation to our communities" (2008: 6), so it will appear wherever there is an author and it will always imply a certain meaning attributed to the writer and to the community. The aim can vary a lot, from positioning the author in relation to the community, evaluating or acknowledging others' results, claiming statements, or establishing a closer and persuasive relation to the reader. The writers' awareness of the different uses enables a thorough study of the authors via their representation in the texts, and a consequent comparison of authors within a same community and with other communities.

The realization of authorial presence in the RAs is done by means of several metadiscursive elements which allow the authors to represent themselves in the texts or to bring other authors' voices. It is by the sue of *self mentions* how writers allow their voice in the articles. Other academic's voices are introduced by means of *evidentials*.

1.3.1. The use of self mentions in academic writing

According to Hyland (2005), a *self mention* refers to the degree of explicit authorial presence in the text. It is measured by the presence of certain lexicogrammatical devices, among them, by the frequency of use of first person pronouns and possessive adjectives (*I, me, mine, exclusive we, our, ours* –to which I added *my* and *us*). The authorial voice in an article may have different communicative intentions as many researchers have already pointed out (Ivanic, 1998; Kuo, 1999; Tang and John, 1999; Harwood, 2005a, 2005b; Ädel, 2006; Lafuente, 2010; Mur-Dueñas, 2010b; Sheldon, 2011, among others) A detailed analysis of the functions of the items will provide a more accurate and objective interpretation of the use of these metadiscursive elements. To do so, a new categorization has been elaborated stemming from those outlined by previous researchers on this issue, such as the ones proposed by Tang and John (1999), Hyland (2002a) and Ädel (2006). According to them, the writer can project a number of roles (voices) by means of the function ascribed to the first person pronouns in the singular and in the plural.

Although their studies have been taken as the basis for the categorization presented here, changes have been considered and added, as Lafuente-Millán (2010) already did in his research, to cover certain uses that were left out in the others. The reason for this new categorization is that some differences among functions are too specific for a small scale study like the present one (e.g. differences among *I* as guide/architect and as recounter of the research process). On the other hand, although all of them are studied and counted, not all have the same metadiscursive importance in terms of face-value. For example, the use of *I* as guide/architect/recounter does not hold a similar metadiscursive value to *I* as claim originator or *I* as opinion holder, as it

implies a less face-theratening role of the writer's voice. But all the functional roles fulfilled by *self mentions* are taken into account to establish comparisons across subdisciplines and across linguistic/cultural contexts.

In the process of the present research, I have been aware of several instances in which more than one function could have been identified. In those cases, and due to a lack of more precised methods of analysis, I have decided that the most prominent one would be counted. However, I am aware that the multifunctional character of some *self mention* markers opens path for future research.

The categorization proposed for the present study derives from those used by authors like Harwood (2005a, 2005b) and Ädel (2006), and has also taken into account the variations proposed by authors like Lafuente (2010). In any case, the one proposed here has been created for the purpose of this article and it is as follows:

a. *I as Originator* of a theory or thesis. Instances in which results or findings are stated or through which claims are made.

Example 1: In the case of having an isolated planar annulus, we proved that there is an equilibrium solution along this axis. SC-ELF 4

Example 2: In the next section we provide previously known facts and notation used in our proofs. SC-ENL 4

b. *I as Opinion-holder.* Opinions, ideas, statements, and hypothesis are stated.

Example 3: Accordingly, I think that there are reasons to challenge the view that Statilius lexicographical work was organized in alphabetical order. SSH-ELF 6

Example 4: This is what I mean when I speak of the maritime moment. SSH-ENL 6

c. *I as Guide* and *Recounter* of the research project and *architect* of the essay. Most of the instances refer to moves in reading or writing of the physical article or to the procedures of the research.

Example 5: First, we studied a different set of behaviors, examining interpersonal workplace aggression rather than antisocial behaviors. SSH-ENL 5

Example 6: We compute first the family composed of equatorial circular orbits far from the planetary annulus. SC-ELF 4

d. *Exclusive I.* According to Quirk et al. (1985: 350) this is the representation of the desire to avoid the use of *I*. It also includes instances of collective *we* as used by several writers. The reader will always feel as not being counted.

Example 7: In our study, these factors were not controlled. SC-ELF 2

Example 8: The flexible nature of the belt drive system allowed us to include a unique suspension system. SC-ENL 1

e. *Inclusive* and *Rhetorical I.* Including both the writer and the reader, emphasising cooperation. Quite persuasive instances as it seems the writer's intention is to include the reader in the group.

Example 9: We can wonder about what has to be done: leaving the sign on the bench, removing it, removing the sign and the bench too, or even putting similar sign in all benches. SSH-ELF 3

Example 10: ...to show that any positive integer x can merge with a, a number that is in whatever congruence class we desire. SC-ENL 4

f. *General I.* Including both the writer and the reader as audience of others different than the writer.

Example 11: This approach could be synthesized as follows: our society does not know only one family model. SSH-ELF 3

Example 12: Despite the low levels and high importance of engagement, our under- standing of why students do or do not engage in high school is underdeveloped. SSH-ENL 2

1.3.2. The use of evidentials in academic writing

According to Hyland (2005:157), *evidentials* are the way in which "writers rely on the work of others in their arguments and […] how they represent such work". *Evidentials*, Hyland suggests, guide the readers' way of interpreting and help establishing an authorial command of the subject. In academic writing specifically, *evidentials* refer to the community-based literature, which provides important support for the arguments in the article. *Evidentials* make clear the responsibility of the author for a certain ideological position in the article, and "while this may contribute to a persuasive goal, it needs to be the writer's stance towards the view, which is coded as an interpersonal feature" (Hyland, 2005:51).

A citation could then be defined as a research report with a specific and clearly identifiable reference and can be subdivided into two major groups, following Swales categorization: integral and non-integral (Swales, 1986). Integral citation is defined as a research report with a specific and clearly identifiable reference, and with the name of the author appearing in a sentence assuming the grammatical role of subject. E. g.:

Example 13: Gernsbacher's (1990) framework predicts that these readers will resolve co-referring expressions (SSH-ENL 1)

Example 14: Davidson (1996) and Yonezawa et al. (2009) have argued that understanding of the self is central to how students experience school and

should be the subject of much research on adolescent engagement (SSH-ENL 2)

Example 15: In the past, Carlson et al. [7], Firoozian et al. [8] and Tan et al. [9] tested the ER clutch and they reported the ER fast speed of response and huge dynamic responses. (SC-ENL 3)

On the other hand, in a non-integral citation, the name of the author appears between brackets or in a note with a numeral reference. E. g.:

Example 16: Research, as well as intuition, suggests that long as dyadic exchange among peer employees remains equitable, it can be mutually beneficial (Cook & Emerson, 1984). (SSH-ENL 4)

Example 17: Due to the relatively few studies until the date, no significant differences can be attributed to the type of vibration, with some studies using vertical vibration (Gilsanz et al., 2006, Pitukcheewanont and Safani, 2006, Ward et al., 2004, Wren et al., 2010) and others oscillating (Ruck et al., 2010, Stark et al., 2010) (SC-ELF 5)

Example 18: For on hand, people might become volunteers for reasons of altruism, investment or even egoism (Ziemek, 2006). (SSH-ELF 4)

1.4. Aims

This paper concentrates on the notion of voice representation in the RAs through the use of the metadiscoursal elements as presented above. It more specifically focuses on the contrastive exploration of the authorial voice in English by native speakers and in English by Spanish writers, who are understood to make contributions to ELF. This analysis will be enriched and problematized through the contrastive study of two disciplinary macroareas that apparently hold the most outstanding differences, pure sciences and humanistic sciences. Certain metadiscursive elements will then be

explored in a corpus compounded of RAs written by writers contributing to ELF (English texts by Spanish scholars) and ENL writers.

The corpus at work was compiled for the purpose of this research and includes articles from both soft and hard sciences and both ENL and ELF writers, as has just been mentioned. In the case of ELF RAs, and due to the particular natures of this research, first versions or articles written by Spanish writers have been used, in order to analyse the contributory elements of these kind of writers to ELF. This would be further detailed in the corresponding Methods section, (the corpus subsection).

The four subcorpora in which it is divided are: pure sciences RAs written by Spanish authors in ELF, pure sciences RAs written by ENL authors, humanistic sciences RAs written by Spanish authors in ELF and humanistic RAs written by ENL authors. They have been named according to the discipline they belong to and to the linguistic background of their authors. The labels used hereafter are as follows:

- SC ENL: ENL RAs from the Hard Sciences
- SC ELF: ELF RAs from the Hard Sciences
- SSH ENL: ENL RAs from the Social Sciences and Humanities
- SSH ELF: ELF RAs from the Social Sciences and Humanities

The detailed list of articles compounding the present corpus can be found in Appendix 1, and their references in Appendix 2 of this article. As it has been mentioned above, it is necessary to clarify here that the references related to ELF RAs are of their final versions, while in this study the first versions have been used for research reasons. Here there is a small table which shows the balanced representation of the different subdisciplnes in the two subcorpora:

SC ELF	SSH ELF	SC ENL	SSH ENL
Mechanical Engineering	Science Didactics	Mechanical Engineering	Science Didactics
Food Technology	Applied Linguistics	Food Technology	Applied Linguistics
Mechanical Engineering	Civil Law	Mechanical Engineering	Civil Law
Mathematics	Economics	Mathematics	Economics
Sports Medicine	Economics	Sports Medicine	Economics
Chemistry	Ancient History	Chemistry	Ancient History

Table 1: *Detailed list of the subdisciplines found in the corpus*

Both subcorpora of pure sciences RAs have a parallel distribution in terms of subdisciplines, with the representation of the same knowledge areas. A similar parallel subdivision has been given to the RAs from the humanities. The metadiscursive elements in which the present research focuses are a type of "interactional resources", *self mentions*, and the "interactive" *evidentials* (Hyland, 2005). To be more specific, this paper will focus on the use of *self mentions* in RAs, understood as the projection of the writer's voice[2]; and the presence of *evidentials*, which are taken to be the projection of other members' voice of the disciplinary community the writer belongs to. The analysis of these interpersonal markers together with previous studies such as those carried out by Lafuente-Millán (2010) and Ädel (2006), will allow to point out important differences between the use of voices by Spanish writers in ELF in each area, regarding the presence and position of the writers within the text and their interaction with their peers. Then, these results will be contrasted with the ones found in writers in ENL. Common elements and differences

---

[2] According to Thompson and Ye (1991), 'writer' refers to the researcher who cites while 'author' is the one cited. (In Charles, 2006) indicate page

will be highlighted, what will show aspects of the contribution Spanish writers are making to ELF. The data derived from this study will, I hope, provide some insights about the contribution of Spanish writers to ELF.

Together with the identification of the two elements analysed, I offer a functional analysis of them, which thus constitutes complementary information needed for an accurate interpretation of the projection of the writer's voice. I then provide my own personal qualitative analysis and draw conclusions about how the discipline may influence the writers' use of the elements analysed, in the same ways as their linguistic background does, as it is also a key differentiating element.

My initial hypotheses are the following:

1. There will be similarities in the way voices are portrayed in ELF and ENL writers only in certain disciplines. Traditional conventions in writing within different disciplines are responsible for drawing the writers closer independently of their cultural differences and linguistic backgrounds.

2. . The previous studies I carried out as assignments for this master, mentioned above, may also suggest that the social sciences and the humanities will present more varying results, while hard sciences are likely to show more homogenous data in the two linguistic backgrounds.

3. In addition, the present research aims to prove that the distribution and frequency of use of *self mentions* and *evidential* markers varies depending on the section of the article they appear in, which have different communicative purposes. Each section shows different distribution and frequency depending on the area of knowledge or discipline in which they are used.

2. Methods and corpus

2.1. Methodology

Due to the characteristics of the results pursued in the course of the research, a specific methodology has been followed in order to ensure the quality of those. The comparative study on the presence of the authorial voice and the voice of the disciplinary community in RAs written by ENL speakers and those written in English as a lingua franca by Spanish scholars require the thorough analysis of certain linguistic realizations and their functions across different subcorpus of RAs

More specifically, my research interests lie firstly in the degree of projection of authorial presence in the RAs, as well as how the author makes use of this projection strategically. Moreover, and related to the previously commented objective, it is also my aim to explore how the voice of the disciplinary community the author belongs to is incorporated in the texts, in order to position his/her arguments at the same level as those of his/her academic community (Belcher, 2007; Afros and Schryer, 2009; Fløttum & Dahl, 2006). Thus, the focus of analysis here is the strategic use of the most characteristic realisations of two metadiscoursal devices which are used by authors to project their voice and bring the voice of others (their disciplinary peers) into the text: *self mentions* and *evidentials* (Hyland 1998, 1999a, 199b, 2005, Vassileva, 1998; Harwood, 2005a, 2005b; among others). In order to do this, a textual analysis throughout the corpus has been carried out in which the instances of the two metadiscursive features under study have been analysed in context.

