

Addressing the reader: A comparison of research papers in Slovak, L1 English and L2 English

Milada Walková

Technical University of Košice

Abstract

The present paper analyzes multimodal features on a theatre website. Anchored in the methodology of John Bateman, the paper employs the GeM model to explore the interconnection of the visual and textual modes present on the Dutch National Opera and Ballet's website, with a special emphasis on the website's layout and its changes induced by the user's navigation across the multimodal document. The paper also focuses on the major issues and constraints of applying Bateman's model, originally created for print media, to the novel genre of theatre websites, and it attempts to determine the optimum and most effective application of the model in this particular genre.

Keywords: academic writing, personal deixis, intercultural rhetoric

The research reported in this paper was supported by the grant *Personálna a sociálna deixa v slovenčine* 'Personal and social deixis in Slovak', grant reference 1/0099/16, from the Scientific Grant Agency VEGA, Slovakia.

1. Introduction

The genre of the research paper might appear monological since there is no immediate reply from its readers. Nevertheless, the writer hopes to provoke the readers' response and to trigger discussion, which gives the research paper a dialogic character. This response usually takes the form of another research paper citing the original paper, and at times of

a short ‘response to the author’ arguing against the original paper. As such, the response from the reader is necessarily delayed, and sometimes it does not occur at all. In the latter case, the paper has failed to stimulate academic debate, and it has thus arguably failed to achieve its purpose. The writer therefore needs to engage the reader as a participant in the communicative exchange. The task is not an easy one, as the readership is anonymous and varied: while research papers are primarily directed at peer researchers, its potential audience involves also practitioners, students, and non-experts interested in the topic. Therefore, writers structure the argument based on their own expectations of the readers’ response to the evolving text (Thompson 58). Such expectations are determined, among other factors, by culture (e.g. Lafuente-Millán 219; Čmejrková and Daneš 55).

The present paper studies reader address as a form of reader engagement. More specifically, it aims to explore how Slovak scholars address the reader in their research papers. In order to achieve this aim, I compare and contrast reader address in native Slovak (as the L1 of the authors), native English (as the L1 of the authors), and non-native English by Slovak authors (as the L2 of the authors). The paper will point out current trends in reader address in Slovak and Anglophone academic writing, which include avoidance of third person terms and second person pronouns, the use of formulaic language in the second person imperative, and the use of inclusive first person plurals to decrease the distance between the writer and the reader. The cross-cultural comparison presented in the paper will show that Slovak authors tend to signpost the reader to other parts of the text less than native English writers, and to use more conditional clauses to persuade the reader. We will see that Slovak linguists use a high amount of modality, i.e. of modal verbs, as a sign of authorial modesty when writing in Slovak. I will also show that, when writing in non-native English, Slovak linguists do not establish the same relationship with their readers as they do in native Slovak.

2. Reader engagement and reader address

Engagement, as defined by Hyland (“Corpus Informed Discourse Analysis” 111), is “the ways writers pull readers along with the unfolding discourse: recognizing their uncertainties, including them as discourse participants and guiding them to interpretations”. Engagement thus serves to acknowledge the reader as an equal member of the discipline and at the same time to persuade the reader of the validity of the claims put forth in the text. More commonly found in soft sciences than in hard sciences (Hyland, “Bringing in the Reader” 554), the overall frequency of engagement has decreased over the past 50 years in proportion to the increased length of the papers (Hyland and Jiang 32).

Hyland (“Bringing in the Reader” et passim) identifies five types of reader engagement, namely (1) real and rhetorical questions, (2) reader mentions (inclusive first person pronouns, second person pronouns and expressions referring to the reader), (3) directives (imperatives, obligation modals, and phrases of the type *it is {adjective} to {verb}*, which direct the reader to an action), (4) references to shared knowledge, and (5) asides addressed to the reader. This paper focuses only on some of these devices, namely directly addressing the reader through reader mentions and imperatives. These are primary means of reader

engagement, as they amount to 61 percent of total engagement in research papers as found by Hyland (“Bringing in the Reader” 554). I will now discuss these devices in turn.

