REPUBLIC OF TURKEY
ÇAĞ UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE EDUCATION

AN INTERDISCIPLINARY CORPUS BASED ANALYSIS ON THE USE OF THE FIRST-PERSON PRONOUNS IN THE ACADEMIC ARTICLES REGARDING GENDER

Dilek WILLIAMS

Supervisor: Dr. Zehra KÖROĞLU

Member of Jury: Dr. Seden TUYAN

Member of Jury: Dr. Figen YILMAZ (Cukurova Universitesi)

MASTER OF ARTS THESIS

MERSIN / NİSAN 2022

APPROVAL

**REPUBLIC OF TURKEY
ÇAĞ UNIVERSITY
DIRECTORSHIP OF THE INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**

We **certify** that thesis under the title of "**An Interdisciplinary Corpus Based Analysis On The Use Of The First-Person Pronouns In The Academic Articles Regarding Gender**" which was prepared by our student **Dilek WILLIAMS** with number **20188061** is satisfactory **consensus** for the award of the degree of **Master of Arts** in the Department of **English Language Education**.

(The Original Copy Hold in the Institute Directorate is signed.)
Univ. inside -Supervisor-Head of Examining Committee: Dr. Zehra KÖROĞLU

(The Original Copy Hold in the Institute Directorate is signed.)
Univ. Inside - permanent member: Dr. Seden TUYAN

(The Original Copy Hold in the Institute Directorate is signed.)
Univ. Outside - permanent member: Dr. Figen YILMAZ (Cukurova Universitesi)

I confirm that the signatures above belong to the academics mentioned.

(The Original Copy Hold in the Institute Directorate is signed.)

28 / 04 / 2022
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Murat KOÇ
Director of Institute of Social Sciences

Note: The uncited usage of the reports, charts, figures and photographs in this thesis, whether original or quoted for mother sources is subject to the Law of Works of Arts and Thought. No: 584

DEDICATION

I dedicate this thesis to my father, Nedim AKCIL, who instilled in me human love, honesty, and the power of knowledge from the moment I was born, to my mother, Serpin AKCIL, who has never left me alone with her hardworking hands and loving heart, to my husband, Marquis WILLIAMS, who has always guided me with his light and love when I am lost, and to my two daughters, Nehir Roza and Petek Stella, who are my endless source of love. This thesis serves as a reminder of our family's accomplishments and sacrifices.

ETHICS DECLARATION

Student's

Name& Surname: Dilek WILLIAMS

Number: 20188061

Department: English Language Education

Program: Master Thesis (X) Ph. D. Thesis ()

Thesis Title: An Interdisciplinary Corpus Based Analysis On The Use Of The First-Person Pronouns In The Academic Articles Regarding Gender

I hereby declare that;

I prepared this master thesis in accordance with Çağ University Institute of Social Sciences Thesis Writing Directive,

I prepared this thesis within the framework of academic and ethics rules,

I presented all information, documents, evaluations and findings in accordance with scientific ethical and moral principles,

I cited all sources to which I made reference in my thesis,

The work of art in this thesis is original,

I hereby acknowledge all possible loss of rights in case of a contrary circumstance. (in case of any circumstance contradicting with my declaration)

28 / 04 /2022
Dilek WILLIAMS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The first and most important thing I would like to do is to express my heartfelt gratitude to my advisor, Dr. Zehra KÖROĞLU, for her support, guidance, extraordinary leadership, and professional expertise, during my master's degree study and research. I am also grateful for her patience, inspiration, excitement, and extensive knowledge of the subject matter. This thesis would not have been possible without her supervision during the whole research and writing process. During my master's degree studies, I could not have asked for a more supportive and knowledgeable advisor and mentor.

In addition to my advisor, I would like to express my gratitude to the jury members of the thesis committee, Dr. Seden TUYAN, and Dr. Figen YILMAZ, for their support, insightful comments, and challenging questions throughout the process. It would be a disservice to my heart if I did not express my gratitude to Prof. Dr. Şehnaz ŞAHİNKARAKAŞ. Her committed, futuristic, and rigorous aptitude inspired me to continue pushing toward the completion of my thesis. I would like to use this occasion to convey my appreciation for Doç. Dr. Murat KOÇ for astonishing management abilities and proficiency over the Social Science Institute. Furthermore, without the assistance and advice of the Social Science Institute Secretary Staff Aycan KOL, and Senay DEMİR, any attempt at any level will be unable to be effectively accomplished.

I am confident that I would not have been able to complete this thesis without the love and support of my family and friends. Firstly, a heartfelt thanks to my husband, Marquis WILLIAMS, who has provided me with an unending amount of support, love, and encouragement during my academic path, as well as my children, Nehir Roza and Petek Stella who are genuinely beautiful young women, and for whom I am truly honored to be their mother. Another meritorious acknowledgment goes to my parents, Nedim AKCİL and Serpin AKCİL who have showered me with love and support throughout my life. Finally, I would like to express my gratitude to my friends for being tolerant when I have not responded to emails or returned phone calls. When it comes to helping me finish this thesis, I cannot express how grateful I am for the altruistic efforts that these individuals have put out.

ABSTRACT

AN INTERDISCIPLINARY CORPUS BASED ANALYSIS ON THE USE OF THE FIRST-PERSON PRONOUNS IN THE ACADEMIC ARTICLES REGARDING GENDER

Dilek WILLIAMS

Master's Thesis, Department of English Language Education
Supervisor: Dr. Zehra KÖROĞLU
April 2022, 71 pages

Within the scope of this study, the use of the first-person pronouns "I" and "We" in interdisciplinary academic articles by female writers (FWs) of English and male writers (MWs) of English was analyzed as a whole. The academic articles from social sciences were arbitrarily selected between 2016 and 2020. The purpose of this study was to determine the frequency of use of the first-person pronouns "I" and "We" in the interdisciplinary academic articles written in English by female writers (FWs) and male writers (MWs) in the departments of sociology, anthropology, psychology, and philosophy at universities in the United States of America. Additionally, it was restricted to the abstract, methodology, and conclusion parts of academic articles rather than the entire article owing to the reliability of the analysis as a whole. Furthermore, the study was limited to 50 academic articles written by female writers and 50 academic articles written by male writers. The frequency of the first-person pronouns was determined in this study using the Key Word in Context (KWIC) Concordance program, which was used to assess the usage of the pronouns in 1,000 words. Apart from the frequency analysis, log-likelihood (LL) calculation was employed for statistical analysis. At the conclusion of the study, it was determined that the LL frequency of the first-person pronouns demonstrated an overuse in the academic articles written by the female writers of English compared to the male writers of English between the years 2016 and 2019. However, it was revealed that first-person pronouns were underused in the academic articles written by the FWs of English compared to male writers in 2020. The findings were statistically significant in the academic articles written by the FWs of English and the MWs of English between 2019-2020.

Keywords: corpus, the first-person pronouns, academic articles, interdisciplinary, gender

ÖZ

DİSİPLİNLERARASI AKADEMİK MAKALELERDE BİRİNCİ KİŞİ ZAMİRLERİNİN CİNSİYETE DAYALI KULLANIMINI İNCELEYEN DERLEM TEMELLİ ANALİZ

Dilek WIILIAMS

Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı
Danışman: Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Zehra KÖROĞLU
Nisan 2022, 71 sayfa

Bu çalışma kapsamında, disiplinler arası İngilizce yazılan akademik makalelerde kadın yazarlar ve erkek yazarlar tarafından "Ben" ve "Biz" birinci şahıs zamirlerinin kullanımı bir bütün olarak incelenmiştir. Akademik makaleler 2016-2020 yılları arasında rastgele seçilmiştir. Bu çalışmanın amacı, Amerika Birleşik Devletleri'nde yer alan üniversitelerin sosyoloji, antropoloji, psikoloji ve felsefe bölümlerinde kadın yazarlar ve erkek yazarlar tarafından yazılan disiplinler arası akademik makalelerde "Ben" ve "Biz" birinci şahıs zamirlerinin kullanım sıklığını belirlemektir. Ayrıca akademik makalelerin tamamından ziyade güvenilirlik açısından öz, metodoloji ve sonuç bölümleri birleşik olarak analiz edilmiştir. Ek olarak, kadın yazarlar tarafından yazılan 50 akademik makale ve erkek yazarlar tarafından yazılan 50 akademik makale ile sınırlandırılmıştır. Bu çalışmada birinci şahıs zamirlerinin sıklığı, zamirlerin 1000 kelimelik kullanım durumlarını değerlendirmek için kullanılan Key Word in Context (KWIC) Concordance programı kullanılarak belirlenmiştir. İstatistiksel analiz için frekans analizinin yanı sıra log-likelihood (LL) hesaplaması kullanılmıştır. Araştırma sonucunda, 2016-2019 yılları arasında kadın yazarların erkek yazarlara oranla İngilizce yazılan akademik makalelerde birinci şahıs zamirlerinin sık kullanıldığı tespit edilmiştir. 2020 yılında ise, kadın yazarlar tarafından yazılan akademik makalelerde erkek yazarlara kıyasla birinci şahıs zamirleri daha az kullanılmıştır. 2016 ve 2020 yılları arasında yazılan akademik makalelerdeki bulguların istatistiksel olarak anlamlı olduğu belirlenmiştir.

Anahtar kelimeler: derlem, birinci şahıs zamirleri, akademik makaleler, disiplinler arası, cinsiyet

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CL   : Corpus Linguistics

EAP   : English for Academic Purposes

FWs   : Female Writers

ICLE   : International Corpus of Learner English

KWIC   : Key Words in Context

LL   : Log-likelihood

MW   s: Male Writers

USA   : United State of America

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF APPENDICES

1. INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

There are a rising number of academic writers worldwide who are not native English speakers, but who produce written academic work in English out of necessity or personal preference. English's exceptional status as the international language of academics is now globally recognized (e.g., Canagarajah, 2002; Ferguson et al., 2011; Flowerdew & Li, 2009; Hamp-Lyons, 2011; Hyland, 2009; Lillis & Curry, 2010; Swales, 2004). Typically, specialized languages relate to the varieties used by experts and specialists to communicate and convey information and knowledge.

According to Vandermensbrugghe (2004), international students select to study in English-speaking countries in order to develop internationally acknowledged communicative and ethnic skills that are immensely beneficial in an international environment, and they believe that a degree from an English-speaking university could well serve as their 'passport' to the world (p. 418). Academic publication is likely to be top of mind for ESL/EFL academics seeking to establish their careers and have their voices heard within their chosen disciplinary communities, as it is the major source by which knowledge is generated, resolved, and communicated within academic discourse societies (Becher & Trowler, 2001; Hyland, 2000, 2009).

As recruitment, promotion, and length of service within universities become increasingly linked to research findings and publications, the tension on academic faculty to publish in 'international' academic papers with a 'high impact' factor rises (Becher & Trowler, 2001; Belcher, 2007; Burgess & Martin-Martin, 2008; Curry & Lillis, 2010; Flowerdew & Li, 2009; Lillis & Curry, 2010; Uzuner, 2008). At first sight, this appears to be a significant indication if a researcher seeks to gain membership in a larger discourse community, it stands to reason for his/her study to be publicly released in a 'international' journal. As Swales (2004) points out, the term 'international' in the context of academic publication traditionally refers to English-language publications.

Over the last two decades, there has been a surge of increase in the popularity of corpus based findings to teaching language. The use of corpora, in particular, has had a significant effect on language education of English for Academic Purposes (EAP) (Flowerdew, 2002; Hyland, 2006; Lee & Swales, 2006; Schlitz, 2010; Thompson, 2000, 2007; Thurstun & Candlin, 1998; Tribble, 2002). Increased student acquaintance with

electronic corpus analysis tools has aided in the development of students' linguistic awareness and facilitated learner autonomy (Bondi, 1999).

Numerous studies have established that academic writing is a crucial talent for university students to master (Lea & Street, 1998; Whitehead, 2002; Andrews, 2003). According to a research, students enrolled in colleges where instruction was given in English were expected to understand the fundamentals of scholarly authoring prior to initiating their academic curriculum (Lillis & Turner, 2001). These basic expectations for students' writing competence are matched in content-specific courses (Whitehead, 2002).

The creation of writer identity in academic writing has frequently been linked to the rhetorical choices made by writers when they compose their writings. One of the frequently highlighted rhetorical devices is the first-person pronouns, which many regard as the most clear manifestation of the author's identity in a text (Harwood, 2005; Hyland, 2002a; Kuo, 1999). Simultaneously, other research studies have focused on the construction of author identity in texts, including those on stance (e.g. Hyland, 1999; Vassileva, 2001), evaluation (e.g. Hunston & Thompson, 2000; Swales & Burke, 2003), hedging (e.g. Salager-Meyer, 1994), and voice (e.g. Hirvela & Belcher, 2001; Shaw, 1992). Research on the relationship between author identity construction and the use of the 'I' in academic writing are massive, and indeed, it has been asserted that by preventing author pronouns and failing to defend their inferences, emerging writers risk failing to establish an effective authorial identity and struggling to build an effective academic argument (Hyland, 2002b, p. 354).

Linguists of all stripes learned that corpora could be quite beneficial for pursuing a variety of research objectives. For example, numerous lexicographers discovered that they might develop more effective dictionaries by examining term usage in very extensive linguistic corpora. Much of the present research in historical linguistics was based on corpora of writings from earlier eras of English (Meyer, 2002).

Tognini-Bonelli (2001) emphasizes the long-standing controversy over how to define corpus linguistics (CL) as a theory and methodology. It has been debated that CL is not a distinct field of study but rather a methodological foundation for researching language.According to Johansson (1998, p. 80), a successful interpretation results from a fruitful synthesis of prior work, reflection, corpus, and experiment; or, more broadly, from heritage, creativity, and observation. He continues that the corpus is a linguist's instruments to be used in combination with other techniques such as introspection and

elicitation (1991, p. 313). Kennedy (1998, p. 1) appears to concur with this approach, arguing that CL is not an end in itself but rather a source of evidence for improved descriptions of language structure and use.

Academic fields have arisen to explore the relationship between language and society, with language and gender being a subset of this. This pursuit is typically divided into two tracks: the study of sexism as the dominant vision of society and gender relations as an asymmetry of power, and the study of feminine and masculine sociolects; that is, the ways in which females and males communicate, as well as stereotypes about how they communicate. Linguistic distinctions between genders reflect the existence of social divisions, most notably in the power balance between females and males. According to some analysts, these discrepancies in industrialized countries, such as the United States, reflect a trend toward gradual but persistent change, owing to females' increased empowerment and education, as well as a rising rejection of gender-related social and linguistic norms. In other words, unjust power imbalances are being challenged more frequently, resulting in a greater democratization of language (Mercedal, 2021, p. 3).