Firstly, an initial compilation of the corpus took place, with an adequate representation of several subdisciplines of the humanities and the hard sciences in

English by Spanish writers. The choice of the two knowledge areas was clear from the very beginning of the research, since the different authorial representations in the humanities had already been studied in previous research (Soto-Mugarza, manuscript). The comparison of linguistic and cultural aspects would be enriched, in my view, if a more encompassing/wider range of disciplines, was taken into account enabling a more complete comparison of the voice representation by every kind of author.

Part of my copus was collected by Dr Mur-Dueñas who gave me access to a corpus by Spanish writers with the desirable characteristics for the present research. The English RAs by Spanish authors is part of the SciELF corpus, included in the WrELFA[3]. This corpus is composed by manuscripts (first versions of the RAs) written by non-native users of English. These versions will allow a detailed study of the contributions of Spanish writers to ELF before any editor or proofreader has taken access to the texts. This is the only way in which the real contribution to ELF could be shown, independent from the degree of the intervention carried out by editors. Reviewer, etc.

 It was composed of 6 RAs belonging to the hard sciences and 6 to the soft sciences. Due to the needs of the research, once a thorough examination of the articles was carried out, one of the RAs was discarded and substituted for by another text because it was recognized as a review and not as a RA. A search of another article was needed to find a text with similar characteristics to the other ones. Once it was found and the new article occupied the gap, the first stage of the research was completed. This collection of RAs is considered in the present research as a representation of the use

---

[3] The WrELFA corpus has been compiled by Dr Mauranen and her team at the University of Helsinki (Finland): http://www.helsinki.fi/englanti/elfa/scielf.html

that Spanish writers make of English as a lingua franca (ELF). Although this subcorpus is composed only by RAs written by authors whose native language is Spanish, it has been considered a sample of their contribution to the building of ELF and a constituent part of the general characteristics shaping the use of English as a lingua franca. The use of this term will in no case be responsible for any misinterpretation of the results later exposed, as they will be presented always in contrast to those found in the subcorpus of RAs by native English speakers (ENL) and will be acknowledged as stemming from a sector inside the ELF.

A second stage in the compilation of the corpus was conducted, in which comparable texts in ENL were needed. A thorough search in several international publications specialized in the different areas of knowledge subject of study in the research gave as a result a list of RAs written by Anglophone speakers, for contrasting ENL-ELF purposes. The existence of the same number of RAs in ELF and ENL, in the hard and soft sciences, and in terms of the subdisciplines whithin each main area, allows a detailed and normalized gathering of results. It is detailed, due to the specific search of items across the different contrastive axes the corpus allows. It is normalized, due to the reasonable size of the corpus, which allows a certain degree of extrapolation of results and to draw significant implications from the reading of the data. For further details, a thorough description of the corpus will be provided in this same section.

Secondly, a rhetorical analysis of the RAs in terms of sections was deemed necessary. It was so because one of the hypotheses of the present research was that the distribution and frequency of use of *self mentions* and *evidential* markers varies depending on the section of the article they appear in, being my second hypothesis

that this variation is a consequence of several factors, among them, the area of knowledge or discipline in which they are used.

To check if this was the case (i.e. variation in terms of textual stage and frequency), and whether these differences were only related to the discipline or they may as well vary according to the linguistic background of the writer, all the RAs included in the corpus were analysed in terms of their rhetorical structure and divided internally following the traditional scientific IMRAD pattern. Although in many cases the pattern was clearly stated in the article, there were a few other instances in which some sections of the pattern were occluded, integrated or merged with another section

or simply absent. Although there were many variations, the most common one seemed to be the absence of a conclusion section, being this one most of the times blurred with the results and the discussion. In some cases in which a clear-cut conclusion section is not present, the previous section is divided into two, being one results, and discussion de other one. This led to added difficulties in the classification of all the RAs to fit this pattern, with all the difficulties the tagging of sections

involved due to the nature of certain subdisciplines such as Ancient History, in which a more argumentative perspective excludes a clear exposition of any methodology or results and discussion section. As finding a solution was needed in those cases, a close reading of the RAs which were not so clearly empirical was carried out to try to outline the parts in which some results were being shown. In those other RAs from areas which do not clearly yield empirical RAs and where, therefore, some sections of the pattern were not found (discussion or conclusion most of the times, as commented above) a more subjective rhetorical analysis was made. Thus, for instance, I tagged as conclusion the last section of the RA in which the analysis of the results was carried

out (although in some of the instances it appeared under the label "discussion"). Or I counted "discussion" and "results" as a single section, because an analysis of the results is traditionally provided together with the reading of the raw data. Some examples of the rhetorical structure analysis applied to RAs are shown:

IMRaD pattern	SC ELF 1	SC ENL 1
INTRODUCTION	1.Introduction	1.Introduction
METHODOLODY	2.Basic constraints of the campo code	2.General configuration
	3.Generation of the densest circular heliostat fields as starting point of the optimization	3.Drive transmission design
	4.Data structure of the campo code based on Matlab© type cell	4.Suspension design
	5.Calculation of the f_{sb} factor and selection of the shading and blocking heliostats	5.General chassis notion
		6.Impact stress analysis
RESULTS &DISCUSSION	6.Maps of the shadowing and blocking factor for densest fields	7.Experiments and design iterations
	7.Azimuth expansion of the layouts through the increase of the security distance	
	8.Radial expansion of the layouts	
CONCLUSION	9.Conclusions	8.Conclusion and summary

Table 2: *Comparison of the sections in which SC ELF 1 and SC ENL 1 are divided and they way they have been grouped to fit the IMRaD pattern.*

This kind of structure in which the sections between introduction and conclusion are given very specific names according to the research and away from a clear IMRaD division is found in articles of the hard sciences both in ENL and ELF. But RAs in the the hard sciences also show the IMRaD pattern with slight variations:

IMRaD Pattern	SC ENL 2	SC ELF 2
INTRODUCTION	Introduction	Introduction
METHODS	Materials and methods	Material and methods
		In vitro study
		In vivo study
		Data analysis
RESULTS & DISCUSSION	Results and discussion	Results
CONCLUSION		Discussion

Table 3: *Comparison of the sections in which SC ENL 2 and SC ELF 2 are divided and they way they have been grouped to fit the IMRaD pattern.*

In some cases, a deeper reading led to further division of the sections in which the articles were already divided, because the last paragraphs of a results and discussion section could be taken as the conclusion of the article. In the case of RAs from the social sciences and the humanities, in many instances a clear IMRaD division was found, but there were examples in which it was not. Some examples are included:

IMRaD Pattern	SSH ELF 1	SSH ENL 1
INTRODUCTION	1. Introduction	Introduction
		Structure building and L2 reading comprehension
		Working memory and reading comprehension
METHODS	2. Methodology	Methodology
RESULTS & DISCUSSION	3. Results from the analysis of the drawings.	Results
	4. Results from the analysis of the text.	
CONCLUSION	5. Discussion	Discussion

Table 4: *Comparison of the sections in which SSH ELF 1 and SSH ENL 1 are divided and they way they have been grouped to fit the IMRaD pattern.*

IMRaD Pattern	SSH ENL 6	SSH ELF 3
INTRODUCTION	Introduction (untagged)	I. Introduction.
METHODS	1. The maritime moment.	II. What "brave new families"?
	2. War at sea, war with the sea.	III. Family and the law.
		IV. Why a family law? What a family law for?
RESULTS & DISCUSSION	3. Roman epic and the maritime moment: Vergil, Livius, Naevius	V. Family models and social functionality.
CONCLUSION	4. Conclusion	VI. As of conclusion: For the revitalization of family law

Table 5: *Comparison of the sections in which SSH ENL 6 and SSH ELF 3 are divided and the way they have been grouped to fit the IMRaD pattern.*

These RAs illustrate some of the difficulties this research had to overcome in order to create a standardized procedure to divide the RAs in similar sections independently of the discipline or linguistic background they were found in. Nevertheless, it is of outmost importance to state here the need of establishing beforehand the divisions

among sections to be able to provide homogeneous data, because the interdisciplinary study being carried out requested a standardisation in the compilation of the results to enable the correct reading and inferences.

The whole texts were used in every case, but certain sections were systematically removed, such as the bibliography, the acknowledgments and the appendixes. Abstracts were here considered as a different genre and consequently have not been taken into account in the present study of the corpus. It is necessary to bear in mind that footnotes have not been removed and have also been studied. The study of footnotes shows has allowed me to gather significant insights about the two metadiscoursal realisations under discussion and their study has yielded different results depending on the texts. Some RAs, usually in certain areas from the hard sciences, use footnotes or notes at the end of the article as a characteristic system of citations in the article: certain procedures like numbering between brackets or in superscript/subscript referring to a footnote with the biographical information or to a list of references at the end of the paper. These *evidentials*, have obviously been included in the analysis regardless of their presence in footnotes or lists, but have been tagged as non-integral because the omission of the presence of the authors referenced in the RA is very notorious. In other cases, in relation this time with certain disciplines in the humanities, the use of footnotes is more related to what Hyland refers to as code glosses (Hyland 2005). In these, the author holds a dialogue with his/her reader parallel to the one present in the main text. The author takes advantage of this other channel of communication to provide further information, explain, specify, etc, During the realisation of the present research, it has been noted a noticeably high amount of *evidentials* and *self mentions* inside *code glosses* in certain articles. As this use seems to be characteristic of some of the disciplines irrespective

of the author's cultural and linguistic background– it appears equally in the ENL and ELF RAs of the corpus–no further study has been carried out and the data have been counted as those of the rest of the articles without taking into account whether they appear in plain text or footnotes. As has been commented above, in every case the *evidentials* have been identified in foot notes, have been tagged as non-integral citation and counted within the section in which the footnote appears.

Once the rhetorical analysis of the RAs was systematized and carried out, the identification of the tokens was done for both metadiscoursal markers, *self mentions* and *evidentials*. In the former, the personal pronouns and the possessive adjectives and pronouns were included as types (*I, we, me, us, my, our, mine, ours*); in the latter, the citations of authors. The identification of *self mentions*, was carried out manually with the help of information technologies. The number of articles in the corpus and elements under study made the use of some concordancing programs unnecessary. A closer reading of the text and careful analysis of the co-text and context of the instances was enough to exclude the instances that were not focus of this analysis, like those being part of citations, examples, etc. Regarding citations, no computer tool was used either and the search was also entirely manual.

The data are presented in tables organised in terms of the rhetorical structure of the articles. Percentages were calculated in relation to types, function, section, and discipline, and normalized per 1,000 words to allow direct comparison

Finally, an evaluation and an interpretation of the results were made. A general classification of the instances is provided in the present study which allows establishing comparison between the disciplines (soft vs hard) and the linguistic contexts (ENL and ELF) leading to the corroboration of the initial hypothesis.

2.1 The corpus

As mentioned above, the English RA by Spanish authors belong to an existing corpus (SciELF corpus, a section within the WrELFA corpus). It has fed the present corpus with 6 RAs on various disciplines of the hard sciences, and 6 RAs of the humanities. In the first case, it includes Mechanical Engineering, Food Technology, Mathematics, Sports Medicine and Chemistry. Science Didactics, Applied Linguistics, Civil Law, Economics and Ancient History are represented in the second. Due to the particular of this research, the first version of the articles have been studied. To observe all the elements that can be considered as a contribution to ELF by Spanish researchers, as the purpose of this study, it is necessary to consider the initial stage of the RAs. The publishing procedure implies a revision of the RAs carried out by editors and proofreaders who may change certain aspects of the texts, and they migh convey a variation in some of the elements being studied here. That is why, in this paper, all the ELF RAs are manuscripts. Anyway, a detailed list of rereferences of the published articles can be found in Appendix 2.