To start with, inclusive first person pronouns are the most frequent reader engagement device (Hyland, “Bringing in the Reader” 554). By assuming a joint position with the reader, writers strategically use inclusive plurals to lead the reader to a conclusion desired by the writers themselves. In contrast, second person pronouns are rare in academic writing (Biber 334, Hyland, “Bringing in the Reader” 554). Hyland (“Bringing in the Reader” 557) suggests that writers try to avoid the distance that *you* creates between the reader and the writer, opting for inclusive plurals instead. Consequently, second person pronouns, as well as the indefinite pronoun *one*, are typically used to refer to people in general (Hyland and Jiang 33). Similarly, direct reader references, such as *the reader*, are rare; Hyland (“Community and Individuality” 178) states that this way of addressing the reader is “extremely unusual in current practice, [...] quaint and rather dated”. Lastly, imperatives belong among directives, which are face threatening (Brown and Levinson, *Politeness*), since they tell the reader what to think or do. For this reason they are more common in textbooks and less frequent in student writing compared to expert research papers (Hyland, “Directives” 223). However, Myers (21) argues that imperatives in academic discourse are similar to polite imperative invitations such as *come in and take a seat*. Therefore, imperatives are the least threatening among directives, which has perhaps contributed to their rise in academic writing in the past five decades (Hyland & Jiang 38). Hyland (“Directives” et passim) recognizes three types of directives, namely (i) physical acts requesting the reader to perform an action in the real world, typically as part of a replicated research process, (ii) cognitive acts asking the reader to understand issues in a particular way, and (iii) textual acts referring the reader to another text or another part of the same text. In the rest of this paper, I refer to the two types of textual acts as *intertextual acts* and *intratextual acts*, respectively.

The use of reader engagement features is influenced by the national culture and mother tongue of the writer (e.g. Lafuente-Millán 219). Consequently, the roles of the reader and the writer in academic discourse may vary across cultures (Čmejrková and Daneš 55). As has been shown by studies in intercultural rhetoric and contrastive linguistics, reader engagement in Slavic academic writing differs from engagement in Anglophone academic writing. Namely, texts in Russian, Bulgarian and Czech, as well as in non-native English written by speakers of Slavic languages, focus more on content than on interaction, and contain less reader engagement and less textual signposting for the reader, making the texts less dialogic than Anglophone texts (Chamonikolasová 83; Čmejrková and Daneš 54; Dontcheva-Navratilova “Autorovy role” 51, “Cross-Cultural Variation” 169, “Lexical Bundles” 10; Duszak 303; Khoutyz, “Engagement Features” 14; Vassileva 173). Further features of Slavic engagement are high modality connected to the first person plural, as found in Czech and Slovak by Čmejrková (28), and preference for collective directives (equivalent of *let us*), as shown by Khoutyz (“Engagement” 144; “Engagement Features” 11) in Russian. As we have seen, reader engagement by Slovak authors has received little research attention, and to the best of my knowledge, the only paper that deals with it is Čmejrková (“The (Re)Presentation”). Therefore, this paper studies ways of addressing

the reader in Slovak and Slovak English by drawing comparisons with native English academic writing.

3. Data collection and analysis

Three corpora of academic writing were created, namely a corpus of native English writing (abbreviated as EN), native Slovak writing (abbreviated as SK), and non-native English writing by Slovak authors (abbreviated as NN). For a text to be included in the native English corpus, it was sufficient for at least one of its authors to be a native English writer, as judged by the authors' names and affiliations. In order to avoid influences from individual styles, the corpora do not contain more than one text by the same author. They were each compiled from 30 research articles in linguistics, published from 2012 to 2016 in journals and (in the case of the non-native corpus due to a lack of suitable journal articles) also in an edited volume. Namely, the texts in the native English corpus were drawn from the journals *English for Specific Purposes*, *English Language and Linguistics*, and *TESL Canada*, the texts in the native Slovak corpus from the journals *Jazyk a kultúra*, *Jazykovedný časopis* and *Slovenská reč*, and the texts in the non-native corpus were taken from the volume *English Matters* and the journals *Jazyk a kultúra*, *SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics*, *Topics in Linguistics*, and *XLinguae*.

The texts were converted to plain text format files using *AntFileConverter* (Anthony). Irrelevant parts of the texts, such as authors' names, abstracts, keywords, references, bios, pagination, etc., were removed. The length of the texts was then determined by *AntConc* (Anthony) as follows: 252,850 words in the native English corpus, 157,614 words in the native Slovak corpus, and 131,047 words in the non-native corpus. Given the varying length of the corpora, the results were normalized to 10,000 words (see Section 4).

Next, the texts were tagged using *TreeTagger* (Schmid; Ó Duibhín) and *TagAnt* (Anthony).¹ The corpora were then searched by *AntConc* (Anthony) and manually sorted for the following:

1. first-person writer-inclusive address – first person plural pronouns and verbs marked for the first person plural, including imperatives,
2. second-person address – second person singular and plural pronouns and verbs marked for the second person, including the imperative in its full forms, as well as abbreviations (such as *cf.*, see Section 4.2),
3. third-person address – the words *reader(s)* and *čitateľ/lia* 'reader(s)' (in all grammatical cases).