Statement of the Problem

Corpus-based studies had already shown a number of distinguishing linguistic characteristics of academic discourse in comparison to other genres. According to Biber's (1988) research of diversity in speech and writing, academic writings are primarily informative and non-narrative in nature; they required extremely clear, text-internal references and cope with abstract, philosophical, or technical subject content. The Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English (Biber et al., 1999) presented an exhaustive account of the variety of specific grammatical and lexical elements of academic prose in comparison to conversation, fiction, and newspaper reporting. The presence of nouns, nominalizations, noun phrases with modifiers, attributive adjectives, derived adjectives, action verbs, verbs with inanimate subjects, agentless passive structures, and connecting adverbials were all common aspects of this genre. By contrast, scholarly texts rarely contained first and second person pronouns, personal verbs, or contractions. It is believed that the selection of a certain personal pronoun for a particular context, or even the presence or absence of a personal pronoun in academic journals, frequently reveals how writers view themselves, their relationships with readers, and their relationship with the discourse community to which they belong.

Academic communication is now widely acknowledged as a social activity in which writers must assume specific views and communicate with their readers in order to be convincing. Thus, academic discourse can be identified not only as knowledge transformation (Tardy 2005, p. 325), but also as a declaration of selfhood (Ivanic', 1998, p. 32) that displays the writer in a sociocultural process in which the discourse's success is derived by the social rules and conventions of discipline and context.

Hyland (2002) researched the use of self-reference by professional academic writers and students in a cross-disciplinary study and discovered that beginner authors used significantly less personal pronouns than research articles authors. Additionally, his findings indicated that writers in soft disciplines (e.g., applied linguistics) referred to themselves more than their colleagues in hard disciplines (e.g., engineering). He contended that this could be because authors in hard disciplines focus more on statistical and objective evidence while minimizing the role of the writer. However, because knowledge in the soft sciences is more conceptual in nature and authors need to convince their readers of the accuracy of their own explanations of a concept, authors in the soft sciences need to connect with their readers and present their findings.

Hyland's (2005) examination of soft and hard disciplines demonstrated that epistemological variations in how these disciplines view the world and define knowledge have an effect on how academics write in these fields. While quantitative research is more closely aligned with the hard side of the continuum, qualitative research is more closely aligned with the soft side. Despite the abundance of research publications and authorial presence, only a few documented studies have examined the relationship between using the first-person pronouns in academic journals and gender separately.

Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of this descriptive and quantitative corpus based research was to evaluate the first-person pronouns in the abstract, methodology, and conclusion sections in the academic articles that were written by the female and male speakers of the English language in the interdisciplinary departments; Sociology, Anthropology, Psychology, and Philosophy at the universities in the United State of America. The study did not examine whether the first-person pronouns 'I' and 'We' were used grammatically or not in the specified parts of the academic articles, but it highlighted any possible differences on the frequency, overuse and underuse of the first-person

pronouns used between the female and the male speakers of the English language affiliated with universities in the USA and shed light into their usage. Moreover, the first-person pronouns, the sections, and the departments were not analyzed separately. In other words, these mentioned parts were analyzed as a whole. Furthermore, another basis for this study was to analyze the differences regarding each year between 2016 - 2020 individually.

Research Questions

This study aims to find answers to the following research questions:

1. Are there any differences in the use of the first-person pronouns in the academic articles regarding genders at the interdisciplinary departments between the years 2016 – 2020?
2. Are there any differences in the use of the first-person pronouns in the academic articles regarding genders at the interdisciplinary departments
   a) in the year 2016?
   b) in the year 2017?
   c) in the year 2018?
   d) in the year 2019?
   e) in the year 2020?

Significance of the Study

Despite the abundance of research publications and authorial presence, only a few documented studies have examined the relationship between using the first personal pronouns in academic journals, and gender (e.g. Harwood, 2005; Basal, 2006; Suwarno, Triyono, Ashadi, Sahayu, 2021). For instance; Shayu's study utilized corpus linguistics and critical microsemiotic analysis to examine how gender is represented in an English as a foreign language (EFL) textbook used in Indonesian junior high schools (Grade 9). The corpus linguistic analysis revealed that textbook authors achieved gender equity by integrating gender-neutral vocabularies in both verbal and visual texts to avoid gender-marked words (Suwarno, Triyono, Ashadi, & Sahayu, 2021).

The present research was carried out on 100 articles written by 50 female and 50 male academicians who were speakers of the English language and worked at universities in the United States of America. Articles were randomly selected from the

departments of Sociology, Anthropology, Philosophy, and Psychology. In the present study, the frequency, overuse and underuse of the first-person pronouns used between the female and the male authors between the years 2016 and 2020 were analyzed individually. The findings will aid in our understanding of whether or not gender has a significant effect on academic writing in between years. Thus, it may highlight the differences between gender and the years in the academic texts.

Limitations of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the frequency of use of the first-person pronouns 'I' and 'We' holistically in academic journals written by the female writers of English (FWs) and the male writers of English (MWs) in the interdisciplinary departments; sociology, philosophy, anthropology, and psychology between the years 2016 and 2020. The interdisciplinary departments regarded above were purposely chosen due to the fact that it is believed that the writers in soft disciplines tend to use self-mentions, such as the first-person pronouns, more than their colleagues in hard disciplines. Academic articles' abstract, methods, and conclusion sections were analyzed as a whole. The introduction and reference list sections were excluded since the academic text's introduction sections featured several quotations and statements from prior researchers. Thus, it posed a risk to the authenticity and collection of the writers' own corpus. Additionally, this study examined only 50 academic articles written by male writers (MWs) of English and 50 academic articles published by female writers (FWs) of English (a total of 100) in the interdisciplinary field. Due to America's multiculturalism in comparison to other countries and the fact that American English is more valid in academic writing than other English dialects, the articles analyzed were limited to American universities.

Assumptions of the Study

The academic articles analyzed were chosen at random from American universities, and the writers' native language was assumed to be English. As a consequence, it was presumed that the authors of articles were native English speakers. Second, since this formal publication date was considered in this study, the article's writing and completion dates were assumed to be between the years 2016 and 2020. There are several scientific studies, theories, and methods concerning corpus linguistics and

related topics. The theoretical foundation for this study was derived from the gender studies and corpus literature.

Definition of Key Terms

Corpus linguistics (CL): A branch of linguistics approach that is centered on the use of computerized collections of naturally occurring texts (Granger, 2002).

Gender: Gender refers to the behavioral, cultural, and psychological characteristics that are usually identified with a particular sex (Merriam-Webster, n.d.).

Interdisciplinary : Involving two or more academic disciplines (Collins Dictionary, n.d.).

Personal pronouns : A personal pronoun is a pronoun such as 'I', 'you', 'she', or 'we' that is used to refer to the speaker or the person talked to, or to a person or object whose identity is already known, usually because they have been mentioned previously (Collins Dictionary, n.d.).

Corpus Linguistics

Corpus linguistics has been a branch of linguistics that gained popularity in the 1990s with the development of computers. McEnery and Wilson (1996, p. 1) stated that corpus linguistics is 'the study of language through real-life language'. The term corpus derives from the Latin word for the body; the plural form is corpora. Thus, a corpus is a body of language, or more precisely, an immense collection of commonly occurring language saved in computer files. The reason that corpora are frequently so vast is that they are intended to serve as a representative sample of a specific language variation. Hence, massive amounts of data enable us to calculate language frequencies and patterns, which provide insight into linguistic norms. Additionally, rare or unexpected instances of language use are likely to occur within immense corpora, which may not be as easily identified through introspective or analysis of smaller samples. Corpora are often built with care to ensure that they accurately represent a given language or linguistic variant. For instance, creating a corpus of spoken in Canadian English may be considered because it is difficult to gather every word spoken in Canadian English, it would be required to think carefully about how to construct a representative sample. This would include balancing the collection to include equal sample data of decoded utterances from a broad cross-section of the Canadian population — other social

characteristics may be considered, including each speaker's age, gender, profession, geographical area, level of education, and mother tongue (Baker, 2010).

A corpus is a vast collection of text that serves as a representative sample of a language or a branch or genre of a language. Teams of researchers compile corpora by selecting, categorizing, and annotating text. Following that, the data is sorted, processed, and evaluated using computer programs—typically concordance and statistical tests. Concordances are listings of instances of specific words or phrases throughout the corpus. Concordance analysis enables researchers to ascertain the settings in which a word, concept, or phrase is most frequent, to compare the frequency and use of synonyms or related concepts, and to define patterns of use using statistical tools. Corpus-based studies have been used to create dictionaries, analyze and define characteristics of language, build new theories of grammar, and create instructional materials that focus on language usage rather than linguistic theory (Stoica, 2021).

Recent advances in the field of second language educational research have been made possible by learner corpora. The term 'learner corpora' refers to collections of material produced or spoken by individuals who are not yet fluent in a language. Sylviane Granger, who is an academician at the University of Louvain in Belgium, founded the International Corpus of Learner English (ICLE) in 1990. ICLE is a collection of articles written by English students from a variety of nations and levels. Researchers can discover disparities in language use between language learners and native speakers, as well as between learners at diverse levels, by examining learner corpora such as ICLE (Shirata & Stapleton, 2007). The range of learner corpora, on the other hand, is now constrained by the sole emphasis on written material.

History of Corpus Linguistics

Though the name 'corpus linguistics' was introduced very recently, all language studies prior to modern, Chomskyian linguistics were corpus-based. Monks constructed extensive tables and indexing of phrases and sections from religious writings as early as the Middle Ages to be utilized for further examination (McEnery & Wilson, 2001). During this time period, the science of lexicography—the study of the meaning and use of words—also gained traction (Biber et al., 1998). Lexicography relied on word frequency and word relationship measures in various texts, or on early linguistic corpus studies.

Empirical language studies were employed in the eighteenth century to gain a better understanding of language acquisition and to create language references and learning resources. For instance, in 1775, a corpus was utilized to offer examples of language usage for dictionary entries, and in the nineteenth century, the Oxford English Dictionary was created using a massive collection of writings (Biber et al., 1998).

From around 1876 to 1926, corpus diary studies were the predominant approach for collecting corpus data pertaining to language acquisition. Parents who took part in research kept meticulous records of their children's outbursts. These were subsequently evaluated for normative behavior patterns, and these diary study corpora are still utilized as 'sources of normative data' today (McEnery & Wilson, 2001, p. 3).

In the early twentieth century, with the advent of field linguistics and the structuralism movement, the empirical study of language took on a more formal aspect (McEnery & Wilson, 2001). Scholars in these traditions gathered samples of spoken language and examined them using a 'bottom-up', procedural approach. Large sample and continuous studies were the most often used to study designs by field and structural linguists. Between 1927 and 1957, large sample studies drew on a large number of students and language samples to determine and define typical language knowledge and usage. Since the early 1960s, continuous studies have been popular. They collected corpus data from the same people over time and used it to define variations in language acquisition and learning behaviors (McEnery & Wilson, 2001).

Corpus-based language studies were halted in the late 1950s by the work of Noam Chomsky, a computer scientist and linguist who brought a new era of rationalistic linguistics and cast doubt on the validity of corpora-based language studies (Chomsky, 1957). Chomsky contended that all empirical samples of language—all corpora—are slanted and incomplete. They were skewed in that they prefer certain uses of language over others; for instance, unpleasant, inaccurate, and clear statements did not frequently appear in corpora (Biber et al., 1998). Additionally, corpora were insufficient because the number of possible sentence structures in a language was unlimited; no finite collection of text could ever properly represent all conceivable word combinations (McEnery & Wilson, 2001).

Therefore, corpus analysis declined in prominence during the 1950s and 1960s, but reappeared in the 1970s once powerful computing capabilities became available. Chomsky's objections against corpus linguistics were discussed during this period, and

by the early 1980s, numerous universities and academic collaborations were undergoing large-scale corpus-building efforts (Stoica, 2021).

After a protracted conflict with rationalist views, corpus language research surmounted Chomsky's obstacles and changed the newly created field of linguistics. Natural language corpora, proponents of corpus linguistics contended, provide critical insights into language acquisition processes that cannot be simply postulated. They acknowledged that corpora do not provide exhaustive accounts of language use, but believed corpus linguistics to be indispensable in research on language acquisition and language pedagogy. Additionally, corpus research began to supply empirical assistance for the rejection of strictly structuralist and rationalist grammars. These grammars viewed language use as a 'fill-in-the-slot' process in which suitable words were inserted into predefined, theoretically 'proper' sentence constructions. On the other hand, research indicated that when language users engaged in true natural speech, they depended on schemata and learned language collocations, or frequently used words (Sinclair, 1991).

The history of corpus linguistics was inextricably linked to technology, as the latter generated new modes of action. However, access to computers was not easy for many decades, owing to the fact that the computers of the period, named mainframes, were extremely massive machines that operated in a highly sophisticated manner, requiring the assistance of highly specialized specialists to operate (Assunção, & Araújo, 2019).

Difficulties associated with data collecting on mainframe computers were solved in the 1980s with the advent of personal computers, which aided in the growth of corpora and new processing tools. As a result, corpus-based language research regained prominence. A pioneering collaboration between the University of Birmingham and the Collins publishing business, with the goal of developing the first dictionary based on corpus linguistics principles, the *Cobuild English Dictionary*, also contributed to the evolving framework. This collaboration was titled the COBUILD project (Sinclair, 1987).

Studies of Corpus Linguistics

Over the last two decades, corpus-based methodologies have been favored in the analysis of a wide variety of frequently produced written registers in academia because they yield reliable and generalizable findings that contribute to the completion of the description of these registers and, in many cases, have direct pedagogical implications.

Earlier research had successfully described diversity in academic language use from a variety of viewpoints by focusing on individual lexico-grammatical aspects (Biber, 2006) or on linguistic forms depending on co-occurring grammatical features in discourse (e.g. Biber et al., 2002; Csomay, 2006). Along with comprehensive grammatical descriptions, researchers examined the lexical characteristics of university registers. For instance, Fortanet (2004) examined the use of the term 'we' in academic lectures, and Simpson-Vlach and Ellis (2010) compiled a list of academic formulas based on academic lectures. Beyond the word as the unit of analysis, other researchers developed an academic collocation list (Ackermann & Chen, 2013), Hsu (2014) classified formulaic sequences in English-medium college textbooks, and Biber and Egbert (2019) examined the benefits of including text dispersion in keyword analysis.

Gender and Language

Concerns regarding gender and language date all the way back to linguistics and feminist theory and practice. Gender had been invoked to account for a wide variety of linguistic diversity, including vocabulary creation (Jespersen, 1922), pronunciation (Coates, 1986), grammatical variance (Key, 1975), and communication style (Maltz & Borker, 1982). A consciousness of the relationship between language and women's social standing could be seen in the nineteenth-century women's movement publications (Rakow & Kramarae, 1990), feminist campaigns concerning personal names (Stannard, 1977), and feminist philosophy (de Beauvoir, 1952). The linguistic message had been that there were critical connections between gender and language; the feminist message had been that those connections were critical for comprehending and resisting sexism and patriarchy.