Parallel to these, another 12 RAs with similar rhetorical characteristics and from the same disciplines have been collected from journals specialized on these areas of knowledge, but authored by ENL writers. The choice of the articles for the present research has been done following several criteria of comparability The similarity constraints put forward by Connor and Moreno (2005: 159) to achieve *tertia comparationis* were controlled when compiling the comparable corpus to ensure that it "provide[s] baseline data for meaningful cultural comparisons" (2005: 156). That is, texts belonging to the same genre, the same academic discipline, with a similar communicative purpose, and similar participants involved were chosen so that they

could lend themselves to intercultural and interdisciplinary analysis. As has been already commented, the articles of each discipline have been collected from different international journals selected according to their impact factor, which ensures the quality of the RAs representative of each discipline. The list of all the 24 RAs included in the present study are listed in the Appendix 1, and their references in Appendix 2.

The corpus amounts to a total of 145,721 words. The data which emerge from this corpus is considered significant enough to establish a preliminary description of the common patterns at work in this kind of RAs as far as *self mentions* and *evidentials* are concerned. In my view, these preliminary data enable a comparative study, which may eventually yield general conclusions, about differences of use of the metadiscoursal markers under discussion in the disciplines chosen, as well as between ENL and ELF authors, thanks to the normalization of the results.

First, the selection of disciplines responds to the evidences provided in previous studies (Lafuente-Millán, docotoral thesis –unpublished-; Soto-Mugarza, manuscript; Lorés-Sanz, 2008; Lorés-Sanz, et al. 2014, among others), where it has been shown that there are significant differences in rhetorical and linguistic manifestations of RAs depending on the disciplines they belong to. Secondly, a compilation of corpus of RAs written by authors from different linguistic backgrounds allows me to explore cross-cultural aspects in the writing of RAs as regards metadiscourse and the contrastive analysis in the projection of the authorial and academic voices across disciplines. As has been commented earlier, the authorial presence is a constant but the way in which it is portrayed in the text used depends mostly on the author. It has also been stated here that some researchers have shown the way in which these voices

appear in the articles depending on disciplinary conventions. That is why, together with a cross-disciplinary comparison of the results, a cross-culture research will be carried out, to see whether there are culture-bound discoursal preferences and constraints.

Thus, the present study broadens the focus to the research of several experimental subdisciplines within the humanities, together with articles from traditional hard sciences. Moreover, it adds the variable of cross-culturality (ENL/EFL). By doing so, I attempt to draw significant conclusions and implications with regard to the impact that the variable of discipline and the variable of linguistic/cultural background may have on the projection of the author's voice as well as that of their peers'.

3. Results and discussion

The present research aims to establish comparisons of the representations of the authors' and their colleagues' voices in hard and soft sciences RAs written by scholars whose native language is English and others who are not Anglophone writers. In other words, this is a corpus-based study which adopts a cross-cultural and cross-disciplinary perspective on the analysis of authorial and academic voices in RAs. I intend to draw conclusions about the way the realizations of these voices may be influenced by the discipline and/or by the linguistic background of the authors.

The analysis of *self mentions* and *evidentials* in the corpus reveals some clarifying results in relation to potential differences with regard to the presence of authorial voice. But results need to be studied and interpreted in detail with certain criteria. When referring to the results obtained in the present study, it is necessary to bear in

mind that interpretations can be approached through the comparison of disciplines or the linguistic background. The output obtained through both perspectives will serve to evaluate the use of ELF by Spanish writers and their contribution to the disciplines in which they work. The data obtained in the present study have been compiled in a series of tables which appear in Appendix 3, annexed at the end of this paper. There, the reader will be able to find the raw results and normalized data of the instances found in the corpus. Moreover, in this section some tables will include normalized results, which will facilitate reading and interpretation of the data extracted from this corpus study.

3.1 Use of evidentials

In the following section I am going to analyse the use of *evidentials* in the corpus. The raw results have been normalized and shown in a table to enable a clearer reading, and divided into integral and non-integral citations (see the Introduction section of the present article, and the subsection *The use of evidentials in academic writing*. It is also clearly stated the section of the article in which they appear. The detailed results of *evidentials* can be found in Appendix 3.

Evidentials		Introduction	Methods	Results &D.	Conclusion	TOTAL
Integral		1.53	1.49	1.24	0.31	4.57
Non-integral		9.09	8.95	6	1.8	25.84
TOTAL		10.62	10.44	7.24	2.11	30.41

Table 2: *Use of evidentials in the whole corpus. Normalized data per 1000 words*

Focusing on the use of *evidentials*, we can clearly find enormous coincidences in the results across subcorpora at first sight. Nevertheless, a more careful study will show differences depending on the subcorpus we focus on. To start with, there is a greater

use of non-integral *evidentials* all along the corpus (examples of the different instances in the corpus have already been provided in the introduction section). The corpus shows that authors, whether from the scientific or the humanistic area, within an ELF or an ENL context, tend to use more of these kind of citations in which the voice of the disciplinary colleges is incorporated to the author's voice We may hypothesize that the preference of use of non-integral citations over integral citations may be due to the need of priorizing the self over the other, incorporating others' knowledge into the author's speech. In the academic world, much importance is given to having researched widely and having published the findings prolifically. This, which is understood as expertise and knowledge, implies the need of standing out within the disciplinary community, the need of enhancing one's findings by incorporating others' knowledge in the work or by contrasting one's findings with those of other scholars.

When comparing in detail the use of non integral citations across subcorpora, it is important to specify that there is a much greater use in SSH RAs than in those from the pure sciences, whether it is by ENL or authors in an ELF context, although it is in the case of ENL RAs in which the results boost with a four times higher figure of instances in the humanities. We can easily draw some conclusions here. For writers in the Humanities, the presence of the voice of the Academia is very important. We may talk of discipline conventions, as we can observe it is of widespread use in all the humanistic articles forming this corpus. But the fact that the ratio of non-integral and integral citations is very similar in the ENL RAs (12.37‰ and 1.55‰ respectively) and ELF RAs (13.47‰ and 3.02‰ respectively) implies that disciplinary conventions are very powerful; thus, humanistic and social scientific authors may intend to include their colleagues' work in order to challenge what has previously been stated by other

researchers, or as a form of providing support to their study, and that this convention has been kept in English by authors of different linguistic backgrounds.

As regards the presence of *evidentials* in the different sections of the RAs, we can foresee some authorial strategic uses behind the use of these citations. To see whether the use of non-integral citations yields similar data when showing colleague's research, a deeper study of these RAs and a more specific differentiation of the instances of *evidentials* in them is deemed necessary.

As it is widely accepted, the different sections of a research article manifest different purposes. The IMRaD (Introduction-Methods-Results-Conclusion) pattern analysis used for the present study allows highlighting the strategic uses of the authorial voice realizations at different stages of the text. The introduction is used to set the basis of the research. It enables the establishment of the research lines the author wishes to continue by acknowledging previous advancements in the field or topic of study, found out by other members of the Academia. But this can also be used for criticism, since it might highlight some kind of lack of or need for previous studies that the research being presented wishes to fulfil. This has been called the "establishment of a niche" (Swales, 1990, 2004). The *evidentials* found in this section of the articles are intended to meet this purpose.

It can be understood that the purpose of the introduction may promote and encourage quoting other voices in the Academia, other members of the same disciplinary community who have previously worked on the issue under study, and that most instances of citations may appear in this section of the RAs. But this insight is only valid in the case of the scientific articles written in English by Spanish speakers (SC ENL). In the rest of the cases, there are higher figures in other parts of the articles.

As a reminder, I need to comment all the data related to normalized results of *evidentials* in Appendix 3. There, it can be seen SC ELF RAs are the only ones presenting a higher proportion of *evidentials* in the introduction whereas the SC ENL subcorpus shows very similar figures for *evidentials* in the introduction and the methods section. As regards the RAs in the humanities and social sciences included in the corpus, and as was already commented in the introduction, instances have been found in which the limits between sections are blurred or there is even no clear section division at all. This allows authors in the soft sciences to quote other academic voices more freely in the rest of the text. In fact, the Methods section also accepts a revision of previous studies and findings by other authors in the issue under research. This is also present in the articles included in this corpus, as can be seen in the instances of *evidentials* that have been recorded in this section across subcorpora. Except for in SC ELF RAs, as commented above, the rest show a high frequency of use of *evidentials* in this section of the article. This is due to the need to comment on the procedures previous authors pioneered or simply followed in similar research processes. Those processes are generally revised and adapted if necessary in every new study but, in doing so, the author necessarily needs to quote the preceding ones as well.

Having commented on the Introduction and the Methods section, and having highlighted the most outstanding differences in the use of *evidentials* found in the present corpus, it is worth continuing with the analysis of the instances in the rest of the sections of the articles. The frequency of use of *evidentials* in the other sections tends to be lower. The section which follows in the frequency of use of citations is Results and Discussion. The Conclusion section shows the lowest rate of elements of this kind. This is consistent in all RAs across the corpus, and it is coherent if we think

of the purposes of these two sections inside the IMRaD pattern. Authors present their findings in the results section. They tend to concentrate on their data without taking into account those from other authors because there are other sections with that purpose, as has already been commented above. In the case of the Conclusion section, some authors feel the need to recall the researchers who have been cited in previous sections, in order to compare the results obtained, to complete previous findings with their own, or to highlight their own findings as contribution to previous knowledge. However, this is not the general case. In fact, in the present corpus there are many examples of articles without a single citation in this last section –as is the case of the SC ENL texts – or with very few elements compared to the numbers of *evidentials* in the other sections.

Regarding the use of *evidentials*, some clear differences can be seen in the cross-disciplinary analysis as well as in the linguistic one. Although some of the differences in the disciplines can be seen with independence of the linguistic background of the writers, the truth is that this background also marks to some extent the writing of the authors. This can be very clearly seen in the articles belonging to the hard sciences. Although the tendency is not to use citations as much as in softer sciences, the data show ELF writers have used more (8.12‰ in SC ELF – 5.01‰ in SC ENL) in total. This does not happen when comparing ENL and ELF writers in the Social Sciences and the Humanities, where the results remain more similar. We can conclude then, that the use of *evidentials* Spanish writers make in English in the hard scientific disciplines is similar to the uses of Spanish authors in the humanistic RAs. This indicates a shared practice in the use of *evidentials* in English by Spanish writers across disciplines. In fact they do not adjust completely to the conventions followed by ENL writers in the soft and hard sciences. In other words, we can claim that the

linguistic background influences these authors more than the disciplinary conventions.

3.2 Use of self mentions

The authorial voice in an article can have different communicative intentions as has already been commented. Through the use of *self mentions*, the authors can shape their presence and their authorial strategies in the text. An analysis of the functions *self mentions* can fulfil will provide interesting results about the use of the authorial voice in the different disciplines and cultural backgrounds. The detailed normalized results related to the presence of self mentions in the articles and the functions they accomplish can be found in Appendix 3.

The present study is mostly based on a corpus of single authored RAs, so the use of plural forms by single authors has not been taken into account in any special form. This use may be understood as a way to indicate a strong metadiscursive aim, because in no way can it refer to a group of authors if the article is single-authored. Thus, due to the purpose of the present research, which aims to explore authorial and academic voice in RAs from a cross-disciplinary and cross-cultural perspective, the instances of the plural form by single authors have not been considered as significant enough To analyse a distinctive use of *we* by single authors, a corpus compounded exclusively by single authored RAs would be required. However, in the present research a realistic representation in the corpus of the articles found in the Academia has been sought, which means that co-authored articles have also been included. To do otherwise would imply, in my view, a manipulation of the real data and the inability to provide consistent and coherent conclusions. Thus, in all the cases the instances of *we* by single authors have been counted as an "exclusive we".

Self Mention	Introduction	Methods	Results	Conclusion	TOTAL
I	0.27	0.84	0.31	0.13	1.55
Me	0.02	0.12	0.02	0.02	0.18
my	0.1	0.19	0.12	0.03	0.44
Mine	0	0	0	0	0
We	1.67	3.77	5.85	1.36	12.65
Us	0.12	2.14	0.17	0.05	2.48
Our	0.6	0.49	0.86	0.48	2.43
Ours	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	2.78	7.55	7.33	2.07	19.73

Table 7: *Use of self mentions in the whole corpus. Normalized data per 1000 words*

The first obvious result stated in the tables is the low use of singular instances of *self mentions* in the corpus. In the case of the hard sciences RAs, there is not a single instance of a *self mention* in the singular form. This shows a consistency all throughout the hard disciplines regardless of the linguistic background of the authors. In the case of the Social Sciences and the Humanities, further comment is necessary because there are examples in which we can find the use of the singular, but the presence of plural instances remains three times higher. It is also important to state that in 50%[4] of the articles of this discipline there are no instances of the use of singular *self mentions*, parallel to the findings in the hard sciences. In the other 50%, there are only two RAs in which we can clearly see the use of singular *self mentions* instead of plural realizations. The rest of the cases show an equal use of singular and plural forms. This may lead us to claim that the plural form is widely preferred in the process of writing an RA irrespective of the discipline conventions or the linguistic background of the author. It is only in the case of the humanistic and social sciences where the use of singular *self mentions* is made to a certain extent.

