

INVESTIGATING APPROPRIATE USAGE OF SELF-MENTIONS IN CONCLUSION SECTIONS OF RESEARCH ARTICLES: A CORPUS- BASED STUDY

Iram Soomro¹, Dr. Tania Laghari^{*2}, Dr. Abdullah Laghari³, Ali Bux Khoso⁴

^{1,4}Research Scholar, Department of English, Shaheed Benazir Bhutto University, Shaheed Benazirabad;

^{*2}Assistant Professor, Department of English, Shaheed Benazir Bhutto University, Shaheed Benazirabad;

³Lecturer, Department of English at Quaid-e-Awam University of Engineering, Science and Technology, Nawabshah

¹iramsoomro581@gamil.com; ^{*2}tania.laghari@sbbusba.edu.pk; ⁴khosoab12345@gmail.com

Corresponding Author: *2

Received: 05 April, 2024

Revised: 05 May, 2024

Accepted: 22 May, 2024

Published: 05 June, 2024

ABSTRACT

The abstract is a most important part of any research study. It gives an outlook of the whole study, it answers what the whole research is about, and gives readers insights to decide whether to read or leave the study. So, this study aimed to identify the appropriate usage of personal pronouns in conclusion sections of research articles of two social sciences' discipline, sociology and linguistics. Its main purpose is to analyze the usage of personal pronouns in each discipline individually, and then it compares the usage in both disciplines. For this, corpus of 50 research articles, twenty-five conclusion sections written in sociology with 21667 numbers of tokens and twenty-five conclusion sections written in linguistics articles with 19670 token numbers were included in the research. In addition to that, Ken Hyland's Interdisciplinary Model of Metadiscourse is applied to analyze the data. Furthermore, the study also analyzes the raw and normalized frequency of each pronoun with the help of a software application called 'Antconc'. The results of the study show how literary scholars use self-mentions in their articles to persuade the readers' attention and to get personally engaged within the study. The results also demonstrated that the writers mostly use first-person plural pronoun "We" in the articles not only to show their collective efforts they put in the research but also to position themselves within the text.

1. INTRODUCTION

In the recent years, genre analysts have given great importance to the research articles. The research article is a genre of academic writing; it also has its sub genres, like as abstract, introduction, literature review, methodology, results, and conclusion. Many linguists have done lots of studies in the area of genre analysis of research articles. This study is conducted on the genre analysis of conclusion section of research articles.

It has been widely accepted that written discourse in academic fields makes a rhetorical appeal to the reader, which seeks to pursue the targeted readers to accept the author's point of views and not only to state particular facts regarding the topic. This step has developed the writer's interest to know how academic writers get involved into the texts with

their personal feelings, attitudes, judgments, opinions, and their own values. In academic discourse, according to Halliday, 1994, the writers project into the written texts and they form a relationship with the audience in many ways through Metadiscourse. It is considered to be as an approach which constructs the discourse. It actually tries to build a relationship between the writers and readers, and the text which is regarded as interpersonal used by writers to form personal relations with the audience. Now a days, the role of self-references or self-mentions in the interaction between writers and their audience has received considerable attention on the basis of various point of views. It has been widely accepted that communication on academic level is like a social activity where writers are supposed to be

persuasive so they need to adopt some positions to get interacted and intermingled with readers through writing.

The studies have been conducted on the nature of academic conversation, which basically describes how writers use language strategies to build an argument that convinces readers to acquire a credible account for themselves, their point of views and the knowledge. Hyland (2005) argues that one of the central ways of achieving such interaction is by taking a stance in writing. He suggests that stance enables writers to project themselves into their texts and present a persuasive writing.

The writer's voice in academic writing is a controversial issue. Traditionally, academic writing was considered to be an objective and impersonal piece of text and writing manuals advised academic writers to avoid any self-mentions, allowing the text itself to report the facts and the results on its own (Hyland, 2001). The logic behind this view was that academic writing is rather formal presentation of facts and ideas and self-projection gives a subjective and informal tone to the writing. Recent studies, however, acknowledged that written text is an interaction between writer and reader and to increase such interaction the writers need not to remove themselves totally from the text (Cherry, 1988; Ivanic, 1998; Tang & John, 1999; Kuo, 1999; Hyland, 2001).

Reference grammars of English standard divide pronouns into subsets, one of which is the set of personal pronouns: I, you, he, she, we, they (and their corresponding object and genitive forms). The personal pronouns are typically deictic and referential, especially in the 1st and 2nd person. That is, "the 1st person forms refer to the speaker/writer, while the 2nd person refers to the addressee or a group including at least one addressee but not speaker/writer" (Huddleston (1984: 288)).

1.1. Aim of the Study

The aim of this study is to analyze the writer's use of self-mentions in the conclusion sections of the research articles of sociology and linguistics.

1.2. Research Objectives

The objectives of this study are;

- To find out the overall frequency of self-mention in conclusion section of research articles of sociology and linguistics.

- To investigate the differences in the uses of self-mention in the conclusion sections of research articles of sociology and linguistics.

1.3. Research Questions

- What the overall frequency is of self-mentions in conclusion section of research articles of sociology and linguistics?
- What are differences in the uses of self-mentions in the conclusion sections of research articles of sociology and linguistics?

2. Literature Review

2.1. The Notion of Meta-Discourse

The term originally introduced by the structural linguist Zelig Harris (1959), the term only gained traction in applied linguistics in the mid-1980s with the work of Vande Kopple (1985), Crismore (1989) and Williams (1981). Nowadays, writing is considered to be as a social engagement where writers not only try to convey or transmit the message to the readers but also to make them understand the message and try to make them involve into it. In simple, it gives the idea that writers here predict the needs, requirements, and expectations of the readers, and try to respond them accordingly. According to Hyland (2004) one of the important ways of representing the features of an underlying community is through the writer's use of Meta discourse. Meta discourse has been defined as writing about writing (Williams, 1981), discourse about discourse, or communication about communication (Vande Kopple, 1985). Mauranen (1993) refers to meta-discourse as certain elements in the text that go beyond the propositional content. Meta discourse is a new and interesting field of inquiry which plays a significant role in organizing and producing persuasive writing, based on the norms and expectations of people involved. Meta discourse embodies the idea that writing and speaking are more than just the communication of ideas and presentation of ideational meaning. Rather they are considered as social acts which involve writers, readers, speakers and listeners to interact with each other to affect the ways ideas are presented and understood. Meta discourse is, therefore, believed to be an important feature of communication because we need to assess the readers' or listeners' resources for understanding the text and their likely responses to it in order to be able to write or to speak effectively. Meta-discourse

simply is what helps relate a text to its context by using language to take readers' needs, understandings, existing knowledge and prior experiences with texts into account and a stretch of discourse may realize both functions. In academic writing, authors include themselves in their texts and create a connection with readers through a technique called meta-discourse. Meta-discourse is a way of constructing discourse that considers the relationship between the writer/speaker, the reader/listener, and the text itself. It serves as a tool for writers to establish their attitudes and personal connections with their audience. Additionally, meta-discourse reflects how the writer perceives the organization and coherence of the text, focusing on its textual aspects (Halliday, 1994). Writers utilize meta-discourse markers to guide and direct their readers, maintaining control over the content they present (Fairclough, 1992).

The term meta-discourse is often confused with terms like meta-language and meta-pragmatics, but it is actually different from both. Meta-language is the language used by teachers, learners, and analysts to talk about and reflect on language itself. It helps us understand and discuss what language is and what it should be. On the other hand, meta-pragmatics is about judging whether someone's communication behavior is appropriate, including our own behavior. It allows us to monitor our interactions and talk about our ability to communicate effectively. Out of these two concepts, meta-pragmatics is more closely related to meta-discourse because it involves using language effectively to manage how others perceive us and to maintain good relationships with them.

2.2. Previous studies

The use of personal pronouns in academic writing in English has increasingly attracted the attention of scholars as they have been shown to be an important rhetorical device that allows writers to emphasize their contribution to the academic debate and construct an authoritative discourse self through the realizations of various discourse functions (Hyland, 2002; Kuo, 1999; Tang & John, 1999). First-person pronouns have been studied across different disciplinary fields (Harwood, 2005; Hyland, 2001) and in texts written by native and non-native speakers of English (Hyland, 2002; Martı́nez, 2005).