Instances with a general reference (e.g. references to the academic community or people in general and references to readers of a studied genre), including the first person plural, as in example (1), the second person, as in example (2), and the pronoun *one*, as in example (3) (cf. Biber et al. 331), as well as instances of addressing specific individuals rather than the reader in general, such as in example (4), were not included in the data.

- (1) *Tak ako sme v obchodných reťazcoch ovplyvnení vonkajším obalom výrobkov, vo svete vedy a výskumu sa obsah originálnej práce snaží „predať“ práve abstrakt. 'Just as at supermarkets we are influenced by the outer packaging of products, in the world of scientific research it is the abstract that tries to "sell" the contents of an original work.'* (SK16)

- (2) *There are different types of corpora (written vs. spoken, diachronic vs. synchronic, plain vs. annotated, monolingual vs. multilingual) and the texts are categorised (different corpora vary in categories but generally **you** can focus **your** searches and specify the subcorpora e.g. according to genre, register, style, etc. (NN6)*
- (3) *Furthermore, electronic dictionaries contain a number of useful and convenient features: academic words indication, help with writing, possibilities of making **one's** own word lists, opportunities to make **one's** own notes and comments within words... (NN22)*
- (4) *Thank **you** to the anonymous reviewer who provided this suggestion. (EN14)*

Similarly, cited examples, quotes, samples from questionnaires, etc., were disregarded, so that only instances referring to the reader of the given paper were retained.

4. Results and discussion

4.1. Reader address

The frequency of reader address is shown in Table 1. The native Slovak corpus has the highest overall frequency of the addressing the reader ($n = 476$), especially when normalized to 10,000 words (30.21). The raw frequency is similar in the native English corpus ($n = 449$), yet since its texts are longer, the normalized frequency is much lower (17.76 per 10,000 words). The frequency is the lowest in the non-native corpus, both raw ($n = 134$) and normalized (10.23 per 10,000 words).

How do these results compare to previous research? On the one hand, in Slovak we do not see the relative lack of engagement reported in some other Slavic languages (Chamonikolasová 83; Čmejrková and Daneš 54, Dontcheva-Navratilova, “Autorovy role” 51, “Cross-Cultural Variation” 169; Khoutyz, “Engagement Features” 14). However, it has to be borne in mind that the present study does not exhaust all types of engagement, so further research would be needed to obtain a complete picture of reader engagement in Slovak. On the other hand, we can see that Slovak authors writing in English underuse means of addressing the reader compared to their use in native English. The same has been found for Czech authors writing in English by Dontcheva-Navratilova (“Autorovy role” 51, “Cross-Cultural Variation” 169, “Lexical Bundles” 10). However, as Slovak authors writing in English underuse reader address also in comparison to native Slovak writing, one cannot assume that the lack of reader address in non-native English is a result of the authors’ culture. In sum, Slovak authors do not establish the same writer – reader relationship in English as in Slovak. One reason for this might be recommendations to avoid personal pronouns found in academic style guides, and the general trend of decreasing occurrence of reader engagement in L1 English (as pointed out to me by a reviewer). However, as reader engagement has a strategic persuasive function (see Section 2), a relative lack of reader engagement may weaken the persuasiveness of a research paper.

Corpus	Native English			Native Slovak			Non-native English		
	AF	%	NF	AF	%	NF	AF	%	NF
1 st person inclusive	160	35.6	6.33	185	38.86	11.74	65	48.5	4.96
2 nd person	282	62.8	11.15	289	60.71	18.34	69	51.5	5.27
3 rd person	7	1.6	0.28	2	0.42	0.13	0	0	0.00
Total	449	100.0	17.76	476	100.0	30.21	134	100.0	10.23

Table 1 The frequency of reader address in the corpora, both raw (AF) and normalized to 10,000 words (NF).

4.2. Second person address

I will now discuss each type of reader address in turn. The most frequent type of reader address is the second person address (cf. Table 1), representing about 61–63 percent in both native corpora, and 51.5 percent in the non-native corpus. Virtually all these instances are imperative forms of verbs – there is only a single case of the use of the second person addressing the reader in the indicative, which occurs in the native English corpus:

- (5) *And if monoclausal as if itself derives from a dependent clause (an adjunct adverbial clause), such a development would involve a double process of elision — the extremes of insubordination, if you will — first of the main clause and then of the content of the newly independent clause, leaving behind only the original subordinating conjunction.* (EN3)