---

[4] Percentages commented here have been calculated taking into account the normalized data of the instances in the corpus.

As for the realizations, most of the cases present in the corpus are of first person pronouns (*I, we*), whether in the singular or in the plural form depending on the articles, as has already been mentioned. Together with these, there is a high percentage of use of the plural possessive adjective (*our*), which even surpasses the number of the singular first person pronouns used (*I*). Its presence is consistent in the cross-disciplinary and cross-cultural analysis. The counting of these two elements *(we, our)* constitutes 79.72% of the total data of *self mentions*, which is obviously a very important part of it. In the case of the singular possessive adjective (*my*), and the plural object pronoun (*us*), the instances remain very rare, only noticeable in both cases in some of the articles by ELF writers. Also worth commenting is the total absence of possessive pronouns in the corpus.

Focusing a little more on the data already commented above in general terms, we can see further differences between the subcorpora of RAs here under study. In the hard sciences, the normalized figures in *self mentions* are similar in the two subcorpora, with very slight differences which do not deserve a comment. However, what is worth mentioning is the fact that there is a clear difference in the frequency of use of *self mentions*, depending on the sections where they tend to appear. Even if, by looking at the total data in all the scientific articles, there are higher numbers of instances in the Results and Discussion and in the Methods section, when we have a look at each subcorpus, the picture that emerges is slightly different. Thus, the RAs by ENL authors use more *self mentions* when explaining their methodology, and not as many when giving results. In any case, the number of instances in the introduction and conclusion is very low in all the hard sciences RAs.

In the case of the social sciences and the humanities, the data also vary between ELF and ENL articles. The total amount of *self mentions* indicates that there is a higher use in the Methods section. In fact, when approaching the figures from the perspective of the authors' linguistic background, results show that ENL writers tend to use more self mentioning in the Introduction section, rather than in the Methods section. This is not the case in ELF RAs, because the number of instances in the Methods section is around the 43.52% of the total amount in all the sections (3.07‰ in Methods while 7.01‰ in total). In any case, it is clear that regardless of their discipline and their linguistic culture, authors avoid self mentioning in their conclusions. This might be that the conclusion is the section where the authors assume more responsibility for the claims made, it is more face-threatening, so they might try to avoid self exposure as much as possible by using other strategies to formulate their claims. Another reason might be that due to the generalization that is expected in the conclusions given; that is, conclusions need to be extrapolated and implications should be drawn for the discipline in the discipline.

Thus, we can suggest that ELF writers in the social sciences and the humanities tend to use self mentioning in their articles in a much more generous way than the rest of the subcorpora that have been studied here. This indicates that there is not a disciplinary convention on the matter, because these results (7.01‰) differ widely from the very similar figures of the rest of the subcorpora (5.94‰ in SC ENL, 4.51‰ in SC ELF, 2.27‰ in SSH ENL). Once the number of apparitions has been dealt with, it is time to focus on the functions these tokens fulfil.

Self Mention	Introduction	Methods	Results	Conclusion	TOTAL
Originator	0.47	0.38	0.79	0.23	1.87
Opinion-h	0.05	0.2	0.46	0.04	0.75
Guide-rec	1.07	2.31	3.79	0.31	7.48
Exclusive	0.63	1.56	1.13	0.72	4.04
Inclusive	0.33	1.3	1.16	0.72	3.51
General	0.23	0.19	0	0.07	0.49

Table 8: *Functions of self mentions in the whole corpus. Normalized data per 1000*

In Table 3, it can be observed how a certain function is used more frequently than the rest and is present in all the RAs of the current corpus: the use of I/we as "guide" or "recounter" of the research process. It represents 41.79% of the total result of *self mentions* in the corpus. This percentage remains similar when analysing the articles from a cross-disciplinary perspective (38.86% in the hard sciences and 43.61% in the social sciences and the humanities) or a cross-cultural approach (43.42% in ELF RAs, and 39.09% in ENL RAs). These results show there are no big differences among the different subcorpora. All the RAs need to state results and explain procedures to the reader in a clear and explanatory way. In my view, the use of *self mentions* as "recounters" of the research process is perceived and received positively in the Academia, as it allows writers to offer a clear and distinguishable voice which facilitates understanding of the findings. However the uses of *self mentions* as a "guide" of the research article and the research progress do show differences in their presence along the subcorpora. For instance, we might think that there should be a clear tendency in the use of this function in the Results and Discussion section. This is the case in the hard sciences RAs. As we commented above, these articles traditionally follow the conventional IMRaD pattern which shows a clearer division in the functions of the different sections and, consequently, this leads to a clearer division also in the functions of the metadiscoursal elements appearing in them. This

is not the case in the Social Sciences and the Humanities, and the instances of *self mentions* as "guide" appear scattered along the RA, especially in the Introduction, Methods and Results sections. However, taking into account the cross-cultural analysis of the latter subcorpora, we can indicate that ELF writers show a clearer tendency towards the use of *self mentions* as "guide" and "recounters" primarily in the Methods section and then in the Results and Discussion section. These findings make ELF writers in the soft sciences display metadiscoursal uses which are typical of the hard sciences. This might indicate the intention to follow disciplinary conventions attributed to the hard ciences, so the authors in ELF might be taking these conventions as a model instead.

Focusing now in further aspects related to the use of *self mentions*, it is noticeable their higher use with exclusive meanings in the corpus 4.04 ‰ (21.36% of the total) and the ones with an inclusive meaning 3.51‰ (18.57% of the total). Depending on the statements authors make, it is important for them to step aside of the audience and differentiate themselves from the rest of their colleagues. The reasons for doing so may be as varied as the intentions authors may have. One of them would be the need to portray themselves as knowledgeable members of their disciplinary community. This could go parallel to the concept of being an "originator", as it is their way of showing their strength in making claims or statements. Hand by hand with stepping aside comes the need of portraying themselves as part of the group (disciplinary community, Academia, etc.) or even more, recognizing the rest of the authors in the Academia as equals.

Results show that there is no such difference in the use of "exclusive" and "inclusive" instances in the corpus between hard and soft sciences. The instances do not tend to

appear in any specific section, but they can be found distributed all along the article. Generally, the Introduction section presents the fewest examples of both, while in the rest of the sections the number of instances is more homogeneous. However, a conclusion cannot be drawn out of this because apparently it does not follow any disciplinary or cultural convention.

However, a clear difference across disciplines is found in the instances of *self mentions* as "opinion holders", with a three times higher presence in the social sciences and the humanities. I consider, this indicates a more tentative approach to the discussion of the results. In fact, their use takes place mostly in that section. This is made clear due to the more frequent use of the function "opinion holder" instead of "originator". When comparing the articles written by ENL and ELF authors the same conclusion comes to the front. ELF authors tend to use a higher number of instances in the Results and Discussion section fulfilling the function of "opinion holder". This is the same uncertainty or tentativeness previously commented regarding the social sciences, by authors who are not using English as their first language. In any case, the frequency of use of *self mentions* holding an originating or claiming function is consistent all through the corpus.

The rest of the functions appear as something constant all through the articles without any outstanding difference in the cross-disciplinary and cross-cultural analysis.

4. Conclusions

The corpus-based nature of this study has allowed a thorough analysis of the results which can be gathered as a general representation of the reality found in the academic world. By means of the cross-cultural (English by native writers ─ENL─ and English by non-native ─Spanish─ scholars) and cross-disciplinary analyses (hard and soft sciences) carried out in a corpus of RAs, it has been possible to identify the differences present in the subcorpora, making the initial aim of this research possible: the analysis of authorial academic voices in RAs through the use of two metadiscoursal elements, *self mentions* and *evidentials*. Let us now draw some conclusions about the way the realizations of these voices may be influenced by the discipline and/or by the linguistic background of the authors, which will show aspects of the contribution Spanish writers are making to ELF. We need to bear in mind that to do so, the articles by Spanish writers are first version, which allows a detailed study of the contributions of these writers to ELF before any editor or proofreader has taken access to the texts.

There were several initial hypotheses which stemmed this research, and which are listed below:

1. Some similarities are expected among disciplines in the way voices are portrayed by ELF and ENL writers. Regarding the linguistic background, ELF and ENL writers' uses of authorial voice are expected to hold several differences in general terms, but more insights can be gathered when a contrastive analysis is tackled. This is related to the idea that, regarding the areas of knowledge, it is generally understood that there are some traditional conventions in writing within different disciplines, and that these are

responsible for drawing the writers close independently of their cultural differences and linguistic backgrounds.

2. Taking as a point of departure the conclusions of previous studies by this author, I hypothesised that the social sciences and the humanities would present more varying results, while the hard sciences are likely to show more homogenous data in the two linguacultural backgrounds.

3. There was an expected variation in the distribution and frequency of use of *self mentions* and *evidentials* depending on the section of the article they appear in. This variation was expected to be consistent in the different areas of knowledge or discipline.

The summary of all these hypotheses would be that the discipline conventions are very influential in the writing process of the authors and in the way they portray themselves and their peers in their works, regardless of their linguistic and cultural background. But to make sure these hypotheses have been proved right or wrong, it is necessary to go back to the findings obtained. Starting with *evidentials*, the preference in the use of non-integral citations over integral citations in the entire corpus does not allow us to get any conclusion regarding the contributions of Spanish writers, but it obviously shows they present the same tendencies than the rest and that their contribution to the ELF is parallel to that by ENL writers. The importance given in the academic world to having researched widely and having published previous findings prolifically is reflected in both kinds of writer; and both show the need of standing out within the disciplinary community and incorporating other colleagues' knowledge.

However, the data drawn regarding the use of *evidentials* in certain sections of the

RAs demonstrate the existence of disciplinary conventions, since the figures are similar all along the corpus. Hard sciences RAs show a high number of instances in the Introduction section in the two linguistic backgrounds under research. The truth is ENL writers in this discipline present a high frequency of use of *evidentials*, both in the Introduction and the Methods sections, to equal degrees. In any case, this practice is very distinct from the soft sciences articles, in which the instances concentrate in the Methods section or are spread along the rest of the sections due to their blurred limits. The need to comment on the procedures previous authors used and their revisions or adaptations is something made more relevant in the social sciences and the humanities. Hard sciences, where methods are much more steady and well established, make more emphasis on giving voice to the Academia in the Introduction.

Although most of the differences among disciplines can be seen with independence of the linguistic background of the writers, the truth is that this background also marks to some extent the writing of the authors. SC ELF show more instances of *evidentials* than SC ENL. In fact, the use of *evidentials* Spanish writers make in English in the hard scientific disciplines is similar to the uses of Spanish authors in the humanistic RAs. This indicates a shared practice by Spanish writers across disciplines, and it means that there are certain linguistic aspects which differentiate Spanish writers from ENL ones. There are some aspects which Spanish writers contribute with in the creation of ELF, which differs from the "norm" ENL writers seem to hold. Further research, in which other "similects" (Mauranen 2012) were explored, could clarify if this is an isolated case only attributed to Spanish writers or it could be taken to be a generalized aspect of ELF also characteristic in writers from other linguistic

backgrounds. If this was the case, it would demonstrate ELF being a separate entity from the English of native speakers.

When focusing on the uses of *self mentions* in the different subcorpora, the high use of plural instances. As already seen in the earlier section, there is not a single instance of a *self mention* in the singular form in the case of the hard sciences RAs, which shows a consistency all throughout the hard disciplines regardless of the linguistic background of the authors. And although, some of the RAs in the social sciences and the humanities present singular instances, these remain three times lower than the plural instances in those articles, moreover being only present in 50% of the articles of the discipline. The plural form is widely preferred in the writing process and we may suppose there are not discipline conventions or elements in the linguistic background of the author which could justify a difference in their use on the different subcorpora. Anyway, it is also true that in the case of the humanistic and social sciences the use of singular instances are likely to be found to some extent. In any case, it would only suggest once more the weight of disciplinary conventions regarding the way the authorial voice is portrayed.