Many people disagree about how writers should express their own voice in academic writing. In the

past, academic writing was thought to be unbiased and impersonal. Writing manuals told academic writers not to talk about themselves, so that the text could focus on presenting facts and results without personal influence (Hyland, 2001). The reason behind this belief was that academic writing should be a formal way to present information and ideas. Mentioning oneself was seen as introducing a subjective and informal tone. As a result, writers of research articles followed this convention. They either did it to increase their chances of getting published by appearing modest or humble (Hyland, 2001), or to protect themselves from potential criticism (Gilbert and Mulkey, 1984). However, recent studies by Cherry (1988), Ivanic (1998), Tang and John (1999), Kuo (1999), and Hyland (2001) have recognized that written text is an interaction between the writer and the reader. These studies suggest that writers don't have to completely remove themselves from the text in order to enhance this interaction. This marks a change from the traditional view that research articles should be impersonal and lacking in personal input. The research article is no longer seen as "faceless prose" (Hyland, 2002) as it has often been perceived. Writers are gradually moving away from impersonal writing and are using strategies such as including first-person pronouns and possessive adjectives to communicate directly with their audience.

An important line of inquiry has been the cross-cultural investigation of personal authorial references (Vassileva, 2000 e English, German, French, Russian and Bulgarian; Breivega, Dahl, & Flbøttum, 2002 e English, French and Norwegian; Yakhontova, 2006 e English, Ukrainian and Russian; Mur Duen̄as, 2007 e English and Spanish), which have been found to vary across "large" (Holliday, 1999), national cultures in terms of both their frequency and range of uses. Personal authorial references, therefore, appear important foci of analysis for the investigation of cultural identity in written academic discourse. Therefore, a study of the discourse functions of impersonal constructions combined with a parallel analysis of personal authorial references may reveal something of how writers position themselves within the academic community they belong to, and how they construct the relationship with their readers.

The use of personal pronouns is central to face-to-face interaction. They usually define or reveal interpersonal relationships between or among the

individuals involved in the interaction. Particularly, in this study, we will explore how the occurrences of various personal pronouns reveal writers' perceptions of their own role in research, of their relationship with expected readers as well as their discipline. However, although varying between disciplines, a number of studies (Chang and Swales, 1999; Harwood, 2006 and Hyland, 2001, 2002) have shown the importance of such pronouns in helping the writer state opinions and arguments and, generally, organize an academic text. Hyland (2004: 143) wrote that 'self-mentions play a crucial role in mediating the relationship between writers' arguments and the expectations of their readers'. Hyland (2002) also identified the different functions of personal pronouns and their frequencies. Kuo (1990) points out that knowing how to use personal pronouns effectively is of great importance. Giving them the opportunity to highlight their own contributions to their field and strengthen the unity with their readers. Therefore, the use of personal pronouns is a powerful way of strong writer identity' and central to face-to-face interaction. Self-mention is when speakers or writers use words like "I," "me," "my," and "mine" to talk about themselves. It shows whether the writer or speaker is clearly identified or not. Self-reference is a technique that writers use to connect with their readers and convince them that their ideas are correct and that they have expertise in their field. It's a strong way for writers to establish their authority and express their identity, which is important for academic writing to be effective (Hyland 2002a, p. 1094).

This is also supported by Cherry (1998) claiming on the importance of self-representation in academic discourse and Groom (1993) in his analysis of academic writing indicates the importance of writer's textual voice and states that writers should clearly state when they are reporting the voice of an author or stating their own expressions and personal point of views (as cited in Martin, n.d.). Kuo (1999) investigated the use of personal pronouns in scientific journal articles and discusses on how writers are able to reveal on their own perception of their position in the academic field as well as other readers. He further comments on how knowledge presented in article journals with the use of personal pronouns poses a great value towards writers as it allows writers to share personal contributions and seek solidarity with readers as well as others involved in the particular discipline.

The given literature, to the study of personal pronouns, explores the appropriate usage of personal pronouns in the research articles and the frequency of usage of personal pronouns. Moreover, the research explores the comparison between two interdisciplinary fields and this study will give awareness to the researchers to know about the uses of personal pronoun in the conclusion sections of research articles.

3. Methodology

3.1. Corpus

The present study deals with the corpus analysis that includes two interdisciplinary corpora of conclusion sections. However, a total number of the corpus was 50 texts for the Meta discourse study. Twenty-five conclusion sections written in sociology with **21667** numbers of tokens and twenty-five conclusion sections written in linguistics articles with **19670** token numbers were included in the research. Moreover, six journals were chosen to take the conclusions from research articles that included the Journal of Pragmatics, Journal of English for Specific Purpose (ESP), and the journal of English for Academic purposes for linguistic articles and for sociology, we selected articles from the British journal of sociology, American journal of sociology, and the international journal of sociology. The articles were collected randomly from the RA conclusions of the journals of each field.

3.2. Instrument

Various instruments were required to compile the given data within the corpus. For that purpose a device was used, named Antconc corpus software. The name "Antconc" stands for "Ant Concordance". The specific software selected for the present study is a software application used for corpus analysis and text mining. It is commonly utilized in the field of linguistics and computational linguistics to study and analyze large collections of texts, known as corpora. AntConc provides various tools and functionalities to assist researchers in examining the linguistic patterns, frequency of words, and other language-related information within a given corpus. Antconc provides the researchers with a set of powerful tools for exploring, analyzing, and visualizing linguistic features and patterns in a given corpus. It performs the function of corpus creation, keyword analysis, collocation analysis, word list analysis, and statistical analysis etc.

3.3. Data analysis

The data were analyzed in different phases. Firstly, each conclusion from the given corpus was studied independently in terms of finding frequency and percentage. Each and every conclusion has been read carefully and the information was cautiously collected by researcher. Secondly, Ken Hyland's model of self-mentions was used to determine the

significant variations in the usage of personal pronouns and frequency of their usage have been identified in the research articles of interdisciplinary fields. Finally, the results were analyzed and in order to avoid subjectivity, an expert in Meta discourse study were asked to read the articles and then to share their opinions regarding the use of personal pronouns

TABLE 1
 AN INTERPERSONAL MODEL OF METADISOURSE (HYLAND, 2005, P. 49)

Category	Function	Examples
Interactive	Help to guide the reader through the text	Resources
Transitions	Express the relations between the main clauses	<i>In addition; but; thus; and</i>
Frame markers	Refer to discourse acts, sequences or stages	<i>Finally; to conclude; my purpose is</i>
Endophoric markers	Refer to information in other parts of the text	<i>Noted above; see Fig.; in section 2</i>
Evidentials	Refer to information in other texts	<i>According to X; Z states</i>
Code Glosses	Elaborate propositional meaning	<i>Namely; e.g.; such as; in other words</i>
Interactional	Involve the reader in the text	Resources
Hedges	Withhold commitment and open dialogue	<i>Might; perhaps; possible; about</i>
Boosters	Emphasize certainty and close dialogue	<i>In fact; definitely; it is clear that</i>
Attitude markers	Express writer's attitude towards the proposition	<i>Unfortunately; I agree; surprisingly</i>
Self-mentions	Explicit reference to the authors	<i>I; me; my; our; we</i>
Engagement markers	Explicitly build relationship with readers	<i>Consider; note; you can see that</i>

Figure: 01

4. Results and Discussion

The present chapter outlines the findings and discussion of the current research. It begins by mapping the overall picture of the use of usage of personal pronouns in the corpora of two soft-sciences disciplines, sociology and linguistics. It first shows the frequency of the various functions of personal pronouns in sociology corpora. Then it analyzes the usage of self-mentions in the linguistics corpus. In last, the chapter also presents the comparative analysis of usage of self-references between both the disciplines. The study also finds the normalized frequencies of their usage.

Section 4.1 represents the corpus of sociology, a discipline of social sciences. This section found the usage of personal pronouns. The writers use self-mentions to put forward their personal opinions, ideas, and the results of the study they have done. The personal pronouns fall in different categories for different purposes. These categories involve 1st personal pronouns (I, We), 2nd personal pronouns (He, she, it, they), and 3rd personal pronouns (you). These categories have their own functions. Writers



mostly use 1st and 3rd personal pronouns in the research articles. The sociology authors have used “we, my, I, our, and us” in the conclusions of research articles of sociology. Where, altogether, 198 cases of 1st person pronoun ‘we’ per 1000 words (n=9.13) are found, 111 cases of “I” per 1000 words (n=5.12), 15 cases of “My” per 1000 words (n=0.69), 10 cases of “I” per 1000 words (n=0.46), whereas, 7 cases of “Us” per 1000 words (n=0.32) are found.