Addressing the reader in the second person is not only limited to imperative forms; it is also restricted to a small number of verbs in all three corpora. More specifically, in the native English corpus it is restricted to the verbs *see* (210 occurrences), *note* (32), *compare* (6), typically in the form of the Latin abbreviation *cf.* (23), *recall* (4), *consider* (3), *take* (2) and *notice* (1). Similarly, the verbs occurring in the second person imperative in the non-native corpus are *cf.* (34), *see* (26), *consider* (3), and *let*, *take* and *note* (2 occurrences each). In the native Slovak, the verbs are *porovnaj* ‘compare’ (1), typically shortened to *porov.* ‘cf.’ (216), *pozri* ‘see’ (69), sometimes shortened to *p.* (4), and also *rozumej* ‘understand’ (1). It is interesting to note that the Slovak imperative forms are in the singular, as Slovak distinguishes between singular and plural form of address as a form of social deixis (cf. Levinson 119-121). Note that equivalent Latin phrases, such as *nota bene*, are also in the singular, as pointed out to me by Alexandra Brestovičová (pers. comm.). The use of the singular form of address appears to be in conflict with the distance expected in formal writing. However, it is not a sign of a close relationship between the writer and the reader; I propose instead that the imperative in academic discourse has become depersonalized, and its meaning is close to Slovak interjections such as *aha* (colloquial), *hľa* (poetic) and *lala* (archaic), which are used to draw the addressee’s attention to something. This impersonal character of the second person imperative, the limited number of verbs in the imperative,

and the abundant use of abbreviations all suggest that the imperative in academic discourse is a type of formulaic language.

The imperative (with associated abbreviations) has the function of signposting and, to a lesser extent, persuasion in all three corpora. It is generally used for the following: (i) to refer the reader to relevant published literature, either written by the given author or by other researchers, see example (6), (ii) to signpost the reader to another part of the text, such as a section, a table, a graph or a figure, see example (7), (iii) to draw the reader's attention to a particular detail, see example (8), and (iv) to make connections between various parts of an argument or between findings, see example (9).

- (6) *V našom lingvisticky zameranom výskume reči matiek orientovanej na dieťa sa venujeme charakteristike prototypovej lexiky,³ a to tak, že lexiku charakterizujeme v rámci jednotlivých slovných druhov (pozri Brestovičová, 2011, 2012, 2013).*
'In our linguistically-focused research of child-directed-speech by mothers we pursue the characterisation of prototype lexis³ by characterising the lexis in the scope of individual word classes (see Brestovičová, 2011, 2012, 2013).' (SK3)
- (7) *Hence, a face-threatening act potentially threatens all participants' faces, despite the fact that they may have a different degree of commitment to and/or presence in the act (cf. Figure 2).* (NN9)
- (8) *Note that COCA is equally divided among these genres.* (EN3)
- (9) *One likely reflection of this trend is the tendency for deontic must to occur more commonly than have to with first and second person subjects (where there is a stronger likelihood of an overbearing or imposing tone than is the case with third person subjects); compare the figure of 49.0 percent of first and second person subjects for deontic must in COOEE with that of 33.4 percent for deontic have to.* (EN8)

Note that the first two instances are textual acts – with (6) being an intertextual act and (7) an intratextual act (see Section 2), while the latter two are cognitive acts. The ratios of types of acts in the corpora are shown in Table 2. Physical acts do not appear in the corpora at all, as the research articles do not give any step-by-step instructions for replicating research. While the representations of textual acts (83%) and cognitive acts (17%) is the same in the native corpora, in the non-native corpus the dominance of textual acts (88%) over cognitive acts (12%) is slightly stronger. The reason for the greater amount of textual acts in the non-native corpus might be that non-native authors are less comfortable with cognitive acts: They tell the reader what to think and as such are more face-threatening than textual acts, which can actually be considered as mere additional information supplied by the writer. However, limited use of cognitive acts might weaken the persuasiveness of non-native texts.

Looking more closely at textual acts (cf. Table 2), we can see that while intertextual acts are more frequent than intratextual acts in all three corpora, their dominance is more apparent in the texts by Slovak authors. Overall, there are fewer intratextual acts in both raw and normalized frequencies in native Slovak and non-native English than in native English. The result confirms the relative lack of textual signposting found in academic Czech, Russian, and Bulgarian (Čmejrková and Daneš 55; Dontcheva-Navratilova, “Autovrovy role” 52, “Lexical Bundles” 18; Khoutyz, “Engagement Features” 11).