As for the realizations of self-mentions, there are no significant findings regarding differences between ENL and ELF writers or within the disciplines. But there is a clear difference in the frequency of use of *self mentions* in the hard sciences, depending on the sections where they tend to appear, holding higher numbers of instances in the Results and Discussion and in the Methods section. In the case of the social sciences and the humanities, overall data show there is also a higher use in the Methods section. But these data need to be taken carefully, depending on their linguistic background. In SSH RAs, when focusing specifically on ENL writers, it is

seen they tend to use more self mentioning in the Introduction section, rather than in the Methods section; whereas ELF authors use more *self mentions* in the Methods section. In the case of SC RAs, ENL writers use more self mentioning firstly in the Methods section, and secondly in the Results and Discussion section; ELF writers rather concentrate their self mentioning in the Results and Discussion section. Although total data would show similarities between the different subcorpora the truth is there are not such. Regarding this matter, there is no clear proof of similarities within disciplines or in the use of English by authors from different cultural backgrounds. What is clear anyway is that regardless of their discipline and their linguistic culture, authors avoid self mentioning in their conclusions. As I have already commented, this might be due to the fact that the Conclusion is the section where the authors assume more responsibility for the claims made, being more face-threatening. Avoiding a clear self exposure would be a logical strategy to deal with it. Also, the use of any sort of self mentioning in that section could be too attached to the research presented and it might be interpreted as only applicable to a particular situation, but with limitations to any further applications.

Coming back to the use of self mentioning, we can suggest that Spanish writers in the social sciences and the humanities tend to use much more in comparison to ENL writers, which indicates an absence of a disciplinary convention on the matter. So as seen above, we may wonder whether these implications are limited to the contribution of Spanish authors to the ELF or they are also generally applicable to writers whose L1 is not English.

With regard to the functions that *self mentions* fulfil more frequently, a similar authorial preference has been found across disciplines, and there are no big

differences among the subcorpora. The functions *I/we* as "guide" and "recounter" are the most frequently used. All the authors need to state results and explain procedures to the reader in a clear and explanatory way. I think that this use is perceived and received positively by their disciplinary community, as it allows writers to offer a clear and distinguishable voice which facilitates understanding of the findings.

When we focus on analysis of *self mentions* functions across RA sections some differences can be highlighted: SC RAs show a more frequent use of the "guide and "recounter" in Results and Discussions section, while the ones in SSH RAs are scattered along the Introduction, the Methods and the Results and Discussion sections. Concentrating on the cross-cultural analysis, Spanish writers tend to use the "guide" and "recounter" function primarily in the Methods section which might indicate the intention to follow disciplinary conventions attributed to the hard sciences, instead of adopting their own disciplinary conventions. In order to clarify if this phenomenon only takes place in the case of Spanish writers in English or, on the contrary, it could be something characteristic of other instances of ELF, a further and deeper analysis would be needed as mentioned in previous cases.

There is no difference in the frequency of use of *self mentions* of I/we as "originator" or "claimer" all through the corpus. However, a clear difference is found in the instances of *self mentions* as "opinion holders", with a presence of this function three times higher in the social sciences and the humanities, and a higher use by Spanish authors. As I have already mentioned, I consider that the higher presence of "opinion holders" might indicate a more tentative approach to the discussion of the results, compared to the more face-threatening "originator". What is remarkably surprising is that it takes place in the SSH RAs and in those written by Spanish authors. Generally,

their use takes place mostly in the Results and Discussion section, so it could be understood as a more cautious approach to the presentation of the findings. Nevertheless, and once more, a further study on the matter would be advised here to know if this is a generalized tendency in ELF.

We can summarise this discussion saying that there are important disciplinary conventions which are applied in the writing process of research papers and which shape the way authors represent themselves and the rest of the Academia, which proves one of the initial hypotheses of this research. We can also state that, although there are certain similarities, the two areas of knowledge studied here present very distinguishable features in the portrayal of the different voices in their articles, which was another of the initial hypothesis we started from. The use of *self mentions* and *evidentials* varies significantly in the sections in which they appear when applying a cross-cultural or cross-disciplinary approach, which was the last of the initial hypothesis of the present study.

To conclude, and together with these findings, this study has accomplished its objective of highlighting some of the contributions Spanish writers may be making to ELF with regard to the projection of their self and their colleagues' voice. Many features have been found to be similar to those made by ENL writers, but others are not. In the latter cases, a deeper and more complete study needs to be pursued, and it is the aim of this author to carry out an extensive study in the area of ELF in the future which might cast some light onto these issues.

5. Acknowledgements

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my master thesis supervisor, Dr. Rosa Lorés Sanz. She has offered me invaluable guidance and support in every stage, and her revisions and suggestions have made possible the completion of this research. In a personal aspect, I cannot forget mentioning her effort, encouragement and support in the weakest moments of this long process. I truly appreciate all the help she has provided and I am grateful of counting her as my supervisor, as well as an academic and professional example.

I would also like to thank the teachers I had the opportunity to learn from in the degree and especially during the master. Their knowledge and expertise have influenced me greatly and encouraged me to continue exploring the possibilities of the academic world. In special, my teachers of the subarea of linguistics, whose teachings and experience have strengthened my interest in this academic field.

In the particulars of this article, I am indebted to Dr Mur-Dueñas for kindly having given me access to the English RAs by Spanish authors used in this research.

6. References

Ädel, A. (2006). *Metadiscourse in L1 and L2 English.* Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Afros, E. & Schryer, C. F. (2009). Promotional (meta)discourse in research articles in language and literary studies. *English for Specific Purposes , 28*, 58-68.

Belcher, D. (2007). Seeking acceptance in and English-only research world. *Journal of Second Language Writing* , 16 (1), 1-22.

Bellés-Fortuño, B. & Querol, J. (2010). Evaluation in research article abstracts: A cross-cultural study between Spanish and English medical discourse. In Lorés-Sanz, R. et al (eds). *Constructing interpersonality: Multiple perspectives on written academic genres.* (83-98). Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Carciu, O. (2009). An intercultural study of first-person plural references in biomedical writing. *Ibérica*, 18, 71-92.

Charles, M. (2009). Stance, Interaction and the Rhetorical Patterns of Restrictive Adverbs: Discourse Roles of Only, Just, Simply and Merely. In Charles, M. (ed). *Academic Writing* (152-169). London and New York: Continuum.

Connor, U., & Moreno, A. I. (2005). Tertium comparationis: A vital component in contrastive rhetoric research. In Bruthiaux, D. A. P. (ed). *Directions in applied linguistics: Essays in honor of Robert B. Kaplan* (153-164). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Ferguson, G.. (2007). The global spread of English, scientific communication and ESP: questions of equity, access and domain loss. *Ibérica,* 13 (Spring). 7–38.

Ferguson, G. et al. (2011). English as an international language of scientific publication: a study of attitudes. *World Englishes*, 30 (1), 41-59.

Fløttum, K., & T. Dahl and T. Kinn 2006. *Academic voices – Across languages and disciplines.* Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Flowerdew, J. (2001). Attitudes of journal editors to nonnative speakers contributions. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35, 121-150.

Gentil, G. (2005, July). Does language matter? French biologists publishing in English. *Paper presented at the 14th World Congress of Applied Linguistics (AILA)* .

Halliday, M. A. K.(1985). *Introduction to functional grammar.* London: Arnold (2nd ed., 1994).

Harwood, N. (2005a). 'Nowhere has anyone attempted...In this article I aim to do just that': A corpus-based study of self-promotional I and we in academic writing across four disciplines. *Journal of Pragmatics , 37*, 1207-1231.

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

Hinds, J. (1987). Reader versus writer responsibility: A new typology . In Connor, U. (ed). *Writing across Languages. Analyses of L2 Texts.* (141–152). Reading: Addison-Weslye.

Hyland, K. (1998). Persuasion and Context: The Pragmatics of Academic Discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics* 30: 437-455.

Hyland, K. (1999a). *Disciplinary Discourse: Social Interactions in Academic Writing.* London: Longman.

Hyland, K. (1999b). Academic Attribution: Citation and the Construction of Disciplinary Knowledge. *Applied Linguistics* 20, 3: 341-67.

Hyland, K. (2001). Humble servants of the discipline? Self-mention in research articles. *English for Specific Purposes , 20*, 207-226.

Hyland, K. (2002a). Authority and invisibility: Authorial identity in academic writing. *Journal of Pragmatics , 34*, 1091-1112.

Hyland, K. (2002b). Options of identity in academic writing. *ELT Journal , 56*, 351-358.

Hyland, K. (2005). *Metadiscourse.* London: Continuum.

Hyland, K. (2008). Disciplinary voices. *English Text Construction , 1* (1), 5-22.

Ivanic, R. (1998). *Writing an identity: the discoursal construction of identity in academic writing*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Ivanic, R. &. Camps, D. (2001). I and how I sound: Voice as self-representation in L2 writing. *Journal of Second LAnguage Writing , 10*, 3-33.

Kirkpatrick, A. (2009). English as the international language of scholarship: Implications for the dissemination of "local" knowledge. In Shariftan, F. (ed.), *English as an international language*, 254-270. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Kramsch, C. &. Lam, W.S.E. (1999). Textual identities: The importance of being non-native. In G. Braine, *Non-native educators in English language teaching.* (57-72). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

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

Lafuente-Millán, E. (2010). 'Extending this claim, we propose...' The writer's presence in research articles from different disciplines. *Ibérica , 20*, 35-56.

Llurdá, E. (2004). Non-native-speaker teachers and English as an International Language. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics , 14* (3), 314-323.

Lorés-Sanz, R. (2006). "I will argue that": First person pronouns and metadiscoursal devices in RA abstracts in English and Spanish. *ESP across Cultures* (3), 23-40.

Lorés-Sanz, R. (2008). Genres in contrast: The Exploration of Writers' Wisibility in Research Articles and Research Article Abstracts. In Burgess, S. & Martín-Martín, P. (ed), *English as an additional language in research publication and communication*, 105-122. Bern: Peter Lang.

Lorés-Sanz, R. (2009a). Different worlds, different audiences: A contrastive analysis of research article abstracts. In E. S.-S. Dervin, *Cross-cultural and cross-linguistic perspectives on academic discourse.* (187-197). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Lorés-Sanz, R. (2009b). (Non-)critical voices in the reviewing of history discourse: A cross-cultural study of evaluation. In K. H. (eds), *Academic evaluation: Review genres in university settings.* (143-160). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Lorés-Sanz, R. (2011a). The construction of the author's voice in academic writing: The interplay of cultural and disciplinary factors. *Text & Talk*, 31, 173-193.

Lorés-Sanz, R. (2011b). The study of authorial voice: Using a Spanish-English corpus to explore linguistic transference. *Corpora , 6* (1), 314-323.

Lorés-Sanz, R.; et al. (2014). Motivations and Attitudes of Spanish Chemistry and Economic Researchers Towards Publication in English-Medium Scientific Journals. *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses*, 69, 83-100

Martín Martín, P. (2003). A genre analysis of English and Spanish research abstracts in experimental social sciences. *Englsih for Specific Purposes* , 22, 25-43.

Martín Martín, P. (2005). *The rhetoric of the abstract in English and Spanish scientific discourse: A cross-cultural genre-analytic approach.* Bern: Peter Lang.

Martín Martín, P. &. Burgess, S. (2004). The rhetorical management of academic criticism in research article abstracts. *Text*, 24, 171-195.

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

Moreno, A. I. & Suárez, L. (2008). A study of critical attitude across English and Spanish academic book reviews. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes.* (7), 15-26.

Moreno, A. I. & Suárez, L. (2009). Academic book reviews in English and Spanish: Critical comments and rhetorical structure. In K. H. (eds), *Academic evaluation: Review genres in university settings.* (161-178). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Mur-Dueñas, P. (2007). 'I/we focus on...': A cross-cultural analysis of self-mentions in business management research articles. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* , 143-162.

Mur-Dueñas, P. (2009). Logical markers in L1 (Spanish and English) and L2 (English) business research articles. *English Text Construction , 2* (2), 246-264.

Mur-Dueñas, P. (2010a). Attitute markers in business management research articles: A cross-cultural corpus-driven approach. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics.* 20, 50-72.

Mur-Dueñas, P. (2010b). A contrastive analysis of research article introductions in English and Spanish. *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses,* 61, 119-133.

Mur-Dueñas, P. (2011). An intercultural analysis of metadiscourse features in research articles written in English and in Spanish. *Journal of Pragmatics,* 43, 3068-3079.

Mur-Dueñas, P. (2013). Spanish scholars' research article publishing process in English-medium journals: English used as lingua franca? *Journal of Englsih as a Lingua Franca , 2* (2), 315-340.

Mur-Dueñas, P. et al. (2010). Editorial. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 9 (2010) 83-85

Murillo-Ornat, S. (2012). The use of reformulation markers in business management research articles: An intercultural analysis. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics , 17*, 62-88.