Section 4.2 involves the analysis of linguistics corpora. This section found the usage of personal pronouns in linguistics. The authors of linguistics have used “we, my, I, our, and us” in the conclusions of research articles of discipline. Where, altogether, 153 cases of 1st person pronoun ‘we’ per 1000 words (n=7.77) are found, 116 cases of “our” per 1000 words (n=5.89), 6 cases of “My” per 1000 words (n=0.30), 28 cases of “I” per 1000 words (n=1.42), whereas, 17 cases of “Us” per 1000 words (n=0.86) are found.

Moreover, to test the second research question of this study, the distinction in the employment of personal pronouns is made. Some insightful findings

regarding the similarities and differences in the form of functions of self-mentions employed in both disciplines are displayed.

4.1. Use of personal pronouns in conclusion sections of sociology research articles:

The Table No. 1 presents the raw and normalized frequency of personal pronouns in the conclusion section of sociology discipline. It can be seen that sociologists prefer to use a large amount of “We” while presenting their concluding remarks.

Pronoun	Raw Frequency (21667)	Normalized frequency
We	198	9.13
Our	111	5.12
My	15	0.69
I	10	0.46
Us	7	0.32

Table No. 1 Corpus of Sociology

4.1.1. Discussion

1. The first-person plural pronoun, “We” appears 198 times in the whole corpus of sociology, it is the most frequently used pronoun. Its normalized frequency is 9.13%, which signifies a large bulk of its usage in the text. “We” is employed to refer to a large group of people including writer and the audience. It gives a sense of togetherness and shared involvement.
2. The pronoun “Our” is the possessive form “We”, which shows shared possession and gives sense of belonging among the group of people. It appears 111 in the text, with a normalized frequency of 5.12%.
3. “My” is a first-person singular possessive pronoun and is found 15 times in the text, with normalized frequency is 0.69%. It indicates the lower prevalence compared to the other plural forms of pronouns. It shows writer’s personal possession or attachment.
4. “I” is the first-person singular pronoun occurs 10 times in the text, with a normalized frequency of 0.46%. It is used for self-reference, allows the speaker to express his thoughts, ideas, or feeling directly. Despite of having a lower frequency, it has a central role in personal expression.
5. The use of “Us” is encountered 7 times throughout the whole sociology corpus, along with 0.32% normalized frequency. It is the objective form of “We”.

Use of We

In the provided text, the pronoun "we" is frequently utilized to signify the authors or speakers of the text, and it plays a crucial role in conveying a sense of collective authorship and academic collaboration. This passage appears from an academic research paper, where the use of "we" is quite common and serves several important functions.

The very first and foremost function is that, usage of “We” pronoun develops a sense of authorship and accountability in the text. It suggests that all the arguments, contentions, analyses, investigations, examinations, and findings discussed in the conclusion sections of research articles are not solely presentation of only one author, but it is the collective work of group of authors who worked collaboratively on the research project. This collaboration is a hallmark of the academic and scientific writings, where various researchers come in contact and work as a team to conduct studies, analyze and investigate the data, and bring out significant conclusions. This usage of “We” also helps to provide transparency and clarity to the reader. It gives a clear sense that the authors are pertaining to their own research and findings that enhances the credibility of their text. The readers can clearly identify that the given data and information is based on author’s own work which is an essential attribution in academic writing.

Moreover, it also guides the readers through the rational progression of the research. It demonstrates that the active engagement of the writers throughout the research process, like from posing and putting forward several questions regarding research and assumptions (we ask whether...) to describing their methodology ("we conducted a multilevel structural equation model") and examining their results and findings ("we find that..."). This sort of guidance is very important for academic writers to provide clarity and transparency in their studies. It directs readers to follow his arguments and the methodology they apply. Besides that, “we” symbolizes literary modesty to the texts. It examines that the provided data and results are completely related to the academic communication. Using “we” is a sign that the authors place themselves into the text as contributors rather than position themselves as absolute authorities. In academic writings this pronoun gives a value of cooperative, compliant tool. Throughout the texts, it has been observed that the authors have examined their efforts they put in

collecting and analyzing the data related to social issues happen in society by using “we” in their academic writings. “We” does not only emphasize on highlighting the process but besides that it also implies author’s contributions to the data in research and also provides suggestions for the future studies. For instance;

1. *“Here we ask whether the political divide on climate change extends to energy views”*, “we”, here indicates the collective action of posing a question and framing the research focus.
2. *“We described our results using primarily cross-group lenses for comparison since....”* here the use of we describes collective responsibility for describing results and highlight originality of the study.
3. *“Based on this finding, we conducted a multilevel structural equation model and found that the relationship between....”*, “we” in the sentence represents collective involvement of the researchers in conducting research and presenting results.
4. *“We expect that the relation between intentions and actual behaviors of public may also vary according to welfare state typologies”*, here, “we” employs writers’ shared expectation regarding the variation in the relationship between intentions and behaviors of people (society).

Use of *our*

The frequent use of pronoun “our” signifies the ownership of the authors in the research. It clarifies the authors are taking responsibility of what data they have provided, the findings, and results. In research writing, this usage of “our” is considered to be as a stylistic choice. It is very essential for the author or group of authors to attribute their findings and research to themselves. In the research articles of sociology, the use of the pronoun “our” highlights the author’s unique perspectives. It shows that authors are conveying their own point of views and expertise. This is highly valuable for the writers to put their own ideas forward. It is also used to admit the shortcomings and limitations in some instances. As in a sentence, “Our study clearly has some shortcomings,” it implies that the researchers are actually presenting themselves as responsible for the flaws and constraints provides in the research. This basically reveals the transparency and integrity of the given data. The use of “our” in academic writings actually emphasizes the authors’ contributions towards their specific fields or the subjects under the

study they are doing. It is the indication of writers’ active participation and involvement in the text and also unveils their role to acknowledge advancement. It also promotes the collective association among the writers, which signifies that the conducted data and provided findings are the result of collaborative efforts of the researchers. Simply it can be said that, constant use of “our” comprised of many important functions in academic writings, including author’s ownership, collective contributions, association, admitting shortcomings, providing viewpoints, and to strengthen the academic voice. It is primarily a basic and fundamental aspect of academic conversation.

Examples;

1. *“We described our results using primarily cross-group lenses for comparison since....”* “Our” in the sentence indicates ownership of the results and emphasizes the expected outcomes of the study.
2. “Our” in the sentence, *“To our knowledge, this study is the first to apply a welfare regime frame to a cross-national study of energy attitudes”*, reveals authorship and authors’ knowledge, and their unique contribution within the study.
3. Researcher has used “our” to provide limitations and shortcomings of their study, as in the sentence, *“Our study clearly has some shortcomings.”*
4. In some sentences “Our” is used to point out author’s possession of results and to invite readers to think about their results and findings, by asking questions, as in the sentence, *“when combined with the indirect effects, the total impact of a neo-liberal tax structure is negligible in these models. What do our results mean?”*
5. In another sentence, the use of “our” discloses author’s active involvement in the study, *“our focus has been on non-activist behaviors in the public sphere as one of the four types of environmentally significant behaviors.”*

Use of *I*

The use of first person pronoun “I”, in conclusion sections of sociology research articles, is an indication of author’s engagement and involvement in the study. The writers use this to admit their personal relation to the text and give a sense of authorship to the writers within a text. This use of “I” highlights the author’s prominent role in supporting, data collection, and results interpretation. It places the researchers as the primary proponent and the scholar who presents themselves as responsible for

the data, ideas, arguments, and the findings given in the text. The text suggests the frequent use of “I” confesses the writer’s active participation in the text. It signifies that the researcher is not only an observer but a vibrant participant having certain intentions and expectations related to research. The use of “I” also pinpoints the writer’s authoritative attitude towards the study which shapes their voice to narrate the arguments and perspectives within a text. Constant usage of “I” gives a sense of accountability of the authors regarding the outcomes provided in the conclusions. It shows the willingness of the authors of being credible source for the work and the interpretations. It reinforces the idea that the authors are proactive and confronted participants within academic writings.