Corpus	Native English			Native Slovak			Non-native English		
	AF	%	NF	AF	%	NF	AF	%	NF
Textual	234	83.3	9.25	240	83.1	15.23	61	88.4	4.66
<i>Intratextual</i>	105	37.4	4.15	58	20.1	3.68	15	21.7	1.15
<i>Intertextual</i>	129	45.9	5.10	182	63.0	11.55	46	66.7	3.51
Cognitive	47	16.7	1.86	49	17.0	3.11	8	11.6	0.61
Physical	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00
Total	281	100.0	11.11	289	100.0	18.34	69	100.0	5.27

Table 2 The frequency of types of acts referred to by imperatives, both raw (AF) and normalized to 10,000 words (NF).

4.3. First person address

The first person inclusive address is relatively more frequent in the non-native corpus (48.5%) than in the native Slovak (39%) and native English (36%) corpora, cf. Table 1, at the expense of the second person address, as discussed above. However, in normalized frequency the first person address is the lowest in the non-native corpus (4.96 per 10,000 words) and the highest in the native Slovak corpus (11.74 per 10,000 words).

Čmejrková (28) points out that the first person plural in Czech and Slovak is typically connected to contemplating possibilities via modality and conditional clauses, and Khoutyz (“Engagement Features” 11, “Engagement” 144) notes a high number of plural directives. Therefore, I studied three features associated with the first person inclusive address – imperatives, see example (10), conditional clauses, see example (11), and modality, i.e. the use of modal verbs, see example (12).

- (10) *For the sake of illustration of the structure in question, **let us take a look** at the following example:* (NN30)
- (11) ***Ak sa** teraz **zameriame na** svedectvo v intenciách náboženskej komunikácie, bude namieste najskôr priblížiť či sformulovať jeho definíciu. ‘**If we** now **focus on** testimony in the framework of religious communication, it will be apt to outline or form its definition.’* (SK2)
- (12) *To identify the relative granularity of meaning, **we need to** track the amount and type of style shifting in a speaker’s discourse, noting whether variable features are finely tuned to interactional stance or not.* (EN23)

Their occurrence in the data is shown in Table 3. (Note that the numbers are not exhaustive, as there is first person inclusive address which is not associated with any of the three features; in addition, there is some overlap between modality and conditionals.)

Corpus	Native English			Native Slovak			Non-native English		
	AF	%	NF	AF	%	NF	AF	%	NF
Imperatives	3	1.88	0.12	39	21.08	2.47	6	9.23	0.46
<i>Textual</i>	2	1.25	0.08	20	10.81	1.27	4	6.15	0.31
<i>Cognitive</i>	1	0.63	0.04	19	10.27	1.21	2	3.08	0.15
Conditional clauses	12	7.5	0.48	24	12.97	1.52	13	20.0	0.99
Modality	62	38.75	2.45	71	38.38	4.51	24	36.92	1.83
Total	160	35.6	6.33	185	39.0	11.74	65	48.5	4.96

Table 3 Some features associated with first person inclusive address, in both absolute frequency (AF) and frequency normalized to 10,000 words (NF).

Imperatives are only marginal in inclusive address in native English (2%). In contrast, they are rather frequent in the non-native corpus (9%) and even more frequent in the native Slovak corpus (21%). In both the native English corpus and the non-native corpus, there is a preference for textual acts over cognitive ones, while in the native Slovak corpus the occurrence of textual and cognitive acts is virtually the same. Comparing these results to the imperatives in the second person (cf. Table 2), we see that the proportion of cognitive acts is higher with the first person (33% in both the EN and the NN and 49% in the SK corpus) than with the second person (17% in the EN and the SK corpus and 12% in the NN) in all three corpora, although there are fewer first person cognitive acts in total. The higher incidence of cognitive acts with the inclusive address in proportion to textual acts may be caused by two factors. First, as imperatives in the first person are not exclusive to the reader, they are less face-threatening than the imperative in the second person. Second, they are not limited to a small set of verbs. In English, the verbs *begin*, *get back to*, *take a look*, *demonstrate*, *group together* and *create a summary* are used. Slovak uses a greater variety of verbs, namely *zhrnúť* ‘summarize’, *ostať* ‘remain’, *zastaviť sa* and *pristaviť sa* ‘stop at’, *prejsť* ‘move on to’, *nazvať* ‘name’, *uviesť* ‘state’, *dodať* and *doplniť* ‘add’, *spomenúť* ‘mention’, *zamyslieť sa* ‘consider’, *predstaviť si* ‘imagine’, *pripomenúť* ‘recall’, *všimnúť si* ‘note’, *venovať/obrátiť pozornosť* ‘pay/turn attention to’, *skúsiť* ‘try’, *pozrieť* ‘look’, *načrtnúť* ‘sketch’, and *sledovať* ‘follow’. The textual acts in the inclusive plural are used to guide the reader through the text (cf. Tang & John 27), see example (13). However, in some cases this use of the inclusive address is peculiar, as the writer is obviously the one presenting knowledge yet still uses the inclusive imperative, cf. example (14).² This gives an impression that the reader has the same knowledge as the writer, who is merely mentioning it as a relevant fact. The writer thus shows that s/he considers the reader his/her equal, effectively decreasing the distance between them.