Pérez-Llantada, C. (2015). Genres in the forefront, languages in the background: The scope of genre analysis in language-related scenarios. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 19, 10-21.

Quirk et al (1985) *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language.* London: Longman.

Seidlhofer, B. (2001). Closing a conceptual gap: The case for a description of English as a lingua franca. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics , 2* (11), 133-158.

Seidlhofer, B. (2011). *Understanding English as a Lingua Franca.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sheldon, E. (2011). Rhetorical differences in RA introductions written by English L1 and L2 and Castilian Spanish L1 writers. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes , 10,* 238-251.

St. John, M. (1987). Writing process of Spanish scientists publising in English. *English for Specific Purposes, 2* (6), 113-120.

Swales, J. (1986). Citation analysis and discourse analysis. *Applied Linguistics* , 7 (1), 39-56.

Swales, J. (1987). Utilizing the literatures in teaching the research paper. *TESOL Quarterly*, 21, 41-68.

Swales, J. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic research settings.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Swales, J. (1997). English as Tyrannosaurus Rex. *World Englishes*, 16, 373-382.

Swales, J. (2004). *Research genres: Exploration and applications.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tang, R. & John, S. (1999). The 'I' in identity: Exploring writer identity in student academic writing through the first person pronoun. *English for Specific Purposes , 18*, 23-39.

Vassileva, I. (1998). "Who am I/who are we in academic writing?: A contrastive analysis of authorial presence in English, German, French, Russian and Bulgarian". *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 8: 163-189

	Title	Discipline	Nº of RA words (excluding
SC ELF 1	Campo: a code for the design of heliostat fields in solar power tower	Mechanical Engineering	7173
SC ELF 2	In vitro and in vivo assessment of glycemic index of bakery products. Influence of ingreadinets reformulation	Food Technology	4203
SC ELF 3	Training plans in eco-efficiency and industry corporate social responsibility opportunities	Mechanical Engineering	2744
SC ELF 4	Numerical analysis of periodic solutions and bifurcations in the planetary annulus problem	Mathematics	4101
SC ELF 5	Effect of whole-body vibration therapy on health-related physical fitness in children and adolescents with disabilities: a systematic review	Sports Medicine	4871
SC ELF 6	Quantification and determiantion of release rates of aroma compounds in wine based on the automated multiple headspace in-tube extraction	Chemistry	4385
			27477
SSH ELF 1	Geology: the invisible element in drawings and sketches of the environment	Science didactics	6884
SSH ELF 2	Spanish practitioners and undergraduates reading and dealing with medical English	Applied Linguisitcs	4495
SSH ELF 3	Is "living together, loving each other" enough for Law? (Reflections about some "brave new families"	Civil Law	10429
SSH ELF 4	Demographic differences on volunteering participation rates in Europe	Economics	5238
SSH ELF 5	Foreign Direct Investment in a Process of Economic Integration: The Case of Spanish Manufacturing, 1986-1992	Economics	5970
SSH ELF 6	Iulius Romanus and Statilius Maximus: A reappraisal	Ancient History	5931
			38947
SC ENL 1	Design of a high-impact survivable robot	Mechanical Engineering	6008
SC ENL 2	Mass spectrometric determination of the predominant adrenergic protoalkaloids in bitter rorange	Food Technology	4555
SC ENL 3	Model validation of the output reciprocating dynamic responses of a twin electro-rheological clutch mechanism	Mechanical Engineering	5253
SC ENL 4	The sufficiency of arithmetic progressions for the 3x+1 conjecture	Mathematics	4068
SC ENL 5	Lower extremity osteoarthritis management neesa a paradigm shift	Sports Medicine	3234
SC ENL 6	Discrimination of biological and chemical threat simulants in residue mixtures on multiple substrates	Chemistry	4801
			27919
SSH ENL 1	Transfer of reading comprehension skills to L2 is linked to mental representations of text and to L2 working memo	Science didactics	8022
SSH ENL 2	Eliciting engagement in the high school classroom: A mixed-methods examination of teaching practices	Applied Linguisitcs	12448
SSH ENL 3	The differing tax treatment of investment advisory fees and brokerage fees; a general Analysis and and analysis in	Civil Law	8944
SSH ENL 4	How much should I give and how often? The effects of generosity and frequency of a favor exchange on social stat	Economics	7248
SSH ENL 5	Interpersonal aggression in work groups: social influence, reciprocal, and individual effects	Economics	5441
SSH ENL 6	Early roman epic and the maritime moment	Ancient History	9275
			51378

Total number of words in ELF	66424
Total number of words in ENL	79297
Total number of words in SC	55396
Total number of words in SSH	90325
Total number of words	145721

APPENDIX 2 – CORPUS REFERENCES[5]

SC ELF

SC ELF 1- Collado, F. J. & Guallar, J. (2011). Campo: Generation of regular heliostat fields. *Renewable Energy*. 46, 49-59

SC ELF 2- Iglesia, I.; Ferrer-Mairal, A.; Peñalva-Lapuente, C; Urtasun, L.; De Miguel-Etayo, P; S. Remón, S.; Cortés, E. & Moreno, L. A. (2012). In vitro and in vivo assessment of the glycemic index of bakery products: influence of the reformulation of ingredients. *European Journal of Nutrition.* 51 (8), 947-954

SC ELF 3- Llera, E.; Scarpellini, S. Aranda, A. & Zabalza, I. (2013). Forecasting job creation from renewable energy deployment through a value-chain approach. Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, 21 (C), 262-271.

SC ELF 4- Tresaco, E.; Riaguas, A. & Elipe, A. (2013). Numerical analysis of periodic solutions and bifurcations in the planetary annulus problem. *Applied Mathematics and Computation.* 225, 645–655

SC ELF 5- Casajús, J. A., Matute-Llorente, A., González-Agüero, A., Gómez-Cabello, A. & Vicente-Rodríguez, G (2014). Effect of Whole-Body Vibration Therapy on Health-Related Physical Fitness in Children and Adolescents With Disabilities: A Systematic Review. *Journal of Adolescent Health* 54 (4), 385–396

SC ELF 6- Zapata, J; López, R. & Ferreira, V. (2013). Quantification of Aroma Compounds in Wine Based on The Automated Multiple Headspace In-Tube Extraction: Comparison of Release Behaviour in Different Wines. *Separation Science.* 5 (4), 7-12.

SSH ELF

SSH ELF 1- Martínez-Peña, M. B. & Gil-Quílez, M. J. (2014). Drawings as a Tool for Understanding Geology in the Environment. *Journal of Geoscience Education*. 62 (4), 701-713.

SSH ELF 2- Herrando-Rodrigo, I. (2015). Attitudes and discourse: Spanish practitioners' and undergraduates' survey results. *PROFILE Issues in Teachers' Professional Development, 17* (1), 55-72.

SSH ELF 3- Martínez de Aguirre, C. (2012). Is 'Living Together, Loving Each Other' Enough for Law? (Reflections on Some 'Brave New Families'). *International Journal of the Jurisprudence of the Family*. 3, 37

---

[5] The references of the SC ELF and SSH ELF articles are those of the final published versions. It is important to state once mora as a reminder, this research has had the priviledge of accessing the first versions of the articles, which allow a deeper analysis of the Spanish writers' contribution to ELF.

SSH ELF 4- Gil-Lacruz, A. I., Marcuello-Servós, C. & Saz-Gil, M. I. (2015). Youth Volunteering in Countries in the European Union: Approximation to Differences. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 10.

SSH ELF 5- Bajo-Rubio, O. & López-Pueyo, C. (2002). Foreign Direct Investment in a Process of Economic Integration: The Case of Spanish Manufacturing, 1986-1992. *Journal of Economic Integration*. 17, (1), 85-103

SSH ELF 6- Uría, J. (2012). Iulius Romanus and Statilius Maximus (Char. Gramm. 252, 14-31): a Reappraisal. *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* : 69, (2).

SC ENL

SC ENL 1- O'Halloran, D., Wolf, A. & Choset, H. (2005). Design of a high-impact survivable robot. *Mechanism and Machine Theory*. 40 (12), 1345-1366.

SC ENL 2- Nelson, B. C.; Putzbach, K.; Sharpless K. E. & Sander, L. C. (2007). Mass Spectrometric Determination of the Predominant Adrenergic Protoalkaloids in Bitter Orange (*Citrus aurantium*). *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, 55 (24), 9769–9775

SC ENL 3- Tan, K. P.; Johnson, A. R.; Stanway, R. & Bullough, W. A. (2007). Model validation of the output reciprocating dynamic responses of a twin electro-rheological (ER) clutch mechanism. *Mechanism and Machine Theory*, 42 (11), 1547-1562.

SC ENL 4- Monks, K. M. (2006). The sufficiency of arithmetic progressions for the 3x + 1 Conjecture. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 134, 2861-2872.

SC ENL 5- Hunter, J. D. (2011). Lower extremity osteoarthritis management needs a paradigm shift. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, 45, 283-288.

SC ENL 6- Gottfried, J. L. (2011). Discrimination of biological and chemical threat stimulants in residue mixtures on multiple substrates. *Analytical an Bioanalytical Chemistry*, 400 (10), 3289-3301.

SSH ENL

SSH ENL 1- Walter, C. (2004). Transfer of Reading Comprehension Skills to L2 is Linked to Mental Representations of Text and to L2 Working Memory. *Applied Linguistics*, 25 (3), 315-339.

SSH ENL 2- Cooper, K. S. (2013). Eliciting Engagement in the High School Classroom: A Mixed-Methods Examination of Teaching Practices. American Educational Research Journal, 51 (2), 363-402.

SSH ENL 3- Rickert, B. (2006). The Different Tax Treatment of Investment Advisory Fees and Brokerage Fees; The Lower the Fiduciary Duty, the

Better the Tax Consequences. *International Journal of Civil Society Law*, 4 (2), 71-90

SSH ENL 4- Flynn, F. J. (2003). How Much Should I Give and How Often? The Effects of Generosity and Frequency of Favor Exchange on Social Status and Productivity . *Academy of Management Journal*, 46 (5), 539-553.

SSH ENL 5- Glomb, T. M. & Liao, H. (2003). Interpersonal Aggression in Work Groups: Social Influence, Reciprocal, and Individual Effects. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46 (4), 486-496.

SSH ENL 6- Leigh, M. (2010). Early Roman Epic and the Maritime Moment. *Classical Philology*, 105 (3), 265-280.

APPENDIX 3
NORMALIZED RESULTS OF *EVIDENTIALS*

DETAILED DATA OF CORPUS

SSH ELF

Evidentials	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Integral	0,56	0,48	0,33	0,25	1,62
Non-integral	1,84	3,18	1,25	0,48	6,75
Total	2,4	3,66	1,58	0,73	8,37

SSH ENL

Evidentials	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Integral	0,33	0,29	0,19	0,03	0,84
Non-integral	2,56	3,3	1,98	0,23	8,07
Total	2,89	3,59	2,17	0,26	8,91

SC ELF

Evidentials	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Integral	0,18	0,47	0,72	0,03	1,41
Non-integral	3,42	0,72	1,49	1,09	6,73
Total	3,6	1,19	2,21	1,12	8,12

SC ENL

Evidentials	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Integral	0,46	0,25	0	0	0,71
Non-integral	1,27	1,75	1,28	0	4,3
Total	1,73	2	1,28	0	5,01

CROSS-DISCIPLINARY CONTRAST

SSH

Evidentials	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Integral	0,89	0,77	0,52	0,28	2,46
Non-integral	4,4	6,48	3,23	0,71	14,82
Total	5,29	7,25	3,75	0,99	17,28

SCL

Evidentials	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Integral	0,64	0,72	0,72	0,03	2,11
Non-integral	4,69	2,47	2,77	1,09	11,02
Total	5,33	3,19	3,49	1,12	13,13

CROSS-CULTURAL CONTRAST

ENL

Evidentials	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Integral	0,79	0,54	0,19	0,03	1,55
Non-integral	3,83	5,05	3,26	0,23	12,37
Total	4,62	5,59	3,45	0,26	13,92

ELF

Evidentials	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Integral	0,74	0,95	1,05	0,28	3,02
Non-integral	5,26	3,9	2,74	1,57	13,47
Total	6	4,85	3,79	1,85	16,49