For example;

Sentence 1: “*In this article, I argue that demand and supply for expertise in Hollywood create and reinforce each other*”, use of “I”, here exposes the arguments presented in the study are based on writer’s own perspectives.

Sentence 2: “*With respect to the sociology of art, I have sought to combined Bourdieu’s insights with those of Becker, and while these are often seen as mutually exclusive...*” here, in this sentence, “I” expresses author’s personal efforts and contributions to the field of sociology.

Sentence 3: “*(Vaughan, 1999, p. 25) I have discussed above the question of Hogarth’s reputation, and by seeking to integrate Becker’s ‘art world’ perspective with Bourdieu’s field analysis’ this necessarily involves a more fluid understanding of the ‘organized striving’ defining the ‘game itself’ (Savage and Silva, 2013, p. 119).*”, here, the I serves to indicate the author’s involvement in the study and presence of various perspectives in the analysis.

Sentence 4: “I” in the given sentence, “*The esoteric and seemingly arbitrary debate dividing the early moments of second-wave feminism I found was actually rooted in coherent, distinct, and stable political models present in Chicago and New York City during the first wave*”, is used to convey the author’s discovery and it highlights writer’s role in finding out the facts regarding the subject matter.

Sentence 5: “*What I have tried to do in this study of Hogarth is to demonstrate how two different sociological approaches to art can help build a richer picture of the artist and his work*”, the use of “I” indicates writer’s role and demonstrate the value of diverse sociological approaches in the sentence.

Use Of My

The writer’s exploitation of the pronoun “My” exploited throughout the text affirms a sense of subjectivity in the text that encourages personal engagement within the text. This constant usage of “my” serves to highlight the writer’s central role in structuring, gathering, and analyzing the research. In simple terms the writer uses “I” to emphasize his intentions and specific purposes within the research study. The throughout usage of “me” and “my project” underscores the writer’s ownership and possession of the research and its particular goals which help them to position themselves as driving forces behind the study.

Moreover, it serves to assert the researcher’s outstanding understanding on diverse topics that have been discussed in the study. It helps the authors to express their personal understandings regarding the claims, goals, and conclusions they have made in the text. As the constant presence of the pronoun “I” emphasizes authors’ critical engagement within the text, use of “my” points out a sense of authorship and seems like the writer is taking the responsibility of the ideas and arguments given in the text and it is the sign of conveying credibility and accountability of the data. The consistent presence of “I” also highlights the author’s critical engagement with the subject matter. They use “my” to establish a sense of authorship and responsibility for the ideas and arguments presented, which conveys credibility and accountability. There are some sentences from the corpus given that reveal the function of possessive pronoun “my”;

Sentence 1: “For my purposes, their approaches provide crucial insight.” here, “My” shows author’s ownership of the study, it indicates that the insights presented in the texts are important for the author.

Sentence 2: “*Here is where my interest in anti-colonial thought lies*”, “My” indicates possession and expresses author’s interest in anti-colonial thought.

Sentence 3: In some sentences, usage of “My” indicates author’s claims on other researcher’s viewpoints, as in this sentence, “*my claim instead is that Khaldun is not necessarily oppositional to the standpoint of European imperial power*”.

Use of Us

The use of pronoun “us” in the text serves multiple objectives. It contributes to provide a sense of collective responsibility, collective engagement, and

shared understanding within the text. It highlights the implicit nature of discourse. It invites the readers and other fellow researchers to be a part of the analysis of the text. The pronoun “us” implies that the author is not isolated but he is the part of a broader community and research team. In some instances, “us” emphasizes that there is a collective involvement of the writers, in the study, in understanding and exploring the topic. It points out that the authors, readers, and the research team collaboratively serves to endeavor and foster the intellectual pursuits. It also gives a sense of team work and responsibility of the findings, results, and conclusions presented in the text. This usage can be specifically relevant in the research study of sociological contexts where various perspectives are pondered and valued.

In addition to that, usage of “us” promotes critical thinking and implies that the given data analysis, hypotheses, arguments, and reasons are open to be explored, evaluated, and discussed in detail. It persuades the readers to get engaged to critically analyze and examine the subject matter. In some of the sentences, the use of “us” signifies wider communal and societal perspectives. It emphasizes that the analysis or findings of the study are provided for the whole society rather than only providing author’s individual points of views.

For Example:

Sentence 1: “Understanding the Hungarian case may thus help us to clarify which conditions are decisive in this respect.” “Us” here indicates the author’s and readers’ collective involvement in the study.

Sentence 2: *The categories representing the different dimensions and sub-dimensions theorized were found to be strongly interrelated, and this allowed us to build an integrated measure of attachment to society for use in our main analyses*”. The pronoun “us” implies collaborative efforts of the writers and the readers to build an attachment to society for the main analyses.

Sentence 3: “Us” in the sentence, “Distinguishing between these three factors enables us to explain the gender variation in SWB gains from pensioner employment”, also indicates involvement of the author and readers and it suggests a collaborative understanding of writers and readers of the presented subject matter.

4.2. Use of personal pronouns in conclusion sections of linguistics research articles:

The Table No. 2 shows the raw and normalized frequency of usage of personal pronouns in the conclusion sections of linguistics field. This analysis suggests that linguists give much preference to use the 1st person-pronoun “We” to present conclusions in the articles.

Pronoun	Raw Frequency (19670)	Normalized frequency
We	153	7.77
Our	116	5.89
I	28	1.42
Us	17	0.86
My	6	0.30

Table No. 2 Corpus of Linguistics

4.2.1. Discussion

1. The first-person plural pronoun “We” appears **153** times in the linguistics corpus with normalized frequency of **7.77%**. This high prevalence indicates that “we” is highly used pronoun in the linguistics articles.

2. “Our” pronoun appeared **116** times within the conclusions of linguistics articles, with **5.89%** normalized frequency. It signifies the ownership and responsibility of the given text.

3. The first person singular pronoun “I” appears **28** times and having a normalized frequency of **1.42%**. It refers to the individual author only, allows him to express his thoughts, ideas, or the opinions directly.

4. The pronoun “Us”, the objective form of “We,” occurred 17 times within the corpus along with a normalized frequency of 0.86%. It represents the collective group of the researchers to indicate their collaborative involvement within the research in various contexts.

5. “My”, a first-person singular possessive pronoun, found to be used 6 times in the whole corpus of linguistics discipline, having normalized frequency of 0.30% which indicates the least usage of this pronoun as compared to other pronouns.

Use of We

The use of first person-pronoun “We” in the sentences performs many functions within the academic texts and research articles. Firstly, it demonstrates the accountability of the authors that they are taking responsibility of whatever the data is

presented in the articles. This is an important aspect to build credibility and trust with readers.

For example;

1. "In performing our analysis, we have noted a degree of fuzziness around some of the categories that have been proposed in the literature on both VL and figurative language." This sentence from the give corpus indicates writer's active involvement in the text and seems like authors are taking responsibility of the given information.

2. "We claim to have relatively clear default politeness or impoliteness values." The authors are taking responsibility for the discussed politeness or impoliteness values by using the phrase "we claim".

3. As we have repeatedly pointed out, all of these diagnostics take their actual politeness or impoliteness value from the actual context in which they occur.

Here, authors' repeated emphasis on pointed out discloses their responsibility for drawing attention to give important consideration within the study.

Secondly, "we" is utilized to provide findings and conclusions in research articles. It points out that the researchers are vigorously involved in research and conveying their own observations and insights regarding the facts. This usage of the pronoun is essential in formal academic writings, where the clarity about the origin of the data is of substantial importance. Besides that, by using "we" writers connect the thoughts, facts, and arguments within the text, which creates a sense of coherence, cohesion, and continuity between the ideas and sentences. This helps the readers to seek out the logical advancement of the writer's views and support effective communication of complex theories and assertions. It is also used to give recommendations and suggestions regarding further research areas. It indicates that authors are actively engaged in the study, contribution their insights and guiding future research in the field. For example;

4. In this paper, we have presented an in-depth, qualitative analysis of the ways in which students and their lecture..... This sentence suggests writers' active involvement in research and gives insights to researchers' own in-depth analysis.

5. We have seen that VL and figurative language have much in common and that they interact in a variety of ways. Here, the phrase "we have seen" implies authors' direct observations and interpretation.