Even though gender and language concerns had a long history, their development as an area of study coincided with the second wave of feminism in the 1960s and 1970s. Around that time, a number of articles and books were published that addressed two issues that had previously split research in the field. The questions sought to elicit information about the nature and significance of gender bias in language and gender inequalities in language use. Lakoff (1973, p. 45) claimed in what had become a classic study that 'women's marginality and powerlessness were mirrored in both the ways men and women were expected to speak and the ways women were spoken of'. The psychologists Cheris Kramer, Barrie Thorne, and Nancy Henley wondered in one of the first overview papers, 'Do women and men utilize language differently? How do

language's structure, content, and everyday usage reflect and contribute to the formation of sexual inequality? How do we change sexist language?' (1978, p. 638). For a while, these questions set the agenda for gender and language study.

Feminist linguists established that men's authority was manifested in a variety of complicated ways in language. Spender (1980) identified one of these when she stated that in the past, when males wielded power over language, as philosophers, writers, politicians, grammarians, linguists, and lexicographers, they encoded sexism into the language in order to bolster their claims of male superiority. Spender's work emphasized a critical area for feminist action: ensuring women's participation in all elements of language and communication. Taking note of women's perspectives and distributing narratives of their experiences are critical tactics for ensuring that women are represented fairly and accurately in texts. The critical relevance of being involved in language and communication advancements was emphasized in Spender's (1995) more recent work on gender and the internet. Spender stated that women must be involved in the world wide web as users and inventors; otherwise, it would evolve to fulfill and boost men's interests at the expense of women's.

In the case of gender and language, it had proven difficult to untangle whether gender difference in voice, for example, resulted from biological and/or social differences between men and women, or whether specific voice characteristics such as pitch were 'performed' in order to enact the appropriate gender identity. A critical question was which arises first: were speech styles expressions of an existing identity or were they the result of a speech style being used (Cameron, 1997)?

Kitzinger (1994) remarked that gender essentialism was a tenet of disputes regarding gender differences. At the risk of oversimplifying, gender essentialism could manifest itself in one of two ways. Biological essentialism was the notion that the major reasons for gender are 'natural' processes (e.g. genetic, anatomical, or physical). The second version of essentialism attributed the development of gender to more 'social' processes (e.g. learning, modeling). Within the context of gender and language, it had been assumed that gender variations in verbal skills and voice were biological, whereas gender disparities in the speech were the product of distinct socialization techniques for males and females. Beyond gender, variation in verbal ability, voice, and speech had generally been neglected due to factors such as sexual orientation, socioeconomic background, or ethnicity (Livia & Hall, 1997).

Bem (1993) claimed that the concept of andro-centrism was necessary to understand how females' and males' experiences were perceived as a neutral standard or norm. In comparison, female experiences were defined as deviant and so decient. The androcentric rule referred to a comparable trend discovered in the gender and language fields. Whereas men would be seen to behave linguistically in ways that conform to the writer's idea of what is good or admirable, women would be blamed for any linguistic state or development deemed undesirable or despicable by the writer (Coates, 1986, p. 15).

Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) analyzed the amount of research on the gender difference in verbal skills that had accumulated to that point as part of a now-classic assessment of the psychology of gender. Even at the time, the presumption of female dominance on verbal tasks was highly qualified: Female superiority on verbal tasks had been one of the more solidly proven generalizations in the field of gender differences. While it was true that if a gender difference was discovered, the two genders performed quite equally on a variety of verbal tasks across a variety of sample populations (Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974, p. 75).

Language was viewed as a locus of both expression and reflection of identity. Social identity and accommodation theories both made the notion that identity had a pre-existing language. The difficulties with this method in the field of gender and language were as follows: the heterogeneity of females and males; the fact that only a few elements of language directly and solely index (gender) identity; and the assumption of gender identity's relevance and causality for speech (Weatherall, 2002).

Sociolinguistic research had explored the relationship between gender identification and language diversity, examining how broad social factors such as gender tend to correlate with linguistic variety. Feminists had criticized this work's inclination to treat gender as stable, coherent social groups with a monolithic and universal influence on language. As an alternative, the framework of the community of practices had been proposed, in which local social practices managed the relationship between language and gender, the community of practice approach overlooked the broader ideological forces that shaped the activities that defined gender in a local community (Weatherall, 2002).

Wetherell (1998) advocated a type of discursive psychology that combined the sense of practice associated with the conversation analytic approach, the sense associated with the community of practice framework, and the sense associated with post-structural

theories of discourse. One of the strengths of this discursive approach was that it took into account the influence of larger discourses and local practices on the formation of gender identity.

Studies of Gender

Numerous research on gender representation in English language textbooks (e.g., gender bias or stereotypes) had been published in recent years. Lee (2018) reported on the representation of gender in the written texts of four EFL textbook series oriented for Japanese high school students that were published in 2011. The findings indicated that the authors of the textbooks were conscious of minimizing gender difference by adopting a neutral title for women (i.e. Ms.) and gender-inclusive language to refer to persons in general or of unknown gender (e.g. police or police officer instead of policeman). However, males were frequently mentioned first in textbooks, and gender inequity still prevailed in favor of women. Lee's (2019) other study examined the Japanese government's efforts to promote gender equality using a corpus of texts culled from three senior high school EFL textbooks published in 2017. Additionally, the empirical evidence suggested that the authors were aware of gender-neutral linguistic options. For instance, the authors used gender-neutral profession-specific terms (e.g., firefighter rather than fireman), gender-inclusive paired pronouns (e.g., he/she and Mr./Ms.), and the neutral title for females (i.e. Ms.). Nonetheless, males continued to outnumber females in social roles and the assumption that males were more active.

Apart from the past research, Lee and Mahmoudi-Gahrouei (2020) examined verbal and visual texts in modern Iranian EFL textbooks using a combination of computational and manual analysis. Furthermore, they examined Iranian instructors' perceptions of gender issues in chosen textbooks. The results demonstrated that, despite the inclusion of gender-neutral vocabulary, males were still depicted more prominently in visual representation than females. Although females were typically given domestic responsibilities, males were assigned professional jobs. Through discussions with teacher participants, it was suggested that textbooks be revised to allow learners to recognize gender equality in the educational sphere.

Dahmardeh and Kim (2020) conducted another discourse study in which they used qualitative content analysis to investigate four new local Iranian coursebooks. Males dominated females in both lexical and visual illustrations. Males were similarly assigned to career-oriented actors or agents. Mengistie and Worku (2021) observed

similar findings after conducting a quantitative content analysis on an Ethiopian EFL textbook used by 8th graders. Females were underrepresented in visual illustrations, gender-related language use, and skilled employment, according to previous empirical data. Additionally, male characters were portrayed as more aggressive initiators of discourse than their female counterparts.

Academic Writing

Academic writing, in the broadest sense, was used to communicate scientific knowledge. It was typically written for scholars and other knowledgeable readers familiar with that field of study. The most rigorous academic writing was seen in scientific publications and doctorate dissertations, where experts communicated their research findings with other scholars, resulting in advancements in knowledge across multiple fields. What all types of academic writing had in common was that ideas took center stage, people took a back seat, and the writer's personal feelings were irrelevant to the presenting of ideas or insights. Everything the reader required should be stated plainly in the text; arguments were accepted or denied on the basis of their logic or proof, not on the basis of who made them. Academic writers were expected to analyze empirical data (which might be compiled in a variety of different ways and from a variety of different sources depending on the subject), formulate a dissertation or claimed—and supported it with proof. The fundamental expectations of academic writing readers had remained constant over the decades (Monippally & Pawar, 2010).

Authorial Identity in Academic Writing

The discourse roles of first-person pronouns had been a significant area of study. The emphasis had been on the authorial identities that these discourses may project. As Hyland (2001, 2002a) and Tang and John (1999) demonstrated, academic writers employed self-mentions, such as first-person pronouns and self-citations, to position themselves as trustworthy and competent members of their academic community. This process resulted in the development of a distinct self or persona, which aided in the construction of compelling writing and the acquisition of reader credibility. However, in academic writing, first-person pronouns did not constitute a 'homogenous entity' but rather assisted in projecting a variety of roles or identities with various levels of authorial presence (Tang & John, 1999).

Ivanic' had extensively discussed the ways in which writers represented themselves and were represented by their rhetorical choices Ivanic' argued that writers' identities were constructed within the 'possibilities for self-hood' available in the sociocultural contexts of writing. According to Ivanic', three facets of identity interacted throughout writing: the 'autobiographical self' which was influenced by the writer's personal history; the 'discoursal self' which was the portrait or 'voice' the writer tasks in a text; and the 'authorial self' which was represented in the extent to which a writer infringed into a text and took responsibility for its content (Ivanic', 1998; Ivanic' & Weldon, 1999).

Writing is one method of assuming a subject position. Social, cultural, and institutional possibilities for self-hood influence all three facets of actual writers' identities. The 'autobiographical self' of a writer emerged in the setting of socially circumscribed access to self-hood possibilities. This implied that individuals would identify differently with various subject perspectives depending on their social group membership. Writers developed a 'discourse self', not from an endless number of alternatives, but from the self-hood possibilities supported by the sociocultural and institutional framework in which they wrote. The constraints and opportunities available to a specific writer interacted with the constraints and opportunities for self-hood made available by a particular writing occasion. Possibilities for self-hood also socially built the self as an author: there were rules for establishing an authorial presence that varied according to the style of writing and social setting. These traditions had an effect on whether and how genuine writers proved their authorship in their work (Ivanic', 1998).

First-person Pronouns in Academic Writing

Self-mention refers to the writer's explicit use of first-person pronouns and possessive adjectives to deliver information and judgements (Hyland, 2001). While writers cannot avoid reflecting an image of themselves in their texts (e.g. Ivanic, 1998; Hyland, 2012), self-mention anchors authors' arguments and demonstrates their relationship to their discipline and readers. The presence or lack of explicit author reference is a deliberate choice by writers to adopt a certain attitude and disciplinary-situated authorial persona; as such, it is a dialogic element that tries to increase reader familiarity or distance.

The first person gives the reader a strong indicator that this is a personal perspective that sets the writer's work apart from others. 69% of all instances occurred in

publications in the humanities and social sciences, with an average of 38 per article, compared to only 17 in science and engineering. Soft-field writings were more interpretative and less abstract than those in the sciences, resulting in discourses that frequently redefine knowledge as sympathetic understanding, so promoting reader tolerance through an ethical rather than cognitive progression (Dillon, 1991). Due to the fact that researchers work with human subjects, they have less control over variables and frequently more diverse outcomes, which means that authors cannot take as much for granted. They must clarify points and try more to establish their credibility and build rapport with readers.

Thus, the first-person pronouns enable writers in the humanities and social sciences to firmly connect with a specific argument and to get credit for a unique perspective. Personal credibility, or the ability to stand behind arguments, is critical for developing a persuasive discourse because it contributes to the development of an erudite, reliable, and engaging colleague by presenting an authorial self that demonstrates an appropriate level of confidence and authority (Soler-Monreal & Gil Salom, 2014).

In contrast, in the hard sciences, it is common for writers to minimize their personal contributions in order to emphasize the phenomena being studied, the reproducibility of research activities, and the generalizability of the findings, effectively subordinating their own voice to that of unmediated nature. This method quietly transmits an empiricist mindset, implying that research outcomes would be identical regardless of who conducted them because knowledge is acquired through relatively steady cumulative growth (Becher & Trowler, 2001), and research frequently requires significant investments in finances, training, supplies, and expertise, it is constantly concentrated at a few sites and engage scientists in long-term involvement in specific research areas. As a result, research arises within a well-established context, in which readers are frequently familiar with past texts and studies, and in which the uniqueness and significance of contributions are readily apparent. Writers are more concerned with documented findings than with individuals, and with bolstering the objectivity of their interpretations, employing a variety of rhetorical devices to conceal their visibility in the process, not the least of which are passive, third singular pronoun 'it' subjects and ascribes agency to abstract participants.

Studies of Personal Pronouns

Numerous studies revealed how skilled academic writers employed first-person pronouns to increase the persuasiveness of their writing. For example, Hyland (2002b) interviewed expert authors, as well as his analysis of 240 journal papers (including eight fields), indicating that many experts employed first-person pronouns to "create a sense of confidence and authority" (p. 353).

When Harwood (2005a) studied published journals from four disciplines (Business and Management, Computing Science, Economics, and Physics), he discovered that writers utilized 'I' and 'we' to emphasize the importance of their work, express ideas, disclose research techniques, declare the text's structure, and develop connection with readers. Certain of these functions entailed a larger degree of danger than others. By asserting their thoughts, for example, authors exposed themselves to criticism if their ideas were later revealed to be incorrect, but they also displayed their authority to make assertions.

Harwood (2007) requested political scientists to discuss first-person pronouns in their works and in the articles of other researchers interviewed. Seven reasons for employing the first person were identified by political scientists. The interviewees' comments emphasized the importance these writers placed on first-person pronouns in "ensuring their work is maximum convincing". Moreover, Pho (2008) discovered the rhetorical motions of abstracts, their language realizations, and the authorial positions associated with various abstract moves (self-referential terms such as "I, we, my, our, the author, the research"). Furthermore, Samraj (2014) explored first-person pronouns in abstracts that serve as the subject of sentences from a move theory perspective.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1. Introduction

The primary objective of this descriptive and quantitative corpus-based research was to evaluate the first-person pronouns in academic articles written by the female and the male English language speakers in the interdisciplinary departments; such as Sociology, Anthropology, Psychology, and Philosophy at universities in the United States of America. The study did not examine whether or not the first-person pronouns 'I' and 'We' were used linguistically or correctly in the specified sections of academic articles, however, it highlighted any possible differences in the frequency, overuse, and underuse of the first-person pronouns used by the female and the male English language speakers affiliated with universities in the United States of America and shed light on their usage. Additionally, the first-person pronouns, the sections of the articles, and the departments were not separately evaluated. In other words, the aforementioned components were evaluated in their entirety. Additionally, another premise for this study was to examine the disparities between each year from 2016 to 2020 on an individual basis.

2.2. Research Questions

This study aims to find answers to the following research questions:

1. Are there any statistically significant differences in the use of the first-person pronouns in the academic articles regarding genders at the interdisciplinary departments between the years 2016 – 2020?

2. Are there any statistically significant differences in the use of the first-person pronouns in the academic articles regarding genders at the interdisciplinary departments
   a) in the year 2016?
   b) in the year 2017?
   c) in the year 2018?
   d) in the year 2019?
   e) in the year 2020?