NORMALIZED RESULTS OF *SELF MENTIONS* – CATEGORIES

KNOWLEDGE AREA CONTRAST

SSH ELF

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
I	0,12	0,59	0,28	0,1	1,09
me	0	0,1	0,02	0,02	0,14
my	0,05	0,17	0,12	0	0,34
mine	0	0	0	0	0
We	0,28	1,79	1,18	0,89	4,14
us	0,12	0,3	0,07	0,02	0,51
our	0,17	0,12	0,38	0,12	0,79
ours	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0,74	3,07	2,05	1,15	7,01

SSH ENL

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
I	0,15	0,25	0,03	0,03	0,46
me	0,02	0,02	0	0	0,04
my	0,05	0,02	0	0,03	0,1
mine	0	0	0	0	0
We	0,42	0,19	0,41	0,05	1,07
us	0	0,05	0	0	0,05
our	0,19	0,02	0,23	0,11	0,55
ours	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0,83	0,55	0,67	0,22	2,27

SC ELF

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
I	0	0	0	0	0
me	0	0	0	0	0
my	0	0	0	0	0
mine	0	0	0	0	0
We	0,51	0,47	2,87	0,21	4,06
us	0	0	0,07	0,03	0,1
our	0,03	0,03	0,11	0,18	0,35
ours	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0,54	0,5	3,05	0,42	4,51

SC ENL

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
I	0	0	0	0	0
me	0	0	0	0	0
my	0	0	0	0	0
mine	0	0	0	0	0
We	0,46	1,32	1,39	0,21	3,38
us	0	1,79	0,03	0	1,82
our	0,21	0,32	0,14	0,07	0,74
ours	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0,67	3,43	1,56	0,28	5,94

NORMALIZED RESULTS OF *SELF MENTIONS* - CATEGORIES (DISCIPLINARY/CULTURALLY)

CROSS-DISCIPLINARY CONTRAST

SSH

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
I	0,27	0,84	0,31	0,13	1,55
me	0,02	0,12	0,02	0,02	0,18
my	0,1	0,19	0,12	0,03	0,44
mine	0	0	0	0	0
We	0,7	1,98	1,59	0,94	5,21
us	0,12	0,35	0,07	0,02	0,56
our	0,36	0,14	0,61	0,23	1,34
ours	0	0	0	0	0
Total	1,57	3,62	2,72	1,37	9,28

SC

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
I	0	0	0	0	0
me	0	0	0	0	0
my	0	0	0	0	0
mine	0	0	0	0	0
We	0,97	1,79	4,26	0,42	7,44
us	0	1,79	0,1	0,03	1,92
our	0,24	0,35	0,25	0,25	1,09
ours	0	0	0	0	0
Total	1,21	3,93	4,61	0,7	10,45

CROSS-CULTURAL CONTRAST

ENL

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
I	0,15	0,25	0,03	0,03	0,46
me	0,02	0,02	0	0	0,04
my	0,05	0,02	0	0,03	0,1
mine	0	0	0	0	0
We	0,88	1,51	1,8	0,26	4,45
us	0	1,84	0,03	0	1,87
our	0,4	0,34	0,37	0,18	1,29
ours	0	0	0	0	0
Total	1,5	3,98	2,23	0,5	8,21

ELF

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
I	0,12	0,59	0,28	0,1	1,09
me	0	0,1	0,02	0,02	0,14
my	0,05	0,17	0,12	0	0,34
mine	0	0	0	0	0
We	0,79	2,26	4,05	1,1	8,2
us	0,12	0,3	0,14	0,05	0,61
our	0,2	0,15	0,49	0,3	1,14
ours	0	0	0	0	0
Total	1,28	3,57	5,1	1,57	11,52

NORMALIZED RESULTS OF *SELF MENTIONS* – FUNCTIONS

DETAILED DATA OF CORPUS

SC ELF

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Originator	0,14	0,11	0,32	0,11	0,68
Opinion-holder	0	0	0,03	0	0,03
Guide/recounter	0,18	0,25	2	0	2,43
Exclusive	0,18	0,14	0,4	0,32	1,04
Inclusive/rhetorical	0,03	0	0,29	0	0,32
General	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0,53	0,5	3,04	0,43	4,5

SSH ELF

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Originator	0,02	0,18	0,23	0,1	0,53
Opinion-holder	0	0,15	0,41	0,02	0,58
Guide/recounter	0,25	1,46	0,82	0,23	2,76
Exclusive	0,2	0,59	0,48	0,23	1,5
Inclusive/rhetorical	0,1	0,59	0,12	0,51	1,32
General	0,18	0,12	0	0,07	0,37
Total	0,75	3,09	2,06	1,16	7,06

SC ENL

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Originator	0,21	0,07	0,07	0	0,35
Opinion-holder	0	0	0	0	0
Guide/recounter	0,1	0,25	0,64	0,03	1,02
Exclusive	0,18	0,78	0,18	0,1	1,24
Inclusive/rhetorical	0,18	0,64	0,68	0,14	1,64
General	0	0,07	0	0	0,07
Total	0,67	1,81	1,57	0,27	4,32

SSH ENL

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Originator	0,1	0,02	0,17	0,02	0,31
Opinion-holder	0,05	0,05	0,02	0,02	0,14
Guide/recounter	0,54	0,35	0,33	0,05	1,27
Exclusive	0,07	0,05	0,07	0,07	0,26
Inclusive/rhetorical	0,02	0,07	0,07	0,07	0,23
General	0,05	0	0	0	0,05
Total	0,83	0,54	0,66	0,23	2,26

NORMALIZED RESULTS OF *SELF MENTIONS* – FUNCTIONS (DISCIPLINARY/CULTURALLY)

CROSS-DISCIPLINARY CONTRAST

SSH

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Originator	0,12	0,2	0,4	0,12	0,84
Opinion-holder	0,05	0,2	0,43	0,04	0,72
Guide/recounter	0,79	1,81	1,15	0,28	4,03
Exclusive	0,27	0,64	0,55	0,3	1,76
Inclusive/rhetorical	0,12	0,66	0,19	0,58	1,55
General	0,23	0,12	0	0,07	0,42
Total	1,58	3,63	2,72	1,39	9,32

SC

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Originator	0,35	0,18	0,39	0,11	1,03
Opinion-holder	0	0	0,03	0	0,03
Guide/recounter	0,28	0,5	2,64	0,03	3,45
Exclusive	0,36	0,92	0,58	0,42	2,28
Inclusive/rhetorical	0,21	0,64	0,97	0,14	1,96
General	0	0,07	0	0	0,07
Total	1,2	2,31	4,61	0,7	8,82

CROSS-CULTURAL CONTRAST

ENL

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Originator	0,31	0,09	0,24	0,02	0,66
Opinion-holder	0,05	0,05	0,02	0,02	0,14
Guide/recounter	0,64	0,6	0,97	0,08	2,29
Exclusive	0,25	0,83	0,25	0,17	1,5
Inclusive/rhetorical	0,2	0,71	0,75	0,21	1,87
General	0,05	0,07	0	0	0,12
Total	1,5	2,35	2,23	0,5	6,58

ELF

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Originator	0,16	0,29	0,55	0,21	1,21
Opinion-holder	0	0,15	0,44	0,02	0,61
Guide/recounter	0,43	1,71	2,82	0,23	5,19
Exclusive	0,38	0,73	0,88	0,55	2,54
Inclusive/rhetorical	0,13	0,59	0,41	0,51	1,64
General	0,18	0,12	0	0,07	0,37
Total	1,28	3,59	5,1	1,59	11,56

RAW DATA OF *EVIDENTIALS* IN THE ARTICLES (SC)

DETAILED DATA FROM RA

SC ELF

1st RA

Evidentials	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Integral	0	2	1	1	4
Non-integral	31	8	3	0	42
Total	31	10	4	1	46

2nd RA

Evidentials	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Integral	0	3	0	0	3
Non-integral	17	4	0	27	48
Total	17	7	0	27	51

3rd RA

Evidentials	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Integral	0	4	0	0	4
Non-integral	0	3	4	1	8
Total	0	7	4	1	12

4th RA

Evidentials	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Integral	1	6	1	0	8
Non-integral	4	2	10	0	16
Total	5	8	11	0	24

5th RA

Evidentials	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Integral	0	2	18	0	20
Non-integral	30	2	26	3	61
Total	30	4	44	3	81

6th RA

Evidentials	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Integral	0	0	0	0	0
Non-integral	9	9	1	0	10
Total	9	9	1	0	10

SC ENL

1st RA

Evidentials	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Integral	4	1	0	0	5
Non-integral	0	3	0	0	3
Total	4	4	0	0	8

2nd RA

Evidentials	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Integral	1	0	0	0	1
Non-integral	10	1	5	0	16
Total	11	1	5	0	17

3rd RA

Evidentials	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Integral	7	0	0	0	7
Non-integral	2	5	3	0	10
Total	9	5	3	0	17

4th RA

Evidentials	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Integral	1	6	0	0	7
Non-integral	1	2	3	0	6
Total	2	8	3	0	13

5th RA

Evidentials	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Integral	0	0	0	0	0
Non-integral	6	38	15	0	59
Total	6	38	15	0	59

6th RA

Evidentials	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Integral	0	0	0	0	0
Non-integral	15	0	10	0	25
Total	15	0	10	0	25

RAW DATA OF *EVIDENTIAL*S IN THE ARTICLES (SSH)

DETAILED DATA FROM RA

SSH ELF

1st RA

Evidentials	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Integral	5	5	5	0	16
Non-integral	19	0	0	6	25
Total	24	5	5	6	41

2nd RA

Evidentials	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Integral	10	1	0	0	11
Non-integral	35	17	0	0	52
Total	45	18	0	0	63

3rd RA

Evidentials	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Integral	0	0	0	0	0
Non-integral	5	26	12	4	47
Total	5	26	12	4	47

4th RA

Evidentials	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Integral	0	0	4	0	4
Non-integral	10	30	0	3	43
Total	10	30	4	3	47

5th RA

Evidentials	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Integral	2	2	11	3	18
Non-integral	2	21	31	3	57
Total	4	23	42	6	75

6th RA

Evidentials	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Integral	5	7	2	1	15
Non-integral	1	30	6	3	40
Total	6	37	8	4	55

SSH ENL

1st RA

Evidentials	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Integral	9	8	4	1	22
Non-integral	37	7	4	0	48
Total	46	15	8	1	70

2nd RA

Evidentials	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Integral	0	1	1	0	2
Non-integral	11	21	28	1	61
Total	11	22	29	1	63

3rd RA

Evidentials	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Integral	0	0	0	0	0
Non-integral	4	46	5	0	55
Total	4	46	5	0	55

4th RA

Evidentials	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Integral	0	4	2	1	7
Non-integral	21	31	1	6	59
Total	21	35	3	7	66

5th RA

Evidentials	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Integral	8	2	3	0	13
Non-integral	56	12	12	0	80
Total	64	14	15	0	93

6th RA

Evidentials	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Integral	0	0	0	0	0
Non-integral	3	53	52	5	113
Total	3	53	52	5	113

RAW DATA OF *SELF MENTIONS* IN THE ARTICLES (SCELF)

DETAILED DATA OF SC ELF

APARITIONS

1st RA

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
I	0	0	0	0	0
me	0	0	0	0	0
my	0	0	0	0	0
mine	0	0	0	0	0
We	5	8	18	0	31
us	0	0	0	0	0
our	0	0	0	0	0
ours	0	0	0	0	0
Total	5	8	18	0	31

2nd RA

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
I	0	0	0	0	0
me	0	0	0	0	0
my	0	0	0	0	0
mine	0	0	0	0	0
We	0	0	0	3	3
us	0	0	0	0	0
our	0	0	0	5	5
ours	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	0	0	8	8

3rd RA

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
I	0	0	0	0	0
me	0	0	0	0	0
my	0	0	0	0	0
mine	0	0	0	0	0
We	0	1	0	1	2
us	0	0	0	0	0
our	0	0	1	1	2
ours	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	1	1	2	4

4th RA

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
I	0	0	0	0	0
me	0	0	0	0	0
my	0	0	0	0	0
mine	0	0	0	0	0
We	8	5	56	2	71
us	0	0	2	1	3
our	1	0	1	0	2
ours	0	0	0	0	0
Total	9	5	59	3	76

5th RA

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
I	0	0	0	0	0
me	0	0	0	0	0
my	0	0	0	0	0
mine	0	0	0	0	0
We	0	0	0	4	5
us	0	0	0	0	0
our	0	0	0	1	1
ours	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	0	0	5	6

6th RA

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
I	0	0	0	0	0
me	0	0	0	0	0
my	0	0	0	0	0
mine	0	0	0	0	0
We	0	0	0	0	0
us	0	0	0	0	0
our	0	1	0	0	2
ours	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	1	1	0	4