6. Our findings have revealed a level of pragmatic sophistication that may have been missed if we had considered only metaphor, metonymy or VL in isolation. The authors emphasize in the sentence that their findings gained insights through their analysis. These sentences convey authors' active involvement in research process, from making observations regarding the subject matter to presenting their own insights on the topic.

In some instances, the pronoun "we" is used to depict the writer's personal points of views and understandings, particularly in fields of linguistics and social sciences, where clear understanding and analysis regarding the subject matter play a central role in research. Moreover, the usage of "we" creates a conversational tone in academic writing to make it more persuasive and reader-friendly. This enhances the access to complex ideas and research findings, particularly for a broader audience. "We" admits the collaborative efforts of different writers or researchers. It underscores that the research is a combined attempt of all the contributors actively involved in the research process. Lastly, the authors use "we" to highlight the processes and research methodology applied in the research articles. For instance;

7. Overall, we conclude that it is, indeed, very likely that the language in movies has changed since the 1930s. The use of the phrase "we conclude" indicates researchers' personal understanding of the changes observed in language over time.

Use of *Our*

The pronoun "our" is repeatedly used in the conclusion sections of the research articles and is mainly utilized to signify a sense of ownership. This usage reflects the author's active participation in the research, findings, and discussions illustrated in the text. The existence of the pronoun "our" in the text strengthen the writer's role as analysts or researchers, engages the audience in a collaborative description of the topic. This helps the writers to create a connection between the audience and the research findings. It creates a sense of transparency and accessibility. Here in this context, "our" does not only appear to reveal the collaborative nature of the research but also signifies the responsibility of the writers of the content, findings, and the ideas discussed in the conclusions. It serves as a tool that encourages reader's engagement and trust in the conclusions presented in the research.

For example;

1. The authors in the given sentence sentences assert their shared involvement, *"Our findings suggest that the students in these classes are able to skillfully combine..."*
2. In another sentence, the researchers used "our analysis" which highlights collective efforts of the research team, *"Our analysis sheds light on previously unexplored facets"*, which reinforces a sense of shared responsibility.
3. *"Our study contributes to the ongoing discourse"*, here, the usage of "our" underlines authors' contributions and responsibility within the text.
4. In this sentence, writer's usage of "our" to provide concluding remarks, stresses their collective findings, *"our results, when considered together, offer a holistic perspective"*, it also gives a sense of shared possession.

Use of I

The first-person pronoun "I" is used throughout many conclusions of the research articles, and it functions in various ways within the text. Firstly, it is used to indicate author's personal involvement and his active role in the research study. It brings out the idea of authorship and expertise of the researcher and helps to clarify that the results and findings given in the text are all author's scholarly efforts and explorations. "I" also acts as a rhetorical device to demonstrate the possibility of writer's credibility and authority within the field. By taking possession of the given data, the writers basically assert their position as a highly acknowledged and a well-experienced researcher. This helps the writers to reinforce a persuasive impact of the analysis on the reader. Moreover, the pronoun "I" is used to drive the readers through the logical structure of the article. This pronoun is used by the authors to refer to the directions of the statements presented in the text and to point out changes in different sections of the research articles. It aids to create coherence in ideas and organize them. This usage of "I" gives a sense of intimacy, subjectivity, and confidentiality into the text. It publicizes authors' perspectives, prejudices or biases, provides transparency of their position, and probable limitations, and also future suggestions for the study in other research areas. By this way of being transparent regarding the data authors can develop readers' trust towards the study and towards the author himself.

For example;

1. *"In this article, I have analyzed actions that bring understandings to the interaction surface...."* this shows writer's active involvement into the study.
2. *"In the following, I will summarize, the identified bodily-visual features and discuss them in relation to previous research"*, the author, here, is taking responsibility of discussed information.
3. *"However, I should stress the need for further research to help us fully understand the role of input formats"*, here, the author is stressing the need for further more research on the subject matter.
4. The writer is trying to take a strong position in the research and asserting his perspective, *"In this paper I have argue that academic publishing is now firmly aligned with current economic models of mass noticing"*,
5. The given sentence is showing researcher's expertise, *"I have as a researcher with a background in academic discourse"*.

Use of My

The usage the pronoun "my" in the conclusion sections of linguistic research articles indicates the researcher's personal involvement in the text, ownership of the data, and ideas stated within the context of academic texts. In some conclusions, usage of "my" reveals author's direct participation into the text. It shows that the writer has put his personal efforts to compile the results and findings by getting involved in the text. It points up the subjectivity towards the subject matter of the study. On some places, in the conclusions, usage of "my" emphasizes the writer's intention of selecting the corpus to analyze. It asserts that writer has selected the literature intentionally that could align with the arguments which reveals his active decision making and his critical engagement with material of the research. It is also used to demonstrate that author has personal awareness of the specific topic. It is mainly focused to show up author's own perspective on the writings. The author's achievement and advertising techniques is shown by self-reflection and realistic test.

Summing up, "my" is utilized to make understand the writer's basic intention in doing analysis. It personalizes the purposes of the study and makes it clear that writer's main intent is to encourage readers to get attentive in academic publishing from their own distinctive perspectives, ideas, and viewpoints.

For instance:

1. "My" in the sentence, "*My LI English corpus,*" my argument, my success, and my main intention" indicates author's personal involvement and ownership. Besides that, "my" here sets a rhetorical appeal of the writer's position in the text, this influences perception of the writer's stance and relationship to the discussed topic. The use of "my" introduces subjective perspectives and personal standpoints, experiences, and intentions.

2. "*I am not naive enough to believe my success has been achieved without resource to some promotional elements,*" the use "my" acknowledges the awareness of promotional strategies and his own limitations.

3. Use of "my" in some sentences serves the purpose of writer's communicative intentions, as, "*My main intention, however, is that this analysis of Attention Economy has encouraged at least some readers*", it shows author's primary purpose or goal of conducting research.

Use of Us

In the overall passage, the linguistic research has remarkable use of "us" to refer to the researchers, writers, and academic community. Hence, the use of "us" creates a sense of association and betrothal between the writer and readers. It shows that the writer is sincerely involved in the research procedure and is representing their results, observations, and breakdown to the readers.

In addition to that, in the field of linguistics, the use of "us" demonstrates a combined tone. It shows that available research shows it has been the section of educational communication, accenting that the writers are giving to the whole body of knowledge in linguistics. In the field of academic discourse, the jointed element is both basic and essential. The topic of discussion or speech is emphasized by the writer with the use of the pronoun "us". It means that the writers are actively engaged in understanding the linguistic material, showing up their opinions and understandings, and breaking them down to the audience. It shows how the writer is included in giving shape to the discourse and interpretation of linguistic aspects. Along with this, the use of "us" also demonstrates the effect of the research done by the researcher. It shows that the results do not only have clues for the writer but also for the whole society. It displays the truth that research is close and functional within the field of linguistics.

Furthermore, the application of "us" is to define the research procedure itself that is, how data is collected, how it is analyzed, and the use of methodology properly. It produces clarity and closeness into the research methods; it gives permission to the audience to interpret how the research was conducted and on what the findings are based.

Summing up, the continuous usage of "us" shows the writer's engagement, a combined tone, and worthwhile efforts in research understanding and representing the data. It also has a stance on the importance and effect of research results. We find this feature in schooling and academic discourse in linguistics, showing the reciprocal and formal nature of the field.

Sentence 1: The pronoun "us" in, "*has allowed us to provide a more nuanced picture*", indicates collective involvement from both sides.

Sentence 2: "*Allows us to carefully investigate*", here "us" is used to show collective capacity of doing careful investigation.

Sentence 3: "Us" in the given sentence, "*study has given us an opportunity*", represents that authors have gotten collective opportunity from the research study.

Sentence 4: The writer has used "Us" in some of the sentences, as in "*it positions us to make specific pedagogical recommendations,*" to denote a joint position of the author and ability to give suggestions.

Sentence 5: "*Should stress the need for further research to help us*", it signalizes collective responsibility to stress the need for further research on the topic.

4.3. Comparative Analysis of sociology and linguistics Disciplines

Table No. 3 exhibits the raw and normalized frequency of personal pronouns in the conclusion sections of both disciplines linguistics and sociology. It reveals that linguists and sociologists both mostly prefer to use "We" to conclude the results within the research.