(13) *Prejdime teraz k výsostne praktickým dôvodom.*

‘Let us now move on to exclusively practical reasons.’ (SK14)

(14) *Odborná verejnosť schopnosť/neschopnosť používať materinský jazyk v zhode s jeho aktuálnymi normami hodnotí dosť nejednoznačne. Spomeňme aspoň zborník z*

konferencie Jazyková kultúra na začiatku tretieho tisícročia, ktorý editoval M. Považaj v roku 2008.

*'The expert community is rather ambiguous in its evaluation of the ability/inability to use the mother tongue in accordance with its current norms. **Let us mention** at least the conference proceedings Language culture at the turn of the third millennium edited by M. Považaj in 2008.'* (SK15)

Another aspect of the inclusive address followed in the study is conditional clauses. (For a detailed analysis of conditional clauses in academic discourse, see Warchał, "Moulding Interpersonal Relations".) As shown in Table 3, the ratio of conditional clauses used with the inclusive address is rather small in native English (7.5%); the ratios are higher in native Slovak (13 %) and especially in the non-native writing by Slovaks (20%). Conditional clauses are used to draw attention to particular data, cf. example (15), to introduce a viewpoint, cf. example (16), or make a concession, cf. example (17), and to make the reader accept the writer's premise, cf. example (18), or conclusion, cf. example (19).

- (15) ***If we examine** the individual scores of northern listeners (grey circles in Figure 4), we see that...* (EN16)
- (16) *To our knowledge, it is the largest existing parallel corpus, **if we take into account** both its size and the number of languages covered.* (NN30)
- (17) ***Even if we assert** that the peak in units 6 and 7 is discourse-linked, the fluctuation is very small.* (EN23)
- (18) *It is generally considered to be the core of modern semiotics, a discipline, which was founded by Saussure under the name semiology, but promoted by Peirce decades earlier **if we are to believe** the sources which we have no reason not to do (it was impossible to publish his findings).* (NN28)
- (19) ***Ak zohľadníme** povahu toho typu esejistiky [...] a **ak** ju (azda trochu neprávom a zjednodušujúco) **vyhlásime** za esejistický štandard, tak potom môžeme povedať, že... **If we take into account** the nature of this type of essay writing [...] **and if we call** it (perhaps a bit wrongfully and simplistically) the essay standard, **then we can say** that...' (SK19)*

In sum, inclusive address used with conditional clauses has a persuasive function. It follows that a relatively high amount of conditional clauses in the non-native corpus (0.99 per 10,000 words, compared to 0.48 in the EN and 1.52 in the SK) compensates for the lack of cognitive acts discussed in Section 4.2.

Lastly, modality is used with the inclusive address at approximately the same rate in all three corpora (37–39%). In frequency normalized per 10,000 words, however, the native Slovak corpus contains more modality with the inclusive person (4.51) than both the native English (2.45) and the non-native corpus (1.83). This result confirms high modality levels found in Czech (Čmejrková 28; Čmejrková and Daneš 47; Chamonikolasová 82).

Modality is typically used in the corpora to express ability, as in example (20), and possibility, as in example (21), with some overlap between the two. Modality in this use serves to hedge authors' claims, showing that "the same 'facts' can be viewed from different perspectives, and the approach taken by the author is just one of the many possibilities", as Warchał ("Moulding Interpersonal Relations", 141) puts it. The acknowledgement that

one's research admits other interpretations can be seen as a sign of authorial modesty. In addition, writers occasionally use modality to boost their claims when it expresses obligation, see example (22), or prediction, see example (23).