2.3. Research Design

The purpose of this study was to determine the frequency of the first-person pronouns 'I' and 'We' in academic articles written by the male writers of English (MWs) and the female writers of English (FWs) in interdisciplinary departments. Male and female corpora were compared in two ways: overuse and underuse. A descriptive analysis was conducted to ascertain the similarities and variations in the frequency calculations observed in the study. Corpus-based analysis is a useful method for describing the presentation of linguistic elements in academic literature. To obtain more authentic and actual results, this study investigated the academic output created by the male and the female writers between 2016 and 2020 utilizing a descriptive and quantitative method in a corpus-based study. Another basis of this study was to evaluate the data related to the mentioned years separately.

2.4. Procedure

The procedure began with a random pick of the written papers published. Academic publications were chosen as a source of information since they contain sufficient definitive and descriptive statements and data. The selection of texts for the comparison corpus was driven by the following principles: samples of academic publications authored by males and females between 2016 and 2020. These selected interdisciplinary academic articles were published by the universities in the United States of America. These articles were chosen from the departments related to the soft disciplines due to the fact that the usage of first-personal pronouns was allowed to be mostly used in the randomly selected articles of the journals, including the reflective language and mindset, and the choice of the vocabulary of the writers. The articles were uploaded from the EBSCOhost and ProQuest data bases.

Between 2016 and 2020, random samples of 100 academic articles from the universities in the United States of America were analyzed. These articles were written by 50 male and 50 female authors. The current study analyzed the first-person pronouns 'I' and 'We' in between the female and the male writers. That is, this study used a computer-assisted corpus-based methodology. To begin, academic articles were in PDF format, but they were converted to plain text using Microsoft Word documents to be uploaded to The Key Word in Context (KWIC). This tool was used to examine the first-person pronouns 'I' and 'We' in this study. Additionally, the frequency of first-

person pronouns in 1,000 words was identified. The data analyzed in this study were limited to two distinct first-person pronouns, 'I' and 'We', which were shown in order of frequency, and the years 2016-2020 individually.

2.5. Instruments

Quantitative analysis methods enable academics to collect sufficient language data. As a result, the data were evaluated using the Key Word In Context (KWIC) Concordance Program and the Log-likelihood (LL) calculator. The log-likelihood calculator is a web-based application that allows researchers to calculate log-likelihood (LL) values. Corpus researchers are expected to utilize them to determine whether or not the results are significant (Kennedy & Miceli 2010). The LL test takes into account word frequencies weighted across two distinct corpora. It detects frequencies that are greater or lower than predicted. The G2 score or LL is the log-likelihood value, which is equivalent to the p value in Pearson's Chi-square (McEnery, Xiao & Tonio, 2006). As with Pearson's Chi-square, LL compares two data sets' measured and projected values. The observed values are the extracted frequencies from corpora. These are the frequencies that one would expect if there was no other reason for the values to change. The larger the discrepancy between observed and expected values, the less likely it is that the discrepancy occurred randomly. According to Friginal and Hardy (2014), when compared to other features or across groups, the frequency of a linguistic feature is significant. Normalized frequency should be explained in terms of making these analyses. The relative frequency of a construct can be calculated by calculating its frequency per x amount of words. The researcher may choose to quantify the number of incidents per 100; 1,000; 10,000; or 1,000,000 words, depending on the item under inquiry and the conventions in the literature. This is referred to as normalization. Not only does normalization enable academics to compare linguistic elements, but it also enables them to compare texts and corpora of varying lengths. The analysis of the current study was calculated per 1,000 words in order to make comparisons of texts of diverse lengths possible that might give a clearer view of possible differences in total first-person pronouns frequency in each corpus regarding gender (Liu, Fang, & Wei, 2014). Along with frequency analysis, log-likelihood (LL) calculations were performed to determine overuse, defined as a higher frequency of recurrence, and underuse, defined as a lower frequency of occurrence, for the investigated data. Most tests, such as

chi-square, to calculate statistical significance are unreliable, when the estimated relative frequency is lower than 5, except for LL tests (Rayson & Garside, 2000, cited in Buysse, 2011).

The Key Word in Context (KWIC) Concordance serves as a concordance, collocation tables, and word lists for corpus investigations employing plain text files. The KWIC Concordance tool was used to generate wordlists for the purpose of analyzing the frequency of first-person pronouns in this study. According to Rayson et al. (1997), the simplest and most generally used tool for corpus-based research is a concordance software.

2.6. Data Analysis

The data analysis stages involved extracting the three sections (abstract, methodology, and conclusion) of academic publications and excluding the other sections from the data. The extracted sections were saved as text files. The data was then imported into the "KWIC Concordance" program. Additionally, the "log-likelihood (LL)" computation was applied to conduct a statistical analysis of overuse and underuse. The research questions were assessed using the tables and statistical figures that were developed. This study examined the differences between the years 2016-2020 in terms of the first-person pronouns 'I' and 'We' regarding the female and the male writers of English.

3. FINDINGS

Introduction

This chapter presents the findings from an analysis of two corpora: i) academic articles in the interdisciplinary departments written by female writers (FWs) of English language; and ii) academic articles in the interdisciplinary departments written by female writers (MWs) of English language. The purpose of this study is to examine the first-person pronouns 'I' and 'We' that FWs and MWs of English used in their academic articles between 2016 and 2020. In this regard, a total of 100 academic articles (50 written by FWs and 50 written by MWs) were assessed to determine the frequency, overuse and underuse of the first-person pronouns. The study employed a descriptive research approach and quantitative analysis of the data to determine the frequency of the first-person pronouns used in the abstract, methodology, and conclusion sections of the academic articles. The data from the academic articles' relevant sections were examined using Key Word in Context (KWIC) and log-likelihood (LL) calculator. Lastly, the findings were tabulated.

Results and Analysis

The data were evaluated to determine the frequency of the first-person pronouns and to highlight the distinction of the usage of the first-person pronouns regarding genders. The first-person pronouns in this study were assessed on the basis of their frequency of occurrence per 1,000 words, which may imply a more explicit assessment of any disparities in each group's total frequency of the first-person pronouns. The overall frequency and LL analysis of the academic articles between 2016 and 2020 regarding genders are shown in Table 1.

The Overall Frequency and LL Analysis of the First-Person Pronouns in Academic Articles Written by the FWs of English and the MWs of English between the Years 2016 – 2020

Table 1 indicated the frequency of which first-person pronouns were used in academic articles (100) written by the female writers (FWs) of English (50) and the male writers (MWs) of English (50) in interdisciplinary departments between the years 2016 and 2020. Additionally, the log-likelihood (LL) value was evaluated to determine whether overuse or underuse occurred.

Table 1.

The Overall Frequency and LL Analysis of the First-Person Pronouns in Academic Articles Written by the FWs of English and the MWs of English between the Years 2016 - 2020

	FWs	MWs	LL Value
Corpus size	336,902	423,891	
First-person prons.	2116	2153	
n per 1,000	6	5	**+48.00***
frequency (%)	0.06	0.05	

n= raw frequency of the first-person pronouns
Frequency= percentage of the first-person pronouns in total of words in groups
+ indicated overuse of the first-person pronouns in FWs of English relative to MWs of English
- indicated underuse of the first-person pronouns in FWs of English relative to MWs of English

As demonstrated in Table 1, the corpus size of academic articles written by FWs of English (336,902) was much lower than the corpus size of academic articles written by MWs of English (423,891) between the years 2016 and 2020. Hence, the FWs of English used first-person pronouns 2116 times in academic articles, while the MWs used them 2153 times, inferring that the FWs of English used first-person pronouns less frequently than the MWs of English. The frequency of first-person pronouns in academic articles authored by the FWs of English and the MWs of English was calculated by summing the total number of the first-person pronouns used per 1,000 words for each gender. Conversely, the FWs of English (6) used slightly more first-person pronouns per 1,000 words in their academic articles than the MWs of English (5). Both groups employed a slightly different frequency of first-person pronouns in academic articles (FWs=0.06; MWs=0.05), according to the overall frequency statistics. In addition to frequency analysis, LL calculations were performed to identify the difference in frequency between the FWs of English and the MWs of English, as well as the relevance of overuse or underuse of first-person pronouns. In comparison to the MWs of English, the LL value for the FWs of English indicated a moderate level of overuse of +48.00, which was statistically significant. In the next section, Table 2, frequency and LL analysis of the first-person pronouns in academic articles written by the FWs of English and the MWs of English in the year 2016 were presented.

Frequency and LL Analysis of the First-Person Pronouns in Academic Articles Written by the FWs of English and the MWs of English in the Year 2016

The frequency analysis and log-likelihood (LL) calculation of the first-person pronouns in the randomly selected academic articles (20) authored by female writers (FWs) of English (10) and male writers (MWs) of English (10) at the interdisciplinary departments in 2016 were compared. Table 2 presents the findings.

Table 2.

Frequency and LL Analysis of the First-Person Pronouns in Academic Articles Written by the FWs of English and the MWs of English in the Year 2016

	FWs	MWs	LL Value
Corpus size	64,979	62,740	
First-person prons.	483	301	
n per 1,000	7	5	**+36.50***
frequency (%)	0.07	0.05	

n= raw frequency of the first-person pronouns
Frequency= percentage of the first-person pronouns in total of words in groups
+ indicated overuse of the first-person pronouns in FWs of English relative to MWs of English
- indicated underuse of the first-person pronouns in FWs of English relative to MWs of English

In Table 2, the corpus sizes of the academic articles of the female writers (FWs) in English (64,979) and the male writers (MWs) in English (62,740) were quite similar. The female writers of English (483) used more first-person pronouns than the male writers of English (301) in their academic articles in the year 2016. Additionally, there was a slightly substantial distinction between the frequency of FWs in English (7) and that of MWs in English (5) in terms of words per 1,000. Similarly, when the frequency findings per 100 words were analyzed, it was found that the difference in the first-person pronouns usage between FWs in English (0.07) and MWs in English (0.05) revealed moderate difference in every 100 words in their academic articles. The log-likelihood (LL) calculation was applied to determine the difference in frequency between the FWs and MWs of English, as well as the significant values of overuse or underuse in terms of genders. With an LL value of +36.50, the LL frequency indicated an overuse in academic articles of the FWs in English relative to MWs of English, and the LL value was statistically significant.

Example 1

[In the following sections **I** present physicians' awareness of the cultural context of healthcare provision.]

<div align="right">Extracted from <FW1></div>

[From these examples, **we** see how parents are working with and for their children to establish everyday life skills that will be essential in the future.]

<div align="right">Extracted from <FW2></div>

As a result of the overuse of the first-person pronouns in the female writers' (FWs) articles, two examples were extracted from the female writers' writings which showed the use of the first-person pronouns 'I' and 'We'. Table 3 indicated the results belonging to the articles written by the FWs of English and the MWs of English in 2017.

Frequency and LL Analysis of the First-Person Pronouns in Academic Articles Written by the FWs of English and the MWs of English in the Year 2017

The log-likelihood (LL) calculation and frequency analysis of first-person pronouns in indiscriminately selected academic articles (20) authored by female writers (FWs) of English (10) and male writers (MWs) of English (10) in 2017 at interdisciplinary departments were presented in Table 3.

Table 3.

Frequency and LL Analysis of the First-Person Pronouns in Academic Articles Written by the FWs of English and the MWs of English in the Year 2017

	FWs	MWs	LL Value
Corpus size	67,258	86,650	
First-person prons.	490	230	
n per 1,000	7	3	**+173.43***
frequency (%)	0.07	0.03	

n= raw frequency of the first-person pronouns
Frequency= percentage of the first-person pronouns in total of words in groups
+ indicated overuse of the first-person pronouns in FWs of English relative to MWs of English
- indicated underuse of the first-person pronouns in FWs of English relative to MWs of English

As shown in Table 3, despite the fact that the corpus size of academic articles written by the female writers (FWs) of English (67,258) was smaller than those written by the male writers (MWs) of English (86,650), the first-person pronouns were used nearly twice as frequently in academic articles written by the female writers of English (490) than in academic articles written by the male writers of English (230) in 2017. There was also a noticeable difference between the frequency of the first-person pronouns used by FWs in English (7) and that of MWs in English (3) in every 1,000 words. Furthermore, it was observed that the difference in the employment of the first-person pronouns between FWs in English (0.07) and MWs in English (0.03) in their academic articles showed noticeable difference in every 100 words of their respective academic articles. This study used the log-likelihood (LL) calculation to examine the differences in frequency between the FWs and MWs of the English language, along with any statistically significant differences between the genders in overuse or underuse. Including an LL value of +173.43, the LL frequency revealed an overuse in academic articles of the FWs in English compared to the MWs in English, and the LL value was statistically significant.

Example 2

[In this comment paper, **I** assert that this text is a fine addition to any graduate-level course on the sociology of religion, and **I** discuss three different threads of discussion that masters and doctoral students could explore in class.]

Extracted from

<FW16>

[Here, **we** expect coverage of Muslim countries to focus predominately on "women's rights and gender equality," regardless of these countries' records with regards to women's rights.]

Extracted from <FW20>

The extraction above presented the examples of the first-person pronouns utilized by the female writers (FWs) of English in 2017 due to the their highest level of overuse. Next part demonstrated the outcomes of the articles searched in terms of the first-person pronouns employed by the FWs and the MWs in their articles in 2018.

Frequency and LL Analysis of the First-Person Pronouns in Academic Articles Written by the FWs of English and the MWs of English in the Year 2018

The frequency of the first-person pronouns in 20 academic articles of the female writers (FWs) of English (10) and the male writers (MWs) of English (10) written at interdisciplinary departments in 2018 was determined based on gender in Table 4. Additionally, the log-likelihood (LL) value was calculated to determine whether there was overuse or underuse and a statistically significant.

Table 4

Frequency and LL Analysis of the First-Person Pronouns in Academic Articles Written by the FWs of English and the MWs of English in the Year 2018

	FWs	MWs	LL Value
Corpus size	61,055	75,845	
First-person prons.	314	382	
n per 1,000	5	5	**+0.08***
frequency (%)	0.05	0.05	

n= raw frequency of the first-person pronouns
Frequency= percentage of the first-person pronouns in total of words in groups
+ indicated overuse of the first-person pronouns in FWs of English relative to MWs of English
- indicated underuse of the first-person pronouns in FWs of English relative to MWs of English

As illustrated in Table 4, since the corpus size of academic articles written by female writers (FWs) of English (61,055) was lower than the corpus size of academic articles written by male writers (MWs) of English (75,845) in 2018, the first-person pronouns were used less frequently in academic articles written by female writers of English (314) than in academic articles written by male writers of English (382). However, there was an equivalence in terms of words per 1,000 between the frequency of the first-person pronouns used by FWs (5) and MWs (5) in English. Moreover, the same level of equality in the use of first-person pronouns was identified between FWs in English (0.05) and MWs in English (0.05) in terms of per 100 words of their respective academic articles. The log-likelihood (LL) calculation was used to determine the frequency differences between the FWs and MWs of the English language, as well as any statistically significant disparities in overuse or underuse between genders. With an LL value of +0.08, the LL frequency demonstrated a statistically significant overuse in academic articles of FWs in comparison to MWs in English.