Sociology			Linguistics	
Pronoun	Raw Frequency	Normalized frequency	Raw Frequency	Normalized frequency
We	198	9.13	153	7.77
Our	111	5.12	116	5.89
My	15	0.69	6	0.30
I	10	0.46	28	1.42
Us	7	0.32	17	0.86

Table No. 03 Corpus of sociology and linguistics disciplines

4.3.1. Discussion

1. The first-person plural pronoun, “We” appears 198 times in the whole corpus of sociology, it is the most frequently used pronoun. Its normalized frequency is 9.13%. Whereas in linguistics, it is used 153 times with normalized frequency of 7.77%. It signifies that it is the most frequently used pronoun in both of the disciplines.

2. The pronoun “Our” is the second highly used pronoun. It shows shared possession and gives sense of belonging among the group of people in both disciplines. It appeared 111 in the text of sociology with a normalized frequency of 5.12%. On the other hand, in the corpus of linguistics, it occurred 116 times, having normalized frequency of 5.89%.

3. “My”, the first-person singular possessive pronoun found 15 times in the text, with normalized frequency is 0.69% in sociology field. In linguistics articles, it appeared 6 times, having normalized frequency of 0.30%. This analysis of “My” indicates the lower prevalence compared to the other plural forms of pronouns. It shows writer’s personal possession or attachment.

4. “I” is the first-person singular pronoun occurs 10 times in the text, with a normalized frequency of 0.46%. In comparison with sociology, “I” found 28 times and its normalized frequency is 1.42%. It is used for self-reference, allows the speaker to express his thoughts, ideas, or feeling directly. Despite of having a lower frequency, it has a central role in personal expression.

5. The use of “Us” is encountered 7 times throughout the whole sociology corpus, along with 0.32% normalized frequency. It is appeared 17 times with the normalized frequency of 0.86% in the linguistics corpora.

Use of We

The usage of “we” in the conclusion sections of research articles of both sociology and linguistics have similar functions with slight differences based on the context of the discipline. As in conclusions of sociology articles, the usage of we indicates the collective authorship and collaborative academic work. It highlights that the provided data and its analysis in research is the result of teamwork of multiple authors. This can be highlighted as an authentication of academic and scientific writings in sociology. Similar to sociology discipline, “we” is employed in linguistics articles exhibits writer’s accountability for the data presented in the study which helps to enhance readers trust towards writers and credibility of the text. It signifies that the arguments, analyses, ideas, and findings in the given text are transparent. In linguistics, the pronoun “we” is used to create cohesion in the thoughts, facts, and evidences within the text.

Sentence 1: “We expect that the relation between intentions and actual behaviors of public may also vary according to welfare state typologies”, here, “we” employs writers’ shared expectation regarding the variation in the relationship between intentions and behaviors of people (society).

Sentence 2: “We described our results using primarily cross-group lenses for comparison since....” here the use of we describes collective responsibility for describing results and highlight originality of the study.

Furthermore, in sociology conclusions, “we” guides the readers by making a logical progression of the study. It reveals researcher’s active engagement throughout the text, from posing research questions to analyzing and providing the results. On the other hand, the usage of “we” in linguistics corpus suggests the further research areas in the field.

Sentence 3: “In performing our analysis, we have noted a degree of fuzziness around some of the categories that have been proposed in the literature on both VL and figurative language.” This sentence from the give corpus indicates writer’s active involvement in the text and seems like authors are taking responsibility of the given information.

Sentence 4: Overall, we conclude that it is, indeed, very likely that the language in movies has changed since the 1930s. The use of the phrase “we conclude” indicates researchers’ personal understanding of the changes observed in language over time.

Moreover, there is literary modesty in the usage of “we” in sociology conclusions. Here, the author appears as a contributor not an absolute authority. It symbolizes author’s cooperative role in academic study. On the other hand, in linguistics conclusions, “we” is used to depict the point of views, ideas, and understandings of the researcher regarding the subject matter, which play a significant role in the study. This depiction helps to analyze linguistics concepts. In last, this usage of “we” highlights the efforts of the researcher into the text in collecting and analyzing data related to societal issues. In linguistics, the pronoun “we” creates a conversational and a friendly tone to make the text persuasive and convincing to the readers. It gives access to complex ideas and research findings to a broader audience.

Use of *Our*

The use of the possessive pronoun “our” in the articles of disciplines, sociology and linguistics, serves similar functions, emphasizes the ownership and collaboration of the authors. However, there are a few nuanced differences of this use of “our” is employed in the two mentioned fields.

In sociology articles’ conclusions, the throughout use of this pronoun implies author’s ownership and responsibility of the provided data. It is a stylistic selection that reveals that authors are taking accountability of the results and findings presented in the research. Similarly, in linguistics articles’ conclusions, “our” also emphasizes and signifies a sense of ownership. It reflects researcher’s active involvement in the study.

Sentence 1: “Our” in the sentence, “*To our knowledge, this study is the first to apply a welfare regime frame to a cross-national study of energy attitudes*”, reveals authorship and authors’ knowledge, and their unique contribution within the study.

Sentence 2: Researcher has used “our” to provide limitations and shortcomings of their study, as in the sentence, “*Our study clearly has some shortcomings.*”

Sentence 3: “*our study contributes to the ongoing discourse*”, here, the usage of “our” underlines authors’ contributions and responsibility within the text.

Sentence 4: In this sentence, writer’s usage of “our” to provide concluding remarks, stresses their collective findings, “*our results, when considered*

together, offer a holistic perspective”, it also gives a sense of shared possession.

On some places in the sociology articles “our” admits shortcomings and limitations of the study. Whereas, “our” in linguistics conclusions strengthens writer’s role as an experienced researcher and analyst who involves the reader in the study. It helps the writer to build a connection of the audiences with the findings of the data to foster transparency in the research. In both of the disciplines, this usage of “our” promotes author’s collective and collaborative efforts they put in research, but the major difference is how they employ is based on their disciplinary contexts.

Use of *I*

The utilization of the first-person pronoun “I” in articles of both disciplines, there are commonalities but have a slight differences in their contextual usages. In sociology articles, “I” underscores researcher’s active participation in the study. It is used to confess author’s personal connection to text, reveals writer’s accountability and authorship. In linguistics, “I” personal pronoun is used to show credibility and expertise of the author within the research study.

Sentence 1: “*In the following, I will summarize, the identified bodily-visual features and discuss them in relation to previous research*”, the author, here, is taking responsibility of discussed information.

Sentence 2: “*In this article, I argue that demand and supply for expertise in Hollywood create and reinforce each other*”, use of “I”, here exposes the arguments presented in the study are based on writer’s own perspectives.

Furthermore, “I” in sociology articles is used to show an authoritative attitude of the writer towards the research. It forms writer’s voice as a primary proponent for the data analyzed in text. On the other side in linguistics articles, “I” functions as a rhetorical device which shows author’s possession of the data. It asserts writer’s position as a well-experienced researcher, gives a sense of persuasive impact on the audience.

Sentence 3: “*However, I should stress the need for further research to help us fully understand the role of input formats*”, here, the author is stressing the need for further more research on the subject matter.

Sentence 4: “*With respect to the sociology of art, I have sought to combined Bourdieu’s insights with those of Becker, and while these are often seen as mutually exclusive...*” here, in this sentence, “I”

expresses author's personal efforts and contributions to the field of sociology.

In sociology discipline, frequent use of "I" emphasizes that the author is a vibrant participant in the study not just a passive observer. On the other hand, in linguistics, "I" is used to guide readers through the logical structure and gives directions towards further statements. Here, in this field, this usage gives a sense of intimacy, subjectivity, and confidentiality regarding the analyzed data. It creates transparency which builds readers' trust in the within the study.

Use of My

In the conclusion sections of linguistics and sociology research articles, possessive pronoun "My" serves to indicate some common functions but there is difference in their application within the study. In linguistics, use of "my" self-mention exhibits the author's personal engagement in the study. It also reveals writer's ownership of the ideas regarding the subject matter discussed in the study. It showcases subjectivity of the researcher in the text. This usage of "my" underscores author's intentions of selecting corpus. It reveals that the literature of the study is deliberately chosen by the researcher which increases active decision-making and providing factual arguments on the research material. "My" in linguistic articles also demonstrate writer's personal awareness of the study. It reflects his perspectives and understanding of the topic.