- (20) *In all the above-stated examples, **we can spot** the use of the subjunctive mood and that of modal verbs.* (NN30)
- (21) *Vo všeobecnosti **môžeme vyčleniť** tri druhy postojov, ktoré informátori zaujímajú k cudzosti jazykových xenosov – pozitívny, neutrálny a mierne negatívny. 'In general, **we can distinguish** three types of attitude that informants adopt towards the foreignness of language xenoses – a positive, neutral and slightly negative one.'* (SK7)
- (22) *Whichever position we take on this debate, **it is important that we do so** on the basis of a sound understanding of how widely-spread key linguistic features are across disciplines.* (EN11)
- (23) ***We will see** below, however, that the resulting patterns are surprisingly clear; by approaching the data from several empirical directions, **we will be able to** draw tentative conclusions from each, converging on an overall pattern of phonological transfer involved in the caught-cot merger.* (EN9)

4.4. Third person address

The third person is used only sporadically: in the native English corpus, there are only seven occurrences of *the reader* and *readers* in the total of five papers out of 30; in the native Slovak corpus, there are only two occurrences in a single paper, and the third person address does not appear at all in the non-native corpus.

The data found in the corpora serve: (i) to refer the reader to published literature, cf. example (24), (ii) to claim a common ground of shared knowledge with the reader, cf. example (25), (iii) to predict the reader's response, cf. example (26), or (iv) to invite an action on the part of the reader, cf. example (27).

Thus the third person address may substitute other forms, such *you/your* and the imperative for textual acts, as in (24), and physical acts, as in (27). The third form of address may feel more personal than a fixed expression like *see* or the distance-imposing second person pronoun *you*.

- (24) *For elaboration on the mathematical and meta-mathematical argument, and more authentic examples from RAs [research articles], I refer **the reader** to Kuteeva and McGrath (2015).* (EN17)
- (25) *Here, we will not recount the history of NA [needs analysis], which will already be familiar to **readers** of this journal and for which detailed accounts are available elsewhere (see, e.g., Hyland, 2009; Long, 2013a, 2015a; Norris, 2009).* (EN22)
- (26) *Uvedené príklady možno podnietili **čitateľovu** zvedavosť sledovať cestu odkryvania aspektov významu, ktoré oscilujú v architektonických termínoch. 'The given examples may have sparked **the reader's** interest in following the path of revealing the aspects of meaning oscillating in architectural terms.'* (SK14)
- (27) *(**Readers** might like to try this [an example task] for themselves.)* (EN26)

5. Conclusion

This paper has studied means of addressing the reader in academic discourse in three types of writing – native Slovak, native English, and non-native English by Slovak authors. I have found the following to hold across all three types of writing: The third person address (*the reader(s)*) and the second person indicative address (*you*) are used rarely, possibly due to the distance they (especially *you*) create between the writer and the reader. In contrast, the second person imperative is very frequent, despite the fact that it increases distance and is potentially face-threatening. To mitigate these undesirable effects, the second person imperative relies on formulaic language – a limited number of routine expressions, often abbreviated. In contrast, authors use the first person inclusive address to decrease the distance. They steer their readers to desired conclusions using conditional clauses and first person plural imperatives. At the same time, by hedging their claims with modal verbs, writers can choose to show that the path they are taking their readers on is just one out of many possibilities.

The comparison of reader address across the corpora reveals culture-specific features: For instance, I have found that Slovak authors use more conditional clauses with the inclusive address and refer the reader to other parts of the text to a lesser extent than Anglophone writers. Some features might not be transferred to L2 writing, however: this is the case of the high amount of modality used with the inclusive first person by Slovak authors in their L1 papers. In addition, there are features which are not transferred from the L1 but are specific to non-native writing by Slovak authors. Among such features are the low amount of cognitive acts and of reader address in general, which may decrease the persuasiveness of Slovak academic discourse written in L2 English.

Notes

¹ The advantage of TagAnt (Anthony) is that it attaches tags in a way that they can be hidden in the concordance; however, it does not tag Slovak, in contrast to TreeTagger (Schmid; Ó Duibhín). For these reasons, both taggers were used in the study.

² Note that *spomeňme* ‘let us mention’ does not allow a reader-exclusive meaning. While in English, *let us mention* is ambiguous between a reader-inclusive (equivalent of *let’s mention*) and reader-exclusive (equivalent of *let me mention*) reading, the imperative in Slovak has distinct forms for the two, namely the first person plural (*spomeňme* ‘let’s mention’) and the second person (*dovoľte mi/nám spomenúť* ‘let me/us mention’) imperative

Bibliography

Anthony, Laurence. *AntConc*. Computer software. Laurence Anthony’s Website. Vers. 3.4.4. Tokyo: Waseda University, 2014. Web. <<http://www.laurenceanthony.net/>>.