Example 3

[In developing this argument, **I** build on traditions from both economic and urban sociology.]

<div align="right">Extracted from < MW21></div>

[**We** can observe that 1286 abstracts published in American journals and only 264 abstracts published in British journals are highly loaded on terms associated with methods.]

<div align="right">Extracted from <MW28></div>

Due to the equality in frequency of the first-person pronouns in academic articles written by the female writers (FWs) of English and the male writers (MWs) of English in 2018, the examples above were extracted from the male writers' articles which visualized the first-person pronouns 'I' and 'We'. Next section represented the year 2019's findings.

Frequency and LL Analysis of the First-Person Pronouns in Academic Articles Written by the FWs of English and the MWs of English in the Year 2019

Table 5 indicated the frequency of the first-person pronouns in academic articles (20) written by female writers (FWs) of English (10) and male writers (MWs) of English (10) in interdisciplinary departments in 2019. Moreover, the log-likelihood (LL) value was evaluated to identify any overuse or underuse including the statistical significance.

Table 5.

Frequency and LL Analysis of the First-Person Pronouns in Academic Articles Written by the FWs of English and the MWs of English in the Year 2019

	FWs	MWs	LL Value
Corpus size	78,093	100,859	
First-person prons.	485	552	
n per 1,000	6	5	**+4.11***
frequency (%)	0.06	0.05	

n= raw frequency of the first-person pronouns
Frequency= percentage of the first-person pronouns in total of words in groups
+ indicated overuse of the first-person pronouns in FWs of English relative to MWs of English
- indicated underuse of the first-person pronouns in FWs of English relative to MWs of English

The corpus size of academic articles written by female writers (FWs) in English (78,093) was fewer than the corpus size of academic articles authored by the male writers (MWs) in English (100,859) in Table 5. Similarly, the number of the first-person pronouns was used less frequently in academic articles of the female writers in English (485) than those in academic articles written by the male writers in English (552). On the contrary, the frequency of first-person pronouns used by FWs in English (6) was lightly greater than that of MWs in English (5) on frequency per 1000 words. Subsequently, there was a similar level of variation in the usage of first-person pronouns of the FWs in English (0.06) and of the MWs in English (0.05) in every 100 words of their academic articles. The log-likelihood (LL) calculation was applied both to calculate the frequency discrepancies between the FWs in English and the MWs in English, and also to report any statistically significant differences in overuse or underuse between genders. The LL frequency indicated a statistically significant overuse of FWs in academic articles in comparison to MWs in English, with a value of +36.50.

Example 4

[First, **I** provide a short sociohistorical overview of how Asian American pan-ethnicity became an important political instrument.]

Extracted from <FW35>

[To understand this **we** should first note that postcolonial theory has had a complex relationship to colonialism.]

Extracted from <MW34>

Owing to the fact that there was a very slight difference in use of the first-person pronouns between the FWs of English and the MWs of English in 2019, the first example was taken from the female writer's article and the second example was extracted from the male writer's article to display the use of the first-person pronouns 'I' and 'We'. The results for the year 2020 was given in Table 6.

Frequency and LL Analysis of the First-Person Pronouns in Academic Articles Written by the FWs of English and the MWs of English in the Year 2020

The frequency of the first-person pronouns used in 20 academic articles authored by the female writers (FWs) of English (10) and the male writers (MWs) of English (10) in interdisciplinary departments in 2020 is given in Table 6. Besides that, the log-likelihood (LL) value was analyzed to detect whether there was any overuse or underuse and a statistical significance.

Table 6.

Frequency and LL Analysis of the First-Person Pronouns in Academic Articles Written by the FWs of English and the MWs of English in the Year 2020

	FWs	MWs	LL Value
Corpus size	65,517	97,797	
First-person prons.	344	688	
n per 1,000	5	7	**-20.22***
frequency (%)	0.05	0.07	

n= raw frequency of the first-person pronouns
Frequency= percentage of the first-person pronouns in total of words in groups
+ indicated overuse of the first-person pronouns in FWs of English relative to MWs of English
- indicated underuse of the first-person pronouns in FWs of English relative to MWs of English

As shown in Table 6, the corpus size of academic articles written by FWs of English (65,517) was lesser than the corpus size of academic articles written by MWs of English (97,797). As an outcome, the FWs of English used first-person pronouns 344 times in academic articles whereas the MWs of English used the first-person pronouns 688 times, implying that the FWs of English used the first-person pronouns less than the MWs of English. The frequency of first-person pronouns in academic articles written by the FWs and MWs of English was determined by the total number of first-person pronouns used per 1,000 words for each gender. However, the FWs of English (5) used fewer first-person pronouns per 1,000 words than the MWs of English (7) in their academic articles. According to the frequency results, both groups used a slightly different proportion of first-person pronouns in academic articles (FWs=0.05; MWs=0.07). To ascertain the difference in frequency between the FWs and MWs of English, as well as the significance of overuse or underuse of first-person pronouns, LL calculation was employed in addition to frequency analysis. When

compared to the MWs of English, the LL value of the FWs of English demonstrated underuse of -20.22, which was statistically significant.

Example 5

[**I** argue that it is critical that **we** also situate racialization and racism within the ongoing unfolding of capitalism and to examine the ways in which imperial states and colonies are racialized.]

Extracted from<FW50>

[In this article, **I** recommend a restructuring of civilian payouts for police misconduct from taxpayer money to police department insurances.]

Extracted from<MW50>

Unlike the previous years' findings, there was underuse of the first-person pronouns in academic articles written by the female writers (FWs) of English compared to the male writers (MWs). Hence, two sample sentences given above were extracted from the FWs and the MWs to illustrate the first-person pronouns 'I' and 'We'. Table 7 presented the Log-likelihood (LL) values between 2016 and 2020.

Log-likelihood (LL) Values of the First-Person Pronouns in Academic Articles Written by the FWs of English and the MWs of English in the Years 2016 - 2020

Table 7 demonstrated the log-likelihood (LL) values for the first-person pronouns in randomly selected academic articles (100) written between 2016 and 2020 by FWs and MWs of English. Additionally, overuse and underuse detections were determined based on LL values. Furthermore, statistical significance was reported.

Table 7.

Log-likelihood (LL) Values of the First-Person Pronouns in Academic Articles Written by the FWs of English and the MWs of English in the Years 2016 - 2020

Years	LL Values	Overused\Underused
2016	+36.50	Overused
2017	+173.43	Overused
2018	+0.08	Overused
2019	+4.11	Overused
2020	-20.22	Underused

+ indicated overuse of the first-person pronouns in FWs of English relative to MWs of English
- indicated underuse of the first-person pronouns in FWs of English relative to MWs of English

As illustrated in Table 7, the year with the highest LL frequency was 2017 with LL value of +173.43 which indicated statistically significant overuse of the first-person pronouns by the FWs in academic articles in comparison to the MWs in English. On the contrary, the year 2018 presented the lowest LL frequency with LL value of +0.08 which showed a minor overuse of the first-person pronouns by the FWs in academic articles relative to the MWs in English. In 2019, the second lowest LL frequency was detected with LL value of +4.11 which described statistically significant overuse of the FWs of English compared to the MWs of English. While the year 2017 possessed the highest LL frequency between the years 2016 and 2020, a marginal difference was detected in the previous year. In other words, a LL value of +36.50 was indicated in 2016 as the second highest LL frequency among the years listed in Table 7 which also signified an overuse of the first-person pronouns by the FWs of English relative to the MWs of English and it was statistically significant.

Unlike all overuses in the years between 2016-2019, LL frequency of the first-person pronouns in 2020 revealed an underuse with LL value of -20.22. Consequently, when examining Table 7, it was obviously seen that this table stands out the unpredictability of the LL frequency disparities. Moreover, whereas overuse of the first-person pronouns by FWs of English compared to MWs of English between the years 2016 and 2019 was reported, underuse of the first-person pronouns was indicated in 2020.

4. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Introduction

The main aim of this descriptive and quantitative corpus-based study was to assess first-person pronouns in academic articles written by the female writers (FWs) of English and the male writers (MWs) of English in interdisciplinary departments in the United States of America. The study did not examine whether or not the first-person pronouns 'I' and 'We' were used correctly or linguistically in the specified sections of academic articles; however, it brought to light any potential differences in the frequency, overuse, and underuse of first-person pronouns used by FWs of English and MWs of English. The first-person pronouns, articles' sections, namely abstract, methodology and conclusion, and interdisciplinary departments were assessed holistically. Moreover, another essence of this study was to determine the discrepancies between individual years from 2016 through 2020. This chapter was created to give the findings of the research questions regarding the use of first-person pronouns written by the FWs and the MWs of English in terms of years. Moreover, the interpretation of the results was presented. To begin, this chapter summarized the overall findings throughout the years. Secondly, the disparities between genders by each year were interpreted in terms of the statistical significance of the first-person pronouns' frequency and gave comparable studies conducted in previous years. Thirdly, the possible reasons were implied depending on each year's result. Lastly, this study discussed the suggestions for further studies.

Discussion and Conclusion

The recent literature on the usage of first person pronouns in academic articles demonstrated that they existed in academic writings and highlighted them as a valuable strategic tool for the building of an authoritative self through the accomplishment of multiple roles (Ivanic' & Camps, 2001; Hyland, 2001). Many authors demonstrated in academic articles that using first-person pronouns played a critical part in the development of the writer's persona. According to Kuo (1999), the intentional use of personal pronouns enabled the authors to emphasize their personal commitment to the area and good communication skills for it. The reader was given a clear prediction of the standpoint from which their comments could be taken when a personal reference was used. As a result, self-mention was frequently perceived in a positive light in the

literature. The introduction of a new approach to language studies relying on databases of writings, or corpora, evolved language teaching and learning. Allowing for the development of computer systems in the last few years, corpus analysis, as this area was called, altered our understanding of what language was and how it was utilized. The purpose of this study was to compare the use of first-person pronouns in a corpus of academic articles written by the female writers (FWs) and the male writers (MWs) of English in interdisciplinary departments, with an emphasis on the frequency of first-person pronouns used by the FWs and the MWs of English from 2016 to 2020. The findings indicated both underuse and overuse of first-person pronouns.

Discussion of the Overall Frequency and LL Analysis of the First-Person Pronouns in Academic Articles Written by the FWs of English and the MWs of English between the Years 2016 – 2020

According to the overall frequency data between the years 2016–2020, each gender used a fairly dissimilar frequency of first-person pronouns in academic articles (FWs=0.06; MWs=0.05) and the overall LL analysis of the first-person pronouns in academic articles written by the FWs of English and the MWs of English showed that the LL value for the FWs of English revealed a moderate level of overuse of +48.00, which was statistically significant when compared to the MWs of English. This particular result demonstrated that FWs of English tended to use the first-person pronouns in their academic articles more frequently than MWs of English. Contrary to academic article conventions, the frequent use of first person pronouns by both groups, but particularly by female authors, brought Hyland's question to mind: 'Is academic writing becoming more informal?' (Hyland & Jiang, 2017). Hyland and Jiang (2017) researched this question in their study, determining if academic writing was becoming less formal and in what ways and within which disciplines. They examined the notion that, as informality permeated a wide variety of written and spoken areas of speech, academic writing fell in line. They enquired whether academics were now open to write less strictly objective texts and cultivate a more engaging relationship with their readers. Hyland and Jiang (2017) examined variations in the use of ten key traits identified by applied linguists and writers having the set of standards for the writing as signifying informality over three years using a corpus of 2.2 million words from the same prominent journals in four disciplines. Their findings indicated that there had been a small rise in the use of these qualities, which was primarily due to growth in the hard

sciences rather than the social sciences. Additionally, they were mostly limited to rises in first person pronouns. Increased use of first person in academic genres might be a due to the increased participation in academic studies by authors whose first language was not English and for whom first-person pronouns did not have the same overtones of personal representation and authority (Hyland & Jiang, 2017). In addition to the idea of academic writing's being less formal, in academic writing, Ivanic' (1998) and Hyland (2001) emphasized the significance of the 'I' in developing a distinct voice and authorial identity. In this study, the overuse of the first-person pronouns by the FWs of English during five years might indicate that the FWs of English try to sound more independent and more authoritarian in their academic articles in order to vanish andro-centrism in academic performance.

Discussion of the Frequency and LL Analysis of the First-Person Pronouns in Academic Articles Written by the FWs of English and the MWs of English in the Years 2016

The findings in 2016 presented that there was a marginally significant difference in terms of words per 1,000 between the frequency of the first-person pronouns used by the female writers (FWs) in English and the male writers (MWs) in English in academic articles. Similarly, when the frequency findings per 100 words were analyzed, it was determined that the difference in the employment of first-person pronouns between the FWs and the MWs in English revealed a considerable difference in their academic articles as well. Even though the female writers were a part of different nations, their mutual side was their being affiliated with the universities located in the United State of America. Hence, it could be stated that this present study might have reflected female writers' freedom gained in the society of the United States of America. According to Kammeyer, Ritzer and Yetman (1997), gender was socially manufactured. It was not constant, but varied according to community and time period. To be considered a straightforward manifestation of the biological categories of sex, gender could be considered to be far too diverse between cultures. As a society, it was defined what was to be male and female (Macionis, 1997). Thus, this present study might have represented a clear representation of how self-perception based on gender could change across the communities over time. The Log-Likelihood (LL) analysis of the first-person pronouns in academic articles written by the FWs of English and the MWs of English in the year 2016 demonstrated overuse of the first-person pronouns (+36.50) by

FWs in English in academic articles relative to MWs in English, and the LL value was statistically significant. Kuo (1999) analyzed the use of personal pronouns in 36 academic journals which were randomly selected. Quantitative analysis revealed significant variation in the frequency of personal pronoun use. In their corpus, the first-person plural pronouns were significantly more commonly employed than other forms of pronouns. According to Kuo (1999), the majority of instances of inclusive first-person pronouns, which related to both writers and readers, offered the discourse function of supposing shared knowledge, objectives, and values. The findings obtained in 2016 in this study may support Kuo's inferences due to the use of the first-person pronouns in academic articles. To be precise, the FWs of English showed an overuse of the first-person pronouns relative to MWs of English which might demonstrate that the FWs of English invite readers to share their claims and arguments in their academic articles.