FUNCTIONS

1st RA

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Originator	0	0	0	0	0
Opinion-holder	0	0	0	0	0
Guide/recounter	1	5	16	0	22
Exclusive	4	3	2	0	9
Inclusive/rhetorical	0	0	0	0	0
General	0	0	0	0	0
Total	5	8	18	0	31

2nd RA

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Originator	0	0	0	0	0
Opinion-holder	0	0	0	0	0
Guide/recounter	0	0	0	0	0
Exclusive	0	0	0	8	8
Inclusive/rhetorical	0	0	0	0	0
General	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	0	0	8	8

3rd RA

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Originator	0	0	0	0	0
Opinion-holder	0	0	0	0	0
Guide/recounter	1	0	1	0	2
Exclusive	0	1	1	0	2
Inclusive/rhetorical	0	0	0	0	0
General	0	0	0	0	0
Total	1	1	1	0	4

4th RA

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Originator	4	3	8	2	17
Opinion-holder	0	0	1	0	1
Guide/recounter	3	2	37	0	42
Exclusive	1	0	5	1	7
Inclusive/rhetorical	1	0	8	0	9
General	0	0	0	0	0
Total	9	5	59	3	76

5th RA

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Originator	0	0	0	1	2
Opinion-holder	0	0	0	0	0
Guide/recounter	0	0	1	0	1
Exclusive	0	0	3	0	3
Inclusive/rhetorical	0	0	0	0	0
General	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	0	5	1	6

6th RA

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Originator	0	0	0	0	0
Opinion-holder	0	0	0	0	0
Guide/recounter	0	0	1	0	2
Exclusive	0	0	1	0	2
Inclusive/rhetorical	0	0	0	0	0
General	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	1	1	0	4

RAW DATA OF *SELF MENTIONS* IN THE ARTICLES (SCENL)

DETAILED DATA OF SC ENL

APARITIONS

1st RA

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
I	0	0	0	0	0
me	0	0	0	0	0
my	0	0	0	0	0
mine	0	0	0	0	0
We	0	24	0	0	24
us	0	5	0	0	5
our	1	2	0	1	4
ours	0	0	0	0	0
Total	1	31	0	1	33

2nd RA

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
I	0	0	0	0	0
me	0	0	0	0	0
my	0	0	0	0	0
mine	0	0	0	0	0
We	0	1	0	0	1
us	0	0	0	0	0
our	0	0	0	0	0
ours	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	1	0	0	1

3rd RA

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
I	0	0	0	0	0
me	0	0	0	0	0
my	0	0	0	0	0
mine	0	0	0	0	0
We	0	0	0	0	0
us	0	0	0	0	0
our	0	0	0	0	0
ours	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	0	0	0	0

4th RA

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
I	0	0	0	0	0
me	0	0	0	0	0
my	0	0	0	0	0
mine	0	0	0	0	0
We	8	3	35	0	46
us	0	0	1	0	1
our	2	2	1	0	5
ours	0	0	0	0	0
Total	10	5	37	0	52

5th RA

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
I	0	0	0	0	0
me	0	0	0	0	0
my	0	0	0	0	0
mine	0	0	0	0	0
We	3	10	2	3	18
us	0	0	0	0	0
our	2	5	0	0	7
ours	0	0	0	0	0
Total	5	15	2	3	25

6th RA

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
I	0	0	0	0	0
me	0	0	0	0	0
my	0	0	0	0	0
mine	0	0	0	0	0
We	0	1	2	3	6
us	0	0	0	0	0
our	0	1	3	1	5
ours	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	2	5	4	11

FUNCTIONS

1st RA

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Originator	0	0	1	0	1
Opinion-holder	0	0	0	0	0
Guide/recounter	0	0	5	0	5
Exclusive	1	1	18	0	20
Inclusive/rhetorical	0	0	7	0	7
General	0	0	0	0	0
Total	1	1	31	0	33

2nd RA

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Originator	0	0	0	0	0
Opinion-holder	0	0	0	0	0
Guide/recounter	0	0	0	0	0
Exclusive	0	1	0	0	1
Inclusive/rhetorical	0	0	0	0	0
General	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	1	0	0	1

3rd RA

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Originator	0	0	0	0	0
Opinion-holder	0	0	0	0	0
Guide/recounter	0	0	0	0	0
Exclusive	0	0	0	0	0
Inclusive/rhetorical	0	0	0	0	0
General	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	0	0	0	0

4th RA

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Originator	6	1	0	0	7
Opinion-holder	0	0	0	0	0
Guide/recounter	2	2	18	0	22
Exclusive	2	2	2	0	6
Inclusive/rhetorical	0	0	17	0	17
General	0	0	0	0	0
Total	10	5	37	0	52

5th RA

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Originator	0	0	0	0	0
Opinion-holder	0	0	0	0	0
Guide/recounter	0	0	0	0	0
Exclusive	0	2	0	0	2
Inclusive/rhetorical	5	11	2	3	21
General	0	2	0	0	2
Total	5	15	2	3	25

6th RA

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Originator	0	0	0	2	2
Opinion-holder	0	0	0	0	0
Guide/recounter	0	1	1	0	2
Exclusive	0	1	3	2	6
Inclusive/rhetorical	0	0	1	0	1
General	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	2	5	4	11

RAW DATA OF *SELF MENTIONS* IN THE ARTICLES (SSHELF)

DETAILED DATA OF SSH ELF

APARITIONS

1st RA

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
I	0	0	0	0	0
me	0	0	0	0	0
my	0	0	0	0	0
mine	0	0	0	0	0
We	5	3	1	4	13
us	3	0	0	0	3
our	2	0	0	0	2
ours	0	0	0	0	0
Total	10	3	1	4	18

2nd RA

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
I	0	2	12	1	15
me	0	0	3	0	3
my	0	1	5	0	6
mine	0	0	0	0	0
We	0	0	0	0	0
us	0	0	0	0	0
our	1	0	0	1	2
ours	0	0	0	0	0
Total	1	3	20	2	26

3rd RA

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
I	4	2	4	2	12
me	0	0	1	1	2
my	0	1	1	0	2
mine	0	0	0	0	0
We	22	0	26	13	61
us	0	1	3	0	4
our	1	0	1	0	2
ours	0	0	0	0	0
Total	27	4	36	16	83

4th RA

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
I	0	0	0	0	0
me	0	0	0	0	0
my	0	0	0	0	0
mine	0	0	0	0	0
We	3	25	17	6	51
us	1	6	0	0	7
our	0	2	2	1	5
ours	0	0	0	0	0
Total	4	33	19	7	63

5th RA

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
I	0	0	0	0	0
me	0	0	0	0	0
my	0	0	0	0	0
mine	0	0	0	0	0
We	3	3	11	4	21
us	0	1	0	0	1
our	4	9	2	0	15
ours	0	0	0	0	0
Total	7	13	13	4	37

6th RA

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
I	0	1	7	8	16
me	0	0	0	1	1
my	0	0	1	5	6
mine	0	0	0	0	0
We	1	0	5	10	16
us	0	1	3	2	6
our	1	1	0	4	6
ours	0	0	0	0	0
Total	2	3	16	30	51

FUNCTIONS

1st RA

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Originator	0	0	0	0	0
Opinion-holder	0	0	0	0	0
Guide/recounter	3	0	0	1	4
Exclusive	2	0	1	0	3
Inclusive/rhetorical	2	0	0	3	5
General	3	3	0	0	6
Total	10	3	1	4	18

2nd RA

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Originator	0	0	5	0	5
Opinion-holder	0	1	1	0	2
Guide/recounter	1	2	9	1	13
Exclusive	0	0	5	1	6
Inclusive/rhetorical	0	0	0	0	0
General	0	0	0	0	0
Total	1	3	20	2	26

3rd RA

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Originator	2	1	1	0	4
Opinion-holder	1	0	3	3	7
Guide/recounter	3	2	5	6	16
Exclusive	4	0	7	6	17
Inclusive/rhetorical	14	0	16	1	31
General	3	1	4	0	8
Total	27	4	36	16	83

4th RA

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Originator	0	0	0	0	0
Opinion-holder	0	0	0	0	0
Guide/recounter	3	22	16	2	43
Exclusive	0	6	0	0	6
Inclusive/rhetorical	1	5	0	3	9
General	0	0	3	2	5
Total	4	33	19	7	63

5th RA

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Originator	0	0	0	0	0
Opinion-holder	0	0	0	0	0
Guide/recounter	2	10	5	2	19
Exclusive	4	3	8	2	17
Inclusive/rhetorical	1	0	0	0	1
General	0	0	0	0	0
Total	7	13	13	4	37

6th RA

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Originator	0	0	1	6	7
Opinion-holder	0	0	2	12	14
Guide/recounter	0	1	8	4	13
Exclusive	1	1	4	4	10
Inclusive/rhetorical	1	1	0	4	6
General	0	0	1	0	1
Total	2	3	16	30	51

RAW DATA OF *SELF MENTIONS* IN THE ARTICLES (SSHENL)

DETAILED DATA OF SSH ENL

APARITIONS

1st RA

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
I	4	0	0	0	4
me	0	0	0	0	0
my	0	0	0	0	0
mine	0	0	0	0	0
We	0	0	0	2	2
us	0	0	0	0	0
our	1	0	0	0	1
ours	0	0	0	0	0
Total	5	0	0	2	7

2nd RA

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
I	0	0	0	0	0
me	0	0	0	0	0
my	0	0	0	0	0
mine	0	0	0	0	0
We	0	0	2	2	4
us	0	0	1	0	1
our	0	2	0	1	3
ours	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	2	3	3	8

3rd RA

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
I	0	0	0	0	0
me	0	0	0	0	0
my	0	0	0	0	0
mine	0	0	0	0	0
We	0	0	0	0	0
us	0	0	0	0	0
our	0	0	0	0	0
ours	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	0	0	0	0

4th RA

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
I	1	2	9	2	14
me	0	0	0	0	0
my	0	0	0	0	0
mine	0	0	0	0	0
We	0	0	0	0	0
us	0	0	0	0	0
our	0	0	0	0	0
ours	0	0	0	0	0
Total	1	2	9	2	14

5th RA

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
I	0	0	0	0	0
me	0	0	0	0	0
my	0	0	0	0	0
mine	0	0	0	0	0
We	0	22	7	17	46
us	0	0	0	0	0
our	1	5	0	11	17
ours	0	0	0	0	0
Total	1	27	7	28	63

6th RA

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
I	3	4	0	0	7
me	1	1	0	0	2
my	3	1	0	2	6
mine	0	0	0	0	0
We	0	1	0	3	4
us	0	2	0	0	2
our	2	1	0	5	8
ours	0	0	0	0	0
Total	9	10	0	10	29

FUNCTIONS

1st RA

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Originator	1	0	0	0	1
Opinion-holder	0	0	0	0	0
Guide/recounter	3	0	0	0	3
Exclusive	0	0	0	0	0
Inclusive/rhetorical	1	0	0	2	3
General	0	0	0	0	0
Total	5	0	0	2	7

2nd RA

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Originator	0	0	0	0	0
Opinion-holder	0	0	0	0	0
Guide/recounter	0	0	0	0	0
Exclusive	0	0	2	1	3
Inclusive/rhetorical	0	0	1	2	3
General	0	2	0	0	2
Total	0	2	3	3	8

3rd RA

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Originator	0	0	0	0	0
Opinion-holder	0	0	0	0	0
Guide/recounter	0	0	0	0	0
Exclusive	0	0	0	0	0
Inclusive/rhetorical	0	0	0	0	0
General	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	0	0	0	0

4th RA

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Originator	0	0	0	0	0
Opinion-holder	0	0	0	0	0
Guide/recounter	1	2	9	2	14
Exclusive	0	0	0	0	0
Inclusive/rhetorical	0	0	0	0	0
General	0	0	0	0	0
Total	1	2	9	2	14

5th RA

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Originator	0	2	0	9	11
Opinion-holder	0	3	2	1	6
Guide/recounter	1	20	5	15	41
Exclusive	0	1	0	3	4
Inclusive/rhetorical	0	0	0	0	0
General	0	1	0	0	1
Total	1	27	7	28	63

6th RA

Self Ment	Intro	Methods	Results	Conclusion	Total
Originator	2	1	0	1	4
Opinion-holder	0	1	0	1	2
Guide/recounter	4	4	0	0	8
Exclusive	3	1	0	4	8
Inclusive/rhetorical	0	3	0	4	7
General	0	0	0	0	0
Total	9	10	0	10	29