- . *AntFileConverter*. Computer software. Laurence Anthony's Website. Vers. 1.2.0. Tokyo: Waseda University, 2015. Web. <<http://www.laurenceanthony.net/>>
- . *TagAnt*. Computer software. Laurence Anthony's Website. Vers. 1.2.0. Tokyo: Waseda University, 2015. Web. <<http://www.laurenceanthony.net/>>.
- Biber, Douglas, et al. *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. London: Pearson, 1999.
- Brown, Penelope, and Stephen C. Levinson. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Chamonikolasová, Jana. "Comparing the Structures of Academic Texts Written in English and Czech." *Slovak Studies in English I*. Ed. Mária Huttová. Bratislava: Univerzita Komenského, 2005. 77–84.
- Čmejrková, Světa. "The (Re)Presentation of the Author in Czech and Slovak Scientific Texts." *Jezik in slovstvo* 52.3–4 (2007): 21–31.
- Čmejrková, Světa, and František Daneš. "Academic Writing and Cultural Identity: The Case of Czech Academic Writing." *Culture and Styles of Academic Discourse*. Ed. Anna Duszak. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1997. 41–62.
- Dontcheva-Navratilova, Olga. "Autorovy role a funkce zájmen v první osobě v odborných článkách anglofonních a českých lingvistů." *Časopis pro moderní filologii* 96.1 (2014): 42–57.
- . "Cross-Cultural Variation in the Use of Hedges and Boosters in Academic Discourse." *Prague Journal of English Studies* 5.1 (2016): 163–184.
- . "Lexical Bundles Indicating Authorial Presence: A Cross-Cultural Analysis of Novice Czech and German Writers' Academic Discourse." *Discourse and Interaction* 6.1 (2013): 7–24.
- Duszak, Anna. "Academic Discourse and Intellectual Styles." *Journal of Pragmatics* 21.3 (March 1994): 291–313.
- Hyland, Ken, and Feng Kevin Jiang. "'We must conclude that...': A Diachronic Study of Academic Engagement." *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 24 (December 2016): 29–42.
- . "Bringing in the Reader: Addressee Features in Academic Articles." *Written Communication* 18.4 (October 2001): 549–574.
- . "Community and Individuality: Performing Identity in Applied Linguistics." *Written Communication* 27.2 (April 2010): 159–188.
- . "Corpus Informed Discourse Analysis: The Case of Academic Engagement." *Academic Writing: At the Interface of Corpus and Discourse*. Eds. Maggie Charles, Diane Pecorari and Susan Hunston. London: Continuum, 2009. 110–128.
- . "Directives: Argument and Engagement in Academic Writing." *Applied Linguistics* 23.2 (June 2002): 215–239.
- Khoutyz, Irina. "Engagement Features in Russian & English: A Cross-Cultural Analysis of Academic Written Discourse." *Working Papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics* 13.1 (2013): 1–20.
- . "Engagement in Written Academic Discourse: A Cross-Cultural Study of Russian and English Research Articles." *International Journal of Russian Studies* 4.2 (July 2015): 135–160.
- Lafuente, Millán, Enrique. "Reader Engagement Across Cultures, Languages and Contexts of Publication in Business Research Articles." *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 24.2 (July 2014): 201–223.
- Levinson, Stephen C. "Deixis." *The Handbook of Pragmatics*. Ed. Laurence R. Horn and Gregory Ward. Oxford: Blackwell, 2004. 97–121.
- Myers, Greg. "The Pragmatics of Politeness in Scientific Articles." *Applied Linguistics* 10.1 (March 1989): 1–35.

- Ó Duibhín, Ciarán. *Windows Interface for Tree Tagger*. Computer software. S.l., 2016. Web. <<http://www.smo.uhi.ac.uk/~oduibhin/oideasra/interfaces/winttinterface.htm>>.
- Schmid, Helmut. *TreeTagger. A Part-of-Speech Tagger for Many Languages*. Computer software. University of Stuttgart, 2009. Web. <<http://www.cis.uni-muenchen.de/~schmid/tools/TreeTagger/>>.
- Tang, Ramona, and John Suganthi. "The 'I' in Identity: Exploring Writer Identity in Student Academic Writing through the First Person Pronoun." *English for Specific Purposes* 18 (December 1999): S23–S39.
- Thompson, Geoff. "Interaction in Academic Writing: Learning to Argue with the Reader." *Applied Linguistics* 22.1 (March 2001): 58–78.
- Vassileva, Irena. "Who Am I/Who Are We in Academic Writing?" *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 8.2 (December 1998): 163–185.
- Warchał, Krystyna. "Moulding Interpersonal Relations through Conditional Clauses: Consensus-Building Strategies in Written Academic Discourse." *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 9.2 (June 2010): 140–150.

Address:

Technical University of Košice

Department of Languages

Vysokoškolská 4

042 00 Košice

Slovakia

milada.walkova@tuke.sk