Discussion of the Frequency and LL Analysis of the First-Person Pronouns in Academic Articles Written by the FWs of English and the MWs of English in the Years 2017

Notwithstanding the smaller corpus size of academic articles authored by female writers (FWs) than by male writers (MWs), first-person pronouns were employed nearly twice as often in female writers' articles as in male writers' articles in 2017. Moreover, the FWs of English used the first-person pronouns far more frequently than the MWs of English per 1,000 words. Every 100 words of their respective academic articles demonstrated a noteworthy difference in the use of first-person pronouns between the FWs of English and the MWs of English. This present study did not confirm the views held by several writers in academic environment. For instance, it was stated by Shultz (2009) that academic writers should avoid using the first-person pronouns in the abstract of academic articles owning to the fact that majority of journals did not approve any articles including the first-person pronouns in their abstract parts. However, this current study analyzed the abstract, methodology and conclusion parts of the articles holistically and the results revealed that especially the FWs of English utilized the first-person pronouns most frequently in regarded parts of their articles in 2017. Unlike what Wilkinson (1991) proposed that the abstract parts be written in the third-person as they were supposed to be about the study itself, not the writer. This present study might represent that the journals where the academic articles were published might have

developed their rules in such a way that academic authors may have felt more confident to spread their own claims in order to impress their readers in their articles. Karahan (2013) conducted research to ascertain the frequency of the first-person pronouns utilized in research articles written in English by Turkish and non-Turkish writers. According to the results of the study done by Karahan (2013), non-Turkish writers utilized first-person pronouns in their academic articles at a higher rate than Turkish writers. Molino (2010) conducted the analysis of the linguistics research articles written in English and Italian to find out the differences of the frequency of the first-person pronouns based across academic cultures. The findings in Molino's study (2010) revealed that the first-person pronouns were detected less frequently in Italian linguistics research articles than English linguistics research articles. In this present study, the findings may support what Molino (2010) and Karahan (2013) resulted in their individual studies due to the fact that the articles analyzed in this current study were written in English which might be a reason to have found out numerous amount of the first-person pronouns. The Log-Likelihood (LL) analysis of the first-person pronouns in academic articles in 2017 presented a great increase in the overuse of the first-person pronouns (+173.43) by the FWs of English compared to MWs of English. Moreover, it represented the highest overuse between 2016-2020. Hyland (2003) studied the use of self-citation and authorial mention in 240 research articles and 800 abstracts across eight fields in his paper. He demonstrated how self-mention was utilized in academic texts and in interviews with the specialist interviewees, demonstrating how these features represented both authors' promotional techniques and the epistemic practices of respective fields. Overall results demonstrated that academic writing was not the impersonal, formal writing it was frequently portrayed to be. There were sufficient occurrences of self-reference to illustrate that authors were motivated by publicity and interpersonal goals, as each article had at least one first-person pronouns (Hyland, 2003). According to Furnham, Hosoe and Tang (2002), males overestimated their abilities while women downplayed them. In the present study, the FWs utilized much more first-person pronouns in their academic articles compared to the MWs which might demonstrate that the FWs of English might have tried to get involved in academic society not as a writer who underestimates their skills but as a writer who trusts their capabilities in academic performance.

Discussion of the Frequency and LL Analysis of the First-Person Pronouns in Academic Articles Written by the FWs of English and the MWs of English in the Years 2018

The number of the first-person pronouns was used less in academic articles written by the female writers (FWs) of English than in academic articles written by the male writers (MWs) of English in 2018, owing to the fact that academic articles written by the FWs of English had lower corpus size than academic articles written by the MWs of English. Nevertheless, the employment of the first-person pronouns in academic articles written by FWs and MWs illustrated an identical frequency for every 1,000 words. The same level of equality per 100 words was revealed in their academic articles as well which pointed out that the number of the first-person pronouns used by the FWs of English was still slightly more than that the MWs of English. Despite the fact that the findings for 2018 showed a decline in frequency of the first-person pronouns between the FWs and the MWs when compared to previous years of this present study, the FWs of English continued to utilize the first-person pronouns more frequently than the MWs of English. However, the slight disparity in frequency of the first-person pronouns between the FWs of English and the MWs of English released that the FWs of English employed the first-person pronouns as frequently as the MWs of English. This present study might enlighten that the decline in the difference in frequency between the FWs and the MWs might have been directly proportional to the increase in the self-confidence and self-efficacy of academic writers in developed countries in relation to the opportunities afforded by the country in which they accommodated. According to Bandura (1995), the rapid advancement of technology and the expansion of knowledge put a priority on self-directed learning. Effective education promoted psychosocial development, which improved life quality outside of the workplace. The goal of formal education should be to provide students with the cognitive skills, self-efficacy, and intrinsic motivation to self-educate. These personal resources encouraged people to expand their knowledge and improve their lives. The Log-Likelihood (LL) analysis of the first-person pronouns in academic articles in 2018 showed a slight overuse of the first-person pronouns (+0.08) by the FWs of English relative to the MWs of English which was statistically significant. After the previous year's findings, a great declined was observed in 2018. The MWs of English used nearly the same amount of the first-person pronouns as well. Hyland (2003), in his study, found that there were significant differences in how the first-person pronouns were used across disciplines in the corpus.

Knowledge in hard sciences was typically universalistic in nature and built evidence based consistency through experimental activities that required accurate measurement and methodical examination of a small set of parameters. Thus, the research entailed gathering data in order to offer solutions to particular academic challenges, and often comprises well-established techniques, largely expected findings, and well-defined factors for approval (Hyland, 2003). On the other hand, in soft fields, variables were frequently more diversified and causal connections were more insubstantial, claims were frequently more openly explanatory, and writers' achievement in obtaining approvals for their claims was more due to the ability to activate a sophisticated, believable, and collaborating persona (Hyland, 2000). Hence, the choice to use the first-person pronouns in these disciplines was motivated by the urge to depict oneself as a knowledgeable and trustworthy peer, firmly associating with a certain point of view in order to receive acclaim for one's unique insight or literature choices (Hyland, 2003). The present study's result, which was significantly different from the previous year, indicated that the LL analysis of the first-person pronouns used by the FWs of English and the MWs of English reduced to the point where the disparity practically disappeared which might demonstrate that the writers in soft disciplines, regardless of gender, may have chosen to spread their own words in their academic articles by using self-mention rather than using impersonal pronouns. Thus, readers may develop the perception that the author is more like the owner of her or his own article.

Discussion of the Frequency and LL Analysis of the First-Person Pronouns in Academic Articles Written by the FWs of English and the MWs of English in the Years 2019

In 2019, both the frequency and the first-person pronouns per 1,000 words in the FWs' articles were still higher than in the MWs' articles. The LL analysis was recorded as +4.11, indicating a statistically significant overuse of the FWs of English relative to the MWs of English. The articles being researched were arbitrarily selected from the departments of sociology, psychology, anthropology and philosophy. These departments were perceived as feminine by some researchers. According to Archer and Freedman (1989), academic fields were developed in a gendered manner, with sociology, biology, and psychology considered as feminine and mathematics and engineering as masculine. Furthermore, Veloo, Krishnasamy and Harun (2015) conducted a study to ascertain gender disparities in English writing performance. The

findings indicated that male and female university students performed differently on average. Female students achieved a better score (68.88 percent) than the average student in the Process Writing course. Males, instead, achieved a score of 64.93% lower than the course's general average. Due to those claims mentioned in the study of Archer and Freedman (1989), it might be implied that in the present study that the FWs of English may have been more confident to include their own self mention in their articles than the MWs of English.

Discussion of the Frequency and LL Analysis of the First-Person Pronouns in Academic Articles Written by the FWs of English and the MWs of English in the Years 2020

The LL analysis of the first-person pronouns in academic articles in 2020 showed underuse of the first-person pronouns (-20.22) by the FWs of English relative to the MWs of English. However, it was statistically significant. In this study, which compared five years, an underuse was detected only in 2020. The FWs of English used quite a lower frequency of the first-person pronouns than the MWs of English. Comparing with the previous years, the finding belonging to 2020 was unique in the sense of having a smaller corpus size, lower frequency and being underuse. The study conducted by Reilly, Neumann and Andrews (2022) examined academic self-esteem and individual variations of 228 participants (125 female students, 103 male students) from the university and the findings presented that males addressed greater self-reports of both general self-esteem and academic self-esteem than the females which indicated that there was a major influence of gender classification. Furthermore, the effect of sex-role identification was slightly stronger than the effect of gender identity. To be precise, the anticipated difference revealed that individuals who identified as having a high degree of masculinity had considerably greater academic self-esteem than those who identified as having a low degree of masculinity (Reilly, Neumann & Andrews, 2022). Families' attitudes might play a significant role in the socialization of gender stereotypes, as parental educational aspirations could shape children's perception of their own potential (Frome & Eccles, 1998). Moreover, parental perceptions may unintentionally strengthen or weaken a growing child's intellectual self-concept and self-efficacy beliefs, resulting in a child who feels either intelligent and competent despite obstacles or overloaded and incompetent of more sophisticated academic success. While many individuals associated with their biological sex, others were more

adaptable and combined both masculine and feminine personality features into their self-schema (Reilly, Neumann & Andrews, 2022). In this present study, in contrast to overuse of the first-person pronouns in academic articles written by the FWs of English between 2016-2019, the FWs of English showed a reverse tendency, underuse, of their writing style in 2020. It is possible that the pandemic was responsible for this reduction. If this is the case, lockdowns may have had a deleterious impact on the females. Instead of the self-esteem that females had gained through their experiences and education over time, the perception of gender stereotypes originating from the environment and family that began in the early stages of childhood may have returned, and this may have had a negative impact on their level of self-confidence and self-esteem in their academic performance, resulting in a significantly lower frequency of self-mention in their academic writing, as demonstrated in this study.

Suggestions for Further Research

It is advised that in the future, a larger number of corpus size, including more extensive years, could be promoted in order to assure the importance of the results when the first-person pronouns are used. In addition, the first-person pronouns, namely 'I' and 'We', the sections of the articles, and interdisciplinary departments could be analyzed separately or other personal pronouns could also be investigated comparatively. This current study analyzed the academic articles written by the FWs and the MWs in interdisciplinary departments which uncovered the frequent usage of the first-person pronouns that might imply that the authors of the academic articles might have been authoritarians of their own articles. This implication might enlighten the organic approach to the writing lessons in the ELT departments where academic writing is taught to be impersonal. In contrast to the standard rules of academic writing in the ELT departments, as the trend of academic writing tends to change, academic writing courses in the ELT departments could reflect the writers' voice and ideas of their academic writing in a more writer friendly style. However, this study could also be conducted in the department of ELT and other interdisciplinary departments in terms of social sciences in order to gain more reliable results. Moreover, additional research might be conducted to determine the differences between novice and professional authors, as well as between the FWs and the MWs. It is possible that academics will benefit from this research because there have not been many gender-based studies conducted on the first-person pronouns in the literature. This study investigated academic articles affiliated

with the universities in the United States of America. Hence, it is recommended that academic articles for next studies could be selected from multiple geographical areas where the first-person pronouns are allowed to be used. Besides, other academic texts such as thesis and dissertations could be examined. Furthermore, this present study did not examine the first-person pronouns in the selected articles on a semantic basis and did not investigate the possible reasons that the disparities were generated from. Thus, semantic references and discourse functions could be analyzed in a future research. Additionally, further research could determine if it is biological sex or psychological gender that is more responsible for gendered differences in the frequency of the first-person pronouns in academic articles.

REFERENCES

Ackermann, K., & Chen, Y.-H. (2013). Developing the Academic Collocation List (ACL) – A corpus-driven and expert-judged approach. Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 12(4), 235–247. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2013.08.002

Andrews, R. (2003). The end of the essay?, Teaching in Higher Education, 8, 117-128.

Assunção, C., & Araújo, C. (2019). Entries on the History of Corpus Linguistics. Linha D'Água, 32(1), 39-57. https://doi.org/10.11606/issn.2236-4242.v32i1p39-57

Archer, J., & Freedman, S. (1989) Gender-stereotypic perceptions of academic. British Journal of Education Psychology, 59, 306-313.

Baker, P. (2010). Sociolinguistics and Corpus Linguistics. Edinburgh University Press.

Bandura, A. (1995). Self-Efficacy in Changing Societies. Cambridge University Press.

Basal, A. (2006). Use of first-person pronouns: A corpus based study of journal articles [Master's thesis, Cukurova University].

Becher, T., & Trowler, P. R. (2001). Academic tribes and territories (2nd ed.). Buckingham: The Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.

Becher, T., & Trowler, P. (2001). Academic Tribes and Territories: Intellectual Inquiry and the Cultures of Disciplines. Milton Keynes: SRHE and Open University Press.

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

Biber, D. (1988). Variation across Speech and Writing. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Biber, D., Conrad, S., & Reppen, R. (1998). Corpus Linguistics: Investigating Language Structure and Use. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Biber, D. (2006). University Language. A Corpus-based Study of Spoken and Written Registers [Studies in Corpus Linguistics 23]. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/scl.23

Biber, D., & Reppen, R. (2002). What does frequency have to do with grammar teaching? Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 24(2), 199-208.https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263102002048

Biber, D., & Egbert, J. (2019). Incorporating text dispersion into keyword analysis. Corpora, (14)1, 77–104.

Bondi, M. (1999). Language awareness and EFL teacher education. In P. Faber, W. Gewehr, M. Jiménez Raya & A. J. Peck (Eds.). English teacher education in Europe (pp. 91–107). Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

Burgess, S., & Martín-Martín, P. (2008). Introduction. In S. Burgess & P. Martín-Martín (Eds.). English as an additional language in research publication and communication (pp. 7–15). Bern: Peter Lang.

Cameron, D. (1997). Theoretical debates in feminist linguistics: questions of sex and gender. In R. Wodak (Ed.). Gender and discourse (pp. 21-36). London: Sage.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2002). A geopolitics of academic writing. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Coates, J. (1986). Women, men and language. London: Longman.

Collins Dictionary. (n.d.). Personal pronouns. In Collins.com dictionary. Retrieved January 14, 2022, from https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/personal-pronoun.

Collins Dictionary. (n.d.). Interdisciplinary. In Collins.com dictionary. Retrieved January 14, 2022, from https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/interdisciplinary.

Csomay, E. (2006). Academic talk in American university classrooms: Crossing the bound-aries of oral – literate discourse. Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 5(4), 117–135. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2006.02.001

Dahmardeh, M., & Kim, S. D. (2020). Gender representation in Iranian English language coursebooks: Is sexism still alive? English Today, 36(1), 12–22. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266078419000117

de Beauvoir, S. (1952, reprint 1988). The second sex. London: Cape.

Dillon, G. L. (1991). Contending Rhetorics: Writing in Academic Disciplines. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Ferguson, G., Pérez-Llantada, C., & Plo, R. (2011). English as an international language of scientific publication: A study of attitudes. World Englishes, 30(1), 41–59.

Flowerdew, J., & Li, Y. (2009). English or Chinese? The trade-off between local and international publication among Chinese academics in the humanities and social sciences. Journal of Second Language Writing, 18, 1–16.