Sentence 1: "My" in the sentence, "*My LI English corpus,*" my argument, my success, and my main intention", indicates author's personal involvement and ownership. Besides that, "my" here sets a rhetorical appeal of the writer's position in the text, this influences perception of the writer's stance and relationship to the discussed topic. The use of "my" introduces subjective perspectives and personal standpoints, experiences, and intentions.

Sentence 2: "*I am not naive enough to believe my success has been achieved without resource to some promotional elements,*" the use of "my" acknowledges the awareness of promotional strategies and his own limitations.

Whereas, similar to linguistic, in sociology papers, usage of "my" affirms writer's subjectivity, originality and his active engagement with in the text. It underscores author's central role in gathering, analyzing and presenting the data in research. It shows possession and ownership of the information.

It also serves to express author's solid understanding of the issues discussed in the study. It allows researchers to disclose own perceptions regarding the claims, arguments, and facts made in the text.

Sentence 3: "*For my purposes, their approaches provide crucial insight.*" here, "My" shows author's ownership of the study, it indicates that the insights presented in the texts are important for the author.

Sentence 4: "*Here is where my interest in anti-colonial thought lies*", "My" indicates possession and expresses author's interest in anti-colonial thought.

Use of Us

Usage of "Us" in linguistics conclusions gives a sense of affiliation and connection between the writers and the audience. It shows author's sincerity towards presenting results, observations, and conclusions within the research study. It creates a combined tone which emphasizes author's contributions to the entire body of knowledge, and his active role in research. Furthermore, this use of "us" illustrates impact of the research on the writer and on the broader society. It demonstrates that research findings are not only for individual writer but also for the entire society means it implies practicality of the evidences provided in research. Moreover, "us" also defines the whole procedure of data collection. It gives detailed information of how the data was collected, analyzed, and what methodology was employed to gather the facts and figures. Simply, it could be said that it brings clarity and transparency within the research and research methods which allows audience to understand how the whole research conducted and findings extracted. For example:

Sentence 1: The writer has used "Us" in some of the sentences, as in "*it positions us to make specific pedagogical recommendations,*" to denote a joint position of the author and ability to give suggestions.

Sentence 2: "*Should stress the need for further research to help us*", it signalizes collective responsibility to stress the need for further research on the topic.

In sociology articles, the pronoun "us" is employed to serve various purposes, gives insights of collective efforts and involvement, and collaborative understanding within the study.

For instance:

Sentence 3: *The categories representing the different dimensions and sub-dimensions theorized were*

found to be strongly interrelated, and this allowed us to build an integrated measure of attachment to society for use in our main analyses". The pronoun "us" implies collaborative efforts of the writers and the readers to build an attachment to society for the main analyses.

Sentence 4: "Us" in the sentence, "*Distinguishing between these three factors enables us to explain the gender variation in SWB gains from pensioner employment*", also indicates involvement of the author and readers and collaborative understanding of writers and readers of the presented subject matter. The usage of this pronoun exposes author as a part of broader community. It also invites audience and the other researchers to be a part of investigation, and involve them in the understanding and exploration of the study. Besides that, the usage of "us" promotes critical thinking and gives suggestions that the information, hypotheses, and facts are open to be explored, evaluated, and to be discussed more in deep. Precisely, it fosters analytical investigation. Moreover, it signifies wider communal and societal issues and perspectives. In last, it indicates that the analyses, findings, and arguments given in the research study are for the whole society and community, surpassing individual perspectives and consider them valued.

5. Conclusion

This chapter explains the major findings of the study, discusses the implications and limitations of the present research, and providing suggestions and giving directions for future research areas in other disciplines.

5.3. Major findings

In this study, it has been observed that both discipline writers use personal pronouns that to ensure their presence in their claims and also express their full responsibility for those claims and ideas in the research study. This study used Ken Hyland's Interpersonal Model of Metadiscourse (2005) for investigating the different ways of writers using personal pronouns to get personally involved in their findings or to show their complete commitment towards their claims they made in the analysis.

This whole research is based on investigating the overall frequency of personal pronouns in two soft sciences disciplines, sociology and linguistics. The results of the study show how literary scholars use self-mentions in their articles to persuade the readers' attention and to get personally engaged within the

study. The result demonstrated that the writers mostly use first-person plural pronoun "We" in the articles to not only to show their collective efforts they put in the research but also to position themselves within the text. As Shehzad, 2007 mentions that the appearance or disappearance of self-mentioning pronouns in research articles does not only expose writer's voice's choice to present the textual information but it also indicates the way of positioning themselves in relation to the arguments they are presenting, and besides that their relation with the readers and the community of research at a large level. Besides that, the study also revealed the usage of self-references of each discipline individually, which reveals how many times each pronoun was used with what normalized frequency. For this, the table and graph is established to show the overall frequency of the appearance of self-references.

Moreover, the study explored the differences between the usage of personal pronouns in disciplines, sociology and linguistics. For this, both disciplines were studied comparatively, which disclosed the commonalities and differences between their usage and how they function differently according to the context of each field. The comparative study of both disciplines unveiled that sociologists usually prefer to use personal pronouns to show their personal understandings and experiences of the societal and communal issues, whereas the linguists use the pronouns to get completely involved in the study and to show collaborative team work of the researchers including the readers.

5.4. Limitations and suggestions

The present study is merely restricted to investigate the usage of personal pronouns in conclusion sections of research articles only, though it could be extended to the other sub-genres, such as the abstracts, introduction, literature review, and results. Besides that this study only focuses on usage of personal pronouns, however, it could have involved detailed study of move analysis, usage of various prepositions, tenses, or other grammatical features. Furthermore, the corpus is limited to two soft sciences disciplines, sociology and linguistics, which could be extended to other hard-sciences disciplines too. In last, it is specific to two soft sciences fields; it also could be a comparative study of differences in usage of self-mentions in a hard-science and a soft-

science field, or native and non-native writers of the mentioned fields.

Based on the presented results and findings, it is to suggest that, future research on this topic should take into account many issues which were not encountered in the present study. The other areas of the various fields should also be analyzed like as the usage of self-mentions in introduction, abstract, or literature review etc. The upcoming exploratory topics can include investigation of possessive pronouns or metonymic expressions. It is also suggested that it would be interesting to replicate this study in other disciplines to gain a better understanding regarding the subject matter.

6. References

- Afshar, H. S., Moradi, M., & Hamzavi, R. (2014). Frequency and type of hedging devices used in the research articles of humanities, basic sciences and agriculture. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 136, 70-74.
- Ansarifar, A., Shahriari, H., & Pishghadam, R. (2018). Phrasal complexity in academic writing: A comparison of abstracts written by graduate students and expert writers in applied linguistics. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 31, 58-71.
- Ávila-Cabrera, J. J., & Esteban, A. C. (2021). The project SubESPSKills: Subtitling tasks for students of Business English to improve written production skills. *English for Specific Purposes*, 63, 33-44.
- Bartram, R. (2021). Cracks in broken windows: How objects shape professional evaluation. *American journal of sociology*, 126(4), 759-794.
- Bukodi, E., Goldthorpe, J. H., & Steinberg, I. (2022). The social origins and schooling of a scientific elite: Fellows of the royal society born from 1900. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 73(3), 484-504.
- Burnette, J., & Calude, A. S. (2022). Wake up New Zealand! Directives, politeness and stance in Twitter# Covid19NZ posts. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 196, 6-23.
- Carrabine, E. (2021). Low life: William Hogarth, visual culture and sociologies of art. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 72(4), 909-929.
- Chaudhuri, S., & Morash, M. (2019). Monitoring team interviews during fieldwork: some lessons from India. *International Journal of Sociology*, 49(5-6), 389-399.
- Cotos, E. (2019). Articulating societal benefits in grant proposals: Move analysis of Broader Impacts. *English for Specific Purposes*, 54, 15-34.
- Cotos, E., & Chung, Y. R. (2019). Functional language in curriculum genres: Implications for testing international teaching assistants. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 41, 100766.
- Dobakhti, L., & Hassan, N. (2017). A corpus-based study of writer identity in qualitative and quantitative research articles. *3L, Language, Linguistics, Literature*, 23(1).
- Drouhot, L. G. (2021). Cracks in the melting pot? Religiosity and assimilation among the diverse Muslim population in France. *American Journal of Sociology*, 126(4), 795-851.
- Doering, L., & Ody-Brasier, A. (2021). Time and punishment: How individuals respond to being sanctioned in voluntary associations. *American Journal of Sociology*, 127(2), 441-491.
- Doolan, S. M. (2021). An exploratory analysis of source integration in post-secondary L1 and L2 source-based writing. *English for Specific Purposes*, 62, 128-141.
- Fioramonte, A., & Vásquez, C. (2019). Multi-party talk in the medical encounter: Socio-pragmatic functions of family members' contributions in the treatment advice phase. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 139, 132-145.
- Go, J. (2023). Thinking against empire: Anticolonial thought as social theory. *The British Journal of Sociology*.
- Gong, H., & Barlow, M. (2022). A corpus-based analysis of research article macrostructure patterns. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 58, 101138.
- Grande, B., Leishman, C. D., & Skilleås, H. K. (2022). "I can't come to the words": Effects of including military flavour when testing the oral proficiency of Norwegian joint terminal attack controllers. *English for Specific Purposes*, 68, 73-86.
- Haddon, E. (2019). How class shapes critical resentment toward inequality: The competing forces of stratification and politics. *International Journal of Sociology*, 49(4), 241-263.
- Henkin, R. (2020). Generic 'you' and gender in Hebrew journalistic interviews. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 169, 273-288.
- Hoff, M. (2019). Epistemic commitment and mood alternation: A semantic-pragmatic analysis of Spanish future-framed adverbials. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 139, 97-108.
- Hughes, C., Bhandari, P., Young-DeMarco, L., Swindle, J., Thornton, A., & Williams, N. (2020). Family obligation attitudes, gender, and migration. *International journal of sociology*, 50(4), 237-264.
- Huszár, Á., & Berger, V. (2022). The new Hungarian middle class?. *International Journal of Sociology*, 52(5), 370-396.
- Hyland, K. (2017). Metadiscourse: What is it and where is it going? *Journal of pragmatics*, 113, 16-29.

- Jalilifar, A., & Mehrabi, K. (2014). A cross-disciplinary and cross-cultural study of directives in discussions and conclusions of research articles. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 2(1), 27-44.
- Kim, C. K. (2009). Personal pronouns in English and Korean texts: A corpus-based study in terms of textual interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 41(10), 2086-2099.
- Kithulgoda, E., & Mendis, D. (2020). From analysis to pedagogy: Developing ESP materials for the Welcome Address in Sri Lanka. *English for Specific Purposes*, 60, 140-158.
- Liu, C., & Tseng, M. Y. (2021). Paradigmatic variation in hedging and boosting: A comparative study of discussions in narrative inquiry and grounded theory research. *English for Specific Purposes*, 61, 1-16.
- Lamont, M. (2019). From 'having' to 'being': Self-worth and the current crisis of American society. *The British journal of sociology*, 70(3), 660-707.
- Langsæther, P. E., & Evans, G. (2020). More than self-interest: Why different classes have different attitudes to income inequality. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 71(4), 594-607.
- Li, F., Borràs-Comes, J., & Espinal, M. T. (2022). On the interpretation of response particles méi (yǒu) and bù to negative polar questions in Mandarin Chinese. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 200, 267-281.
- Li, Y., Cargill, M., Gao, X., Wang, X., & O'Connor, P. (2019). A scientist in interdisciplinary team-teaching in an English for Research Publication Purposes classroom: Beyond a "cameo role". *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 40, 129-140.
- Lu, X., Casal, J. E., & Liu, Y. (2020). The rhetorical functions of syntactically complex sentences in social science research article introductions. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 44, 100832.
- Martin, J. L., & Lembo, A. (2020). On the other side of values. *American Journal of Sociology*, 126(1), 52-98.
- Mik-Meyer, N., & Silverman, D. (2019). Agency and clientship in public encounters: Co-constructing 'neediness' and 'worthiness' in shelter placement meetings. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 70(5), 1640-1660.
- McElhattan, D. (2022). The Proliferation of Criminal Background Check Laws in the United States. *American Journal of Sociology*, 127(4), 1037-1093.
- McLean, C., Long, M. A., Stretesky, P. B., Lynch, M. J., & Hall, S. (2019). Exploring the relationship between neoliberalism and homicide: a cross-national perspective. *International Journal of Sociology*, 49(1), 53-76.
- Molino, A. (2010). Personal and impersonal authorial references: A contrastive study of English and Italian Linguistics research articles. *Journal of English for academic Purposes*, 9(2), 86-101.
- Monteiro, K., & Hirano, E. (2020). A periphery inside a semi-periphery: The uneven participation of Brazilian scholars in the international community. *English for specific purposes*, 58, 15-29.
- Neil, R., & Sampson, R. J. (2021). The birth lottery of history: Arrest over the life course of multiple cohorts coming of age, 1995–2018. *American Journal of Sociology*, 126(5), 1127-1178.
- Ocobock, A. (2020). Leveraging legitimacy: Institutional work and change in the case of same-sex marriage. *American Journal of Sociology*, 126(3), 513-544.
- Otero, G., Volker, B., Rözer, J., & Mollenhorst, G. (2022). The lives of others: Class divisions, network segregation, and attachment to society in Chile. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 73(4), 754-785.
- Ozdemir, N. O., & Longo, B. (2014). Metadiscourse use in thesis abstracts: A cross-cultural study. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 141, 59-63.
- Pérez-Paredes, P., & Bueno-Alastuey, M. C. (2019). A corpus-driven analysis of certainty stance adverbs: Obviously, really and actually in spoken native and learner English. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 140, 22-32.
- Samraj, B. (2021). Variation in interpersonal relations in manuscript reviews with different recommendations. *English for Specific Purposes*, 62, 70-83.
- Sharma, B. K., & Hussein, I. (2021). Discourses of professional identities and linguistic capital formation of international STEM faculty. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 52, 100997.
- Shen, Q., & Yao, S. (2022). Syntactically incomplete turns as delicate actions: A way to manage interpersonal relationships. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 197, 27-42.
- Shen, L., Carter, S., & Zhang, L. J. (2019). EL1 and EL2 doctoral students' experience in writing the discussion section: A needs analysis. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 40, 74-86.
- Silva, B. B., & Otwinowska, A. (2019). VST as a reliable academic placement tool despite cognate inflation effects. *English for specific purposes*, 54, 35-49.
- Skarpelis, A. K. M. (2023). Horror Vacui: Racial Misalignment, Symbolic Repair, and Imperial Legitimation in German National Socialist Portrait Photography. *American Journal of Sociology*, 129(2), 313-383.

- Solera, C. (2019). Do 'his' education and class matter? The changing effect of the husband on women's labour-market transitions in Italy and Britain. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 70(2), 526-550.
- Stubager, R., & Harrits, G. S. (2022). Dimensions of class identification? On the roots and effects of class identity. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 73(5), 942-958.
- Tanaka, T., Masumura, R., & Oba, T. (2021). Neural candidate-aware language models for speech recognition. *Computer Speech & Language*, 66, 101157.
- Tayyebi, M. (2012). Personal pronouns in English and Persian medical research articles. *English for Specific Purposes World*, 36(12), 1-12.
- Thompson, G. (2008). Ken Hyland, Metadiscourse: Exploring interaction in writing. *Language in Society*, 37(1), 138-141.
- Ulybina, O. (2022). Explaining the Cross-National Pattern of Policy Shift toward Childcare Deinstitutionalization. *International Journal of Sociology*, 52(2), 128-155.
- Vassileva, I. (2022). An 'academic war'—A case study of confrontation in academia. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 57, 101115.
- Vold, E. T. (2006). Epistemic modality markers in research articles: a cross-linguistic and cross-disciplinary study. *International journal of applied linguistics*, 16(1), 61-87.
- Walkinshaw, I., Mitchell, N., & Subhan, S. (2019). Self-denigration as a relational strategy in lingua franca talk: Asian English speakers. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 139, 40-51.
- Warikoo, N. (2020). Addressing emotional health while protecting status: Asian American and white parents in suburban America. *American Journal of Sociology*, 126(3), 545-576.
- Wang, S. P., Tseng, W. T., & Johanson, R. (2021). To we or not to we: Corpus-based research on first-person pronoun use in abstracts and conclusions. *Sage Open*, 11(2), 21582440211008893.
- Xia, G. (2017). A cross-disciplinary corpus-based study on English and Chinese native speakers' use of first-person pronouns in academic English writing. *Text & Talk*, 38(1), 93-113