Flowerdew, J., & Li, Y. (2009). English or Chinese? The trade-off between local and international publication among Chinese academics in the humanities and social sciences. Journal of Second Language Writing, 18, 1–16.

Flowerdew, L. (2002). Corpus-based analyses in EAP. In J. Flowerdew (Ed.). Academic discourse (pp. 95–114). Harlow: Longman.

Fortanet, I. (2004). The use of 'we' in university lectures: reference and function. English for Specific Purposes, 23(1), 45–66. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(03)00018-8

Frome, P. M., & Eccles, J. S. (1998). Parents' influence on children's achievement-related perceptions. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74, 435-452. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.74.2.435

Furnham, A., Hosoe, T., & Tang, T. L. P. (2002). Male hubris and female humility? A cross-cultural study of ratings of self, parental, and sibling multiple intelligence in America. Intelligence, 30(1), 101–115.

Friginal, E., & Hardy, J. A. (2014). Corpus-Based Sociolinguistics: A Student Guide. New York: Routledge.

Granger, S. (2002). A bird's eye view of learner corpus research. In S. Granger, J. Hong & S. Petch-Tyson (Eds.). Computer learner corpora, second language acquisition and foreign language teaching. pp. 3-33.

Hamp-Lyons, L. (2011). English for academic purposes: 2011 and beyond. Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 10, 2–4.

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(8), 1207-1231.

Harwood, N. (2005b). 'We do not 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.

Harwood, N. (2007). Political scientists on the functions of personal pronouns in their writing: An interview-based study of "I" and "we." Text & Talk, 27(1), 27-54.

Hirvela, A., & Belcher, D. (2001). Coming back to voice: The multiple voices and identities of mature multilingual writers. Journal of Second Language Writing, 10(1/2), 83–106.

Hunston, S., & Thompson, G. (Eds.). (2000). Evaluation in text. Oxford: Oxford

Hsu, W. (2014). The most frequent opaque formulaic sequences in English-medium college textbooks. System, 47, 146–161. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2014.10.001

Hyland, K. (2005). Stance and engagement: a model of interaction in academic discourse. Discourse Studies, 7(2), 173–192.

Hyland, K. (1999). Academic attribution: Citation and the construction of disciplinary knowledge. Applied Linguistics, 20(3), 341–367.

Hyland, K. (2000). Disciplinary discourses. London: Longman.

Hyland, K. (2001). Humble servants of the discipline? Self-mention in research articles.English for Specific Purposes, 20(3), 207–26. DOI: 10.1016/S0889-4906(00)00012-0

Hyland, K. (2002a). Authority and invisibility: Authorial identity in academic writing. Journal of Pragmatics, 34(8), 1091–1112.

Hyland, K. (2002b). Options of identity in academic writing. ELT Journal, 56(4), 351-358.

Hyland, K. (2003). Self-Citation and Self-Reference: Credibility and Promotion in Academic Publication. Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology, 54(3), 251–259. https://doi-org.ezproxy.umgc.edu/10.1002/asi.10204

Hyland, K. (2006). English for academic purposes: An advanced resource book. London: Routledge.

Hyland, K. (2009). Academic discourse. London: Continuum.

Hyland, K. (2012). Disciplinary Identities. Cambridge: CUP.

Hyland, K., & Jiang, F. K. (2017). Is academic writing becoming more informal? English for Specific Purposes, 45, 40–51.https://doi org.ezproxy.umgc.edu/10.1016/j.esp.2016.09.001

Ivanič, R., & Camps, D. (2001). I am how I sound: Voice as self-representation in L2 writing. Journal of Second Language Writing, 10, 3–33.

Ivanič, R. (1998). Writing and Identity: The Discoursal Construction of Identity in Academic Writing. John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Ivanic´, R., & Weldon, S. (1999). Researching the writer-reader relationship. In: Candlin, C. N., Hyland, K. (Eds.). Writing: Texts, Processes and Practices. Longman, London, pp. 168–192.

Johansson, S. (1991). Times change, and so do corpora. In English Corpus Linguistics Studies in Honour of Jan Svartvik, Karin Aijmer & Bengt Altenberg (Eds.), 305–314. London: Longman.

Johansson, S. (1998). On computer corpora in contrastive linguistics. In Compare or contrast? Current Issues in Cross-Language Research [Tampere Studies in English], W. Robert Cooper (Ed.), 269–289. Tampere: University of Tampere.

Kammeyer. K., Ritzer. G., & Yetman, N. R. (1997). Sociology, experiencing changing societies. Needham Heights: Allyn and Bacon.

Karahan, P. (2013). Self-mention in Scientific Articles Written by Turkish and Non-Turkish Authors. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 70, 305–322. https://doi-org.ezproxy.umgc.edu/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.01.068

Kennedy, Graeme. (1998). An Introduction to Corpus Linguistics. London: Longman.

Kennedy, G., & Miceli, T. (2010). Corpus-assisted creative writing: Introducing intermediate Italian learners to a corpus as a reference resource. Language Learning & Technology, 14(1), 28-44.

Kitzinger, C. (1994). Sex difference: feminist perspectives. Feminism and Psychology, 4(4), 501-596.

Kramer, C., Thorne, B., & Henley, N. (1978). Perspectives on language and communication. Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 3(3), 638-651.

Kuo, C. H. (1999). The Use of Personal Pronouns: Role Relationships in Scientific Journal Articles. English for Specific Purposes, 18(2), 121–138. https://doi-org.ezproxy.umgc.edu/10.1016/S0889-4906(97)00058-6

Lakoff, R. (1973). Language and woman's place. Language in Society, 2, 45-80.

Lea, M., & Street, B. (1998) Student writing in higher education: An academic literacies approach. Studies in Higher Education (11), 182-199.

Lee, D., & Swales, J. (2006). A corpus-based EAP course for NNS doctoral students: Moving from available specialized corpora to self-compiled corpora. English for Specific Purposes, 25(1), 56–75.

Lee, J. F. K. (2018). Gender representation in Japanese EFL textbooks—A corpus study. Gender and Education, 30(3), 379–395. https://doi.org/10.1080/09540253.2016.1214690

Lee, J. F. K. (2019). In the pursuit of a gender-equal society: Do Japanese EFL textbooks play a role? Journal of Gender Studies, 28(2), 204–217. https://doi.org/10.1080/09589236.2018.1423956

Lee, J. F. K., & Mahmoudi-Gahrouei, V. (2020). Gender representation in instructional materials: A study of Iranian English language textbooks and teachers' voices. Sexuality and Culture, 24, 1107–1127. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12119-020-09747-z

Lillis, T. & Turner. J. (2001) Student writing in higher education: Contemporary confusion, traditional concerns. Teaching in Higher Education, 6, 57-68.

Lillis, T., & Curry, M. J. (2010). Academic writing in a global context. London: Routledge Linguistics, 26(3), 343–375.

Liu, Y., Fang, A. C., & Wei, N. (2014). A Corpus-Based Quantitative Study of Nominalizations across Chinese and British Media English. 28th Pacific Asia Conference on Language, Information and Computation (PACLIC 28), 101–110.

Livia, A., & Hall, K. (1997). Queerly phrased. Language, gender and sexuality. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Maccoby, E. E., & Jacklin, C. N. (1974).The psychology of sex differences. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Macionis, J. (1997). Sociology (6th ed.). Prentice Hall.

Maltz, D. N., & Borker, R. A. (1982). A cultural approach to male female miscommunication. In J. Gumperz (Ed.), Language and Social Identity (pp. 196-216). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Monippally, M. M., & Pawar, B. S. (2010). Academic Writing : A Guide for Management Students and Researchers, Sage Publications Pvt. Ltd.

McEnery, T. & Wilson, A. (1996). Corpus Linguistics. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

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

McEnery, T., Xiao, R., & Tonio, Y. (2006). Corpus-based language studies: An advance resource book. New York: Routledge.

Mengistie, S. M., & Worku, M. Y. (2021). Gender Representation in Educational Materials: A Focus on Ethiopian English Textbooks. In W. L. Filho, A. M. Azul, L. Brandli, A. L. Salvia, & T. Wall (Eds.), Gender Equality, Encyclopedia of the UN Sustainable Development Goals (pp. 599–611). Cham: Springer.

Mercadal, T. (2021). Language and Gender. Salem Press Encyclopedia.

Merriam-Webster. (n.d.). Gender. In Merriam-Webster.com dictionary. Retrieved January 14, 2022, from https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/gender

Meyer, C. F. (2002). English Corpus Linguistics - An Introduction. Cambridge University Press.

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. https://doi-org.ezproxy.umgc.edu/10.1016/j.jeap.2010.02.007

Monippally, M. M., & Pawar, B. S., (2010). Academic Writing : A Guide for Management Students and Researchers. Sage Publications Pvt. Ltd.

Pho, P. D. (2008). Research article abstracts in applied linguistics and educational technology: A study of linguistic realizations of rhetorical structure and authorial stance. Discourse Studies, 10(2), 231–250.

Rakow, L. F., & Kramarae, C. (Eds.). (1990).The revolution in words: righting women, 1868-1871. New York: Routledge.

Rayson, P., & Garside, R. (2000). Comparing corpora using frequency profiling. In proceedings of the workshop on Comparing Corpora, held in conjunction with the 38th annual meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL 2000). 1-8 October 2000 (pp. 1-6), Hong Kong.

Rayson, P., Leech, G., & Hodges, M. (1997). Social differentiation in the use of English vocabulary: some analyses of the conversational component of the British National Corpus. International Journal of Corpus Linguistics, 2(1), 133-152.

Reilly, D., Neumann, D. L., & Andrews, G. (2022). Gender Differences in Self-Estimated Intelligence: Exploring the Male Hubris, Female Humility Problem. Frontiers in Psychology, 13. https://doi-org.ezproxy.umgc.edu/10.3389/

Salager-Meyer, F. (1994). Hedges and textual communicative function in medical English written discourse. English for Specific Purposes, 13, 149-170.

Samraj, B. (2014). Disciplinary variations in abstracts: The case of wildlife behavior and conservation biology. In J. Flowerdew (Ed.), Academic discourse (pp. 40–56). Routledge.

Schlitz, S. A. (2010). Introduction to special issue: Exploring corpus-informed approaches to writing research. Journal of Writing Research, 2(2), 91–98.

Schultz, D. M. (2009). Eloquent Science, Boston, Massachusetts: American Meteorological Society.

Shaw, P. (1992). Reasons for the Correlation of Voice, Tense, and Sentence Function in Reporting Verbs. Applied Linguistics, 13. 10.1093/applin/13.3.302.

Shirato, J., & Stapleton, P. (2007). Comparing English vocabulary in a spoken learner corpus with a native in Japan speaker corpus: Pedagogical implications arising from an empirical study. Language Teaching Research, 11, 393-412.

Simpson-Vlach, Rita & Ellis, Nick C. (2010). An Academic Formulas List: New methods in phraseology research. Applied Linguistics, 31(4), 487–512. https://doi.org/ 10.1093/applin/amp058

Sinclair, J. (Ed.). (1987).Collins cobuild English dictionary. London: Williams Collins Sons & Co.

Sinclair, J. (1991). Corpus, concordance, collocation. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Soler-Monreal, C., & Gil Salom, L. (2014). Dialogicity in Written Specialised Genres. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Spender, D. (1980). Man-made language. Boston and London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Spender, D. (1995). Nattering on the net: women, power and cyber space. Melbourne: Spinifex.

Stoica, I. (2021). Corpus Linguistics. Salem Press Encyclopedia.

Stannard, U. (1977). Mrs. Man. San Francisco, CA: Germain books.

Suwarno, S., Triyono, S., Ashadi, A., & Sahayu, W. (2021). Gender Construction in the Indonesian Government-Distributed English Textbook: Combining Critical Discourse Analysis and Corpus Linguistics. Sexuality & Culture, 25(6), 2158–2175. https://doi-org.ezproxy.umgc.edu/10.1007/s12119-021-09870-5

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

Swales, J. M., & Burke, A. (2003). 'It's really fascinating work': Differences in evaluative adjectives across academic registers. In P. Leistyna & C. F. Meyer (Eds.), Corpus analysis: Language structure and language use (pp. 1–18). New York: Rodopi.

Tardy, C. M. (2005). It's like a story: Rhetorical knowledge development in advanced academic literacy. Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 4(4), 325-338.

Thompson, P. (Ed.). (2000). Patterns and perspectives: Insights into EAP writing practice. Reading: The University of Reading, Centre for Applied Language Studies.

Thompson, P. (Ed.). (2007). Corpus-based EAP pedagogy. Special issue of Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 6(4).

Thurstun, J., & Candlin, C. (1998). Concordancing and the teaching of the vocabulary of academic English. English for Specific Purposes, 17(3), 267–280.

Tognini-Bonelli, E. (2001). Corpus Linguistics at Work [Studies in Corpus Linguistics 6]. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

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

Tribble, C. (2002). Corpora and corpus analysis: New windows on academic writing. In J. Flowerdew (Ed.), Academic discourse (pp. 131–149). Harlow: Longman University Press.

Uzuner, S. (2008). Multilingual scholars' participation in core/global academic communities: A literature review. Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 7(4), 250–263.

Vandermensbrugghe, J. (2004). The unbearable vagueness of critical thinking in the context of the Anglo-Saxonisation of education. International Education Journal, 5(3), 417–422.

Vassileva, I. (2001). Commitment and detachment in English and Bulgarian academic writing. English for Specific Purposes, 20, 83–102.

Veloo, A., Krishnasamy, H. N., & Harun, H. M. (2015). What Are the Learning Approaches Applied by Undergraduate Students in English Process Writing Based on Gender? International Education Studies, 8(6), 46–55.

Whitehead, D. (2002). The academic writing experiences of a group of student nurses: A phenomenological study. Journal of Advanced Nursing, 38, 498-506.

Wetherell, M. (1998). Positioning and interpretative repertoires: conversation analysis and post-structuralism in dialogue. Discourse and Society, 9(3), 387-412.

Weatherall, A. (2002). Gender, Language and Discourse. Routledge.

Wilkinson, A. M. (1991). The Scientist's Handbook for Writing Papers and Dissertations. Prentice Hall.

APPENDICES

Appendix A. Ethic Committee Approval of Çağ University

T.C	
ÇAĞ ÜNİVERSİTESİ	
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ	
TEZ / ARAŞTIRMA / ANKET / ÇALIŞMA İZNİ / ETİK KURULU İZNİ TALEP FORMU VE ONAY TUTANAK FORMU	
ÖĞRENCİ BİLGİLERİ	
T.C. NOSU	
ADI VE SOYADI	Dilek Williams
ÖĞRENCİ NO	20188061
TEL. NO.	
E - MAİL ADRESLERİ	
ANA BİLİMDALI	İngiliz Dili Eğitimi
HANGİ AŞAMADA OLDUĞU (DERS / TEZ)	Tez
İSTEKDE BULUNDUĞU DÖNEME AİT DÖNEMLİK KAYDININ YAPILIP-YAPILMADIĞI	2021 / 2022 - GÜZ DÖNEMİ KAYDINI YENİLEDİM.
ARAŞTIRMA/ANKET/ÇALIŞMA TALEBİ İLE İLGİLİ BİLGİLER	
TEZİN KONUSU	Erkek ve kadın yazarlar tarafından yazılan disiplinler arası makalelerde birinci kisi zamirlerini 'ben' ve 'biz' kullanım yogunluguna dair derlem tabanlı bir araştırma
TEZİN AMACI	Bu calisma İngilizce konusan ve Amerika Birlesik devletlerinde bulunan universitelere bagli calisan akademisyenlerin yazdıkları akademik makaleler secilmistir. Bu makaleler 2016-2020 yılları arasinda ve disiplinler arası olup yazarların cinsiyet farklılıkları uzerinden birinci kisi zamirlerini ne oranda kullandıklarını tespit etmek amacı ile yapilmaktadir.
TEZİN TÜRKÇE ÖZETİ	Bu calismanin ozeti İngilizce konusan ve Amerika Birlesik devletlerinde bulunan universitelere bagli calisan akademisyenlerin yazdıkları akademik makaleler secilmistir. Bu makaleler 2016-2020 yılları arasinda ve disiplinler arası olup yazarların cinsiyet farklılıları uzerinden birinci kisi zamirlerini tespit etmek ve bunu cinsiyet ve yıllar bazinda incelemektir. Makale sayıları 100 olup,
ARAŞTIRMA YAPILACAK OLAN SEKTÖRLER/ KURUMLARIN ADLARI	Amerika'da yazılmış akademik makaleler
İZİN ALINACAK OLAN KURUMA AİT BİLGİLER (KURUMUN ADI- ŞUBESİ/ MÜDÜRLÜĞÜ - İLİ - İLÇESİ)	Amerika birleşik devletleri üniversiteleri internet kaynakları
YAPILMAK İSTENEN ÇALIŞMANIN İZİN ALINMAK İSTENEN KURUMUN HANGİ İLÇELERİNE / HANGİ KURUMUNA/ HANGİ BÖLÜMÜNDE / HANGİ ALANINA/ HANGİ KONULARDA/ HANGİ GRUBA/ KİMLERE/ NE UYGULANACAĞI GİBİ AYRINTILI BİLGİLER	Amerika'da yazılmış ve gerek kütüphaneler gerek çeşitli internet kaynaklarınca serbest erişime açık akademik makaleler
UYGULANACAK OLAN ÇALIŞMAYA AİT ANKETLERİN/ ÖLÇEKLERİN BAŞLIKLARI / HANGİ ANKETLERİN - ÖLÇELERİN UYGULANACAĞI	Çalışma, content çalışması olduğu için hiçbir anket, ölçek, form vb. evrak kullanılmamıştır.
EKLER (ANKETLER, ÖLÇEKLER, FORMLAR, V.B. GİBİ EVRAKLARIN İSİMLERİYLE BİRLİKTE KAÇ ADET/SAYFA OLDUKLARINA AİT BİLGİLER İLE AYRINTILI YAZILACAKTIR)	1) .... (............) Sayfa .... Ölçeği. 2) .... (............) Sayfa .... Anketi. 3) .... (............) Sayfa .... Formları. 4) .... (............) Sayfa ....

ÖĞRENCİNİN ADI - SOYADI: Dilek Williams	ÖĞRENCİNİN İMZASI: TARİH: …07… / …01…/ 2022	Enstitu mudurlugunde evrak asli imzalidir.

TEZ/ ARAŞTIRMA/ANKET/ÇALIŞMA TALEBİ İLE İLGİLİ DEĞERLENDİRME SONUCU

1. Seçilen konu Bilim ve İş Dünyasına katkı sağlayabilecektir.

2. Anılan konu .... **faaliyet alanı içerisine girmektedir.**

1.TEZ DANIŞMANININ ONAYI	2.TEZ DANIŞMANININ ONAYI (VARSA)	ANA BİLİM DALI BAŞKANININ ONAYI	SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ MÜDÜRÜNÜN ONAYI
Adı - Soyadı: ……Zehra Korloglu	Adı - Soyadı: ……………….....…	Adı - Soyadı: …Sehnaz Sahinkarakas	Adı - Soyadı: ……….........
Unvanı: Dr. Ogr. Uyesi ……...……...….	Unvanı: …………..…	Unvanı: Prof. Dr.	Unvanı: …………..…
Enstitu mudurlugunde evrak asli imzalidir.	…………..…	İmzası: Enstitu mudurlugunde evrak asli imzalidir.	İmzası:……
… / ….. / 20….	…. / …. / 20….	……. / …….. / 20……	…. / …. / 20…

ETİK KURULU ASIL ÜYELERİNE AİT BİLGİLER

Adı - Soyadı: **Şehnaz ŞAHİNKARAKAŞ**	Adı - Soyadı: **Yücel ERTEKİN**	Adı - Soyadı: **Deniz Aynur GÜLER**	Adı - Soyadı: **Mustafa BAŞARAN**	Adı - Soyadı: **Mustafa Tevfik ODMAN**	Adı - Soyadı: **Hüseyin Mahir FİSUNOĞLU**	Adı - Soyadı: **Jülide İNÖZÜ**
Unvanı : Prof. Dr.	Unvanı : Prof. Dr.	Unvanı: Prof. Dr.	Unvanı : Prof. Dr.	Unvanı: Prof. Dr.	Unvanı : Prof. Dr.	Unvanı : Prof. Dr.
Enstitu mudurlugunde evrak asli imzalidir.	Enstitu mudurlugunde evrak asli imzalidir.	Enstitu mudurlugunde evrak asli imzalidir.	Enstitu mudurlugunde evrak asli imzalidir. İmzası : ……………	Enstitu mudurlugunde evrak asli imzalidir. İmzası : ……..……	Enstitu mudurlugunde evrak asli imzalidir.	Enstitu mudurlugunde evrak asli imzalidir.
…… / ….. / 20…..	…… / ….. / 20….	… / ….. / 20…..	….. / ….. / 20…..	… / ….. / 20…..	…… / ….. / 20…..	…… / ….. / 20….
Etik Kurulu Jüri Başkanı - Asıl Üye	**Etik Kurulu Jüri Asıl Üyesi**	**Etik Kurulu Jüri Asıl Üyesi**	**Etik Kurulu Jüri Asıl Üyesi**	**Etik Kurulu Jüri Asıl Üyesi**	**Etik Kurulu Jüri Asıl Üyesi**	**Etik Kurulu Jüri Asıl Üyesi**

OY BİRLİĞİ İLE	◯	**Çalışma yapılacak olan tez için uygulayacağı olduğu Anketleri/Formları/Ölçekleri Çağ Üniversitesi Etik Kurulu Asıl Jüri Üyelerince İncelenmiş olup, …… / …… / 20…… - …….. / …….. / 20…… tarihleri arasında uygulanmak üzere gerekli iznin verilmesi taraflarımızca uygundur.**
OY ÇOKLUĞU İLE	◯	

AÇIKLAMA: BU FORM ÖĞRENCİLER TARAFINDAN HAZIRLANDIKTAN SONRA ENSTİTÜ MÜDÜRLÜĞÜ SEKRETERLİĞİNE ONAYLAR ALINMAK ÜZERE TESLİM EDİLECEKTİR. AYRICA FORMDAKİ YAZI ON İKİ PUNTO OLACAK ŞEKİLDE YAZILACAKTIR.

Appendix B. Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Committee Permission

T.C.
ÇAĞ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü

Sayı : E-23867972-050.01.04-2200000183   10.01.2022
Konu : Bilimsel Araştırma ve Yayın Etiği
             Kurulu Kararı Alınması Hk.

REKTÖRLÜK MAKAMINA

İlgi: 09.03.2021 tarih ve E-81570533-050.01.01-2100001828 sayılı Bilimsel Araştırma ve
Yayın Etiği Kurulu konulu yazınız.

İlgi tarihli yazınız kapsamında Üniversitemiz Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü bünyesindeki
Lisansüstü Programlarda halen tez aşamasında kayıtlı olan **Dilek Williams** isimli öğrencimize
ait tez evraklarının "Üniversitemiz Bilimsel Araştırma ve Yayın Etiği Kurulu Onayları"
alınmak üzere Ek'te sunulmuş olduğunu arz ederim.

Doç. Dr. Murat KOÇ
Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Müdürü

Ek : 1 Adet öğrenciye ait tez evrakları listesi.

Appendix C. Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Committee Permission

T.C.
ÇAĞ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
Rektörlük

Sayı : E-81570533-044-2200000402   17.01.2022
Konu : Bilimsel Araştırma ve Yayın Etiği
Kurul İzni Hk.

SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ MÜDÜRLÜĞÜNE

İlgi : a) 11.01.2022 tarih ve E-23867972- 050.01.04-2200000236 sayılı yazınız.
b) 10.01.2022 tarih ve E-23867972- 050.01.04-2200000183 sayılı yazınız.

İlgi yazılarda söz konusu edilen Dilek Williams, İslam Kurthan Açıkbaş ve Emine Nalçacı Akbaba isimli öğrencilerimizin tez evrakları Bilimsel Araştırma ve Yayın Etiği Kurulunda incelenerek uygun görülmüştür.

Bilgilerinizi ve gereğini rica ederim.

Prof. Dr. Ünal AY
Rektör

Appendix D. The Interdisciplinary Academic Articles List of Female Writers

Academic Article Writer (Female)	Year	University
1. FW1	2016	Northwestern University, USA
2. FW2	2016	University of Wisconsin–Madison, USA
3. FW3	2016	State University of New York, USA
4. FW4	2016	University of Kansas, USA
5. FW5	2016	University of South Carolina Aiken, USA
6. FW6	2016	The Ohio State University, USA
7. FW7	2016	University of Notre Dame, USA
8. FW8	2016	University of Notre Dame, USA
9. FW9	2016	University of Massachusetts Boston, USA
10. FW10	2016	Michigan State University, USA
11. FW11	2017	University of Portland, USA
12. FW12	2017	University of California, Los Angeles, USA
13. FW13	2017	Princeton University, USA
14. FW14	2017	University of Michigan, USA
15. FW15	2017	Smith College, Massachusetts, USA
16. FW16	2017	Drexel University, USA
17. FW17	2017	Tulane University, New Orleans, USA
18. FW18	2017	Temple University, Philadelphia, USA

Academic Article Writer (Female)	Year	University
19. FW19	2017	University of Vermont, Burlington, USA
20. FW20	2017	Stanford University, USA
21. FW21	2018	University New Brunswick, USA
22. FW22	2018	University of California Los Angeles, USA
23. FW23	2018	Pennsylvania State University, USA
24. FW24	2018	Central Michigan University, USA
25. FW25	2018	Wichita State University, USA
26. FW26	2018	Drexel University, USA
27. FW27	2018	Kent State University, USA
28. FW28	2018	University of Tampa, USA
29. FW29	2018	University of North Carolina Asheville, USA
30. FW30	2018	Radford University, USA
31. FW31	2019	University of Richmond, USA
32. FW32	2019	Stanford University, USA
33. FW33	2019	Wayne State University, USA
34. FW34	2019	Oglethorpe University, USA
35. FW35	2019	University of California, USA
36. FW36	2019	Northeastern University, USA
37. FW37	2019	Tulane University, USA
38. FW38	2019	University of California, USA
39. FW39	2019	University of North Carolina, USA
40. FW40	2019	The University of Texas at Austin, USA
41. FW41	2020	DePauw University, USA
42. FW42	2020	California State University, USA
43. FW43	2020	Indiana University, USA
44. FW44	2020	University of Hawai'i at Manoa, USA
45. FW45	2020	Monmouth University, USA
46. FW46	2020	State University of New York, USA
47. FW47	2020	The Ohio State University, USA
48. FW48	2020	Northern Arizona University, USA
49. FW49	2020	University of Wisconsin-Madison, USA
50. FW50	2020	Providence College, USA

Appendix E. The Interdisciplinary Academic Articles List of Male Writers

Academic Article Writer (Male)	Year	University
1. MW1	2016	Northwestern University, Evanston, USA
2. MW2	2016	University of Chicago, USA
3. MW3	2016	Emory University, Atlanta, USA
4. MW4	2016	University of Notre Dame, USA
5. MW5	2016	University of Texas, Austin, TX, USA
6. MW6	2016	Bellarmine University, Louisville, Kentucky, USA
7. MW7	2016	University of Washington, USA
8. MW8	2016	Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee, USA
9. MW9	2016	University of Pennsylvania, USA
10. MW10	2016	University of North Carolina, USA
11. MW11	2017	University of Wisconsin Madison, USA
12. MW12	2017	University of Arizona, USA
13. MW13	2017	University of Connecticut, USA
14. MW14	2017	University of Michigan, USA
15. MW15	2017	Bowie State University, USA
16. MW16	2017	Wheaton College, USA
17. MW17	2017	Hunter College, USA
18. MW18	2017	Harvard University, USA

Academic Article Writer (Male)	Year	University
19. MW19	2017	Western Michigan University, USA
20. MW20	2017	Colgate University, Hamilton, NY, USA
21. MW21	2018	Princeton University, USA
22. MW22	2018	University of Chicago, USA
23. MW23	2018	University of Arkansas, USA
24. MW24	2018	University of North Carolina, USA
25. MW25	2018	University of Notre Dame, USA
26. MW26	2018	Quinnipiac University, USA
27. MW27	2018	Stony Brook University, USA
28. MW28	2018	University of Hawaii-West O'ahu, USA
29. MW29	2018	Princeton University, USA
30. MW30	2018	University of Tennessee, USA
31. MW31	2019	Harvard University, USA
32. MW32	2019	Northwestern University, USA
33. MW33	2019	University of Oregon, USA
34. MW34	2019	University of Michigan, USA
35. MW35	2019	University of California, USA
36. MW36	2019	University of North Texas, USA
37. MW37	2019	Harvard University, USA
38. MW38	2019	Cleveland State University, USA
39. MW39	2019	Cornell University, USA
40. MW40	2019	University of Tennessee, USA
41. MW41	2020	Indiana University, USA
42. MW42	2020	Saint Louis University, USA
43. MW43	2020	Harvard University, USA
44. MW44	2020	Columbia University, USA
45. MW45	2020	Clark University, USA
46. MW46	2020	University of South Carolina, USA
47. MW47	2020	University of California, USA
48. MW48	2020	Brandeis University, USA
49. MW49	2020	University of Illinois, USA
50. MW50	2020	University of Maryland, USA