Abstract

私は誰？

　この論文は三編の学術論文における著者の直接的、間接的存在を実証的に考察するものである。これら三編の論文は英語で書かれ、沖縄県（日本）内の二大学から出版されたものである。考察の焦点は著者たちの一人称代名詞の使用法にある。一編の論文を詳細に考察した後、使用法と分布に関して仮説が組み立てられ、その後他の二編の論文について論究、実証する。

　This article documents an exploration of direct and indirect authorial presence in three academic articles. The articles were written in English and published in journals associated with two universities in Okinawa, Japan. The focus of investigation is the authors' usage of first-person pronouns. After detailed examination of one article, hypotheses of usage and distribution are formulated and then tested on two other articles.

First, which person?
By Karen Lupardus

　The topic of concern here is the means by which the authors of academic writing refer to themselves within the text and accompanying acknowledgements and notes of their published articles. It is recognized here also that authors may additionally, or instead, use means of concealment. My interest in this topic came about as a consequence of my having read the article "Where Does First Person Go across Time and Space?" written by my colleague Reijirou Shibasaki and published in this same journal a year ago. That article presented Shibasaki's interpretation of referential shifting, "the process of shifting or expanding the reference from one grammatical person to another," within the framework of intersubjectification. What interested me, however, in reading that article was Shibasaki's own use of both first-person-singular and first-person-plural pronouns as instruments to effect the delivery of his message that "forms for first person are likely to shift...reference to second person" (with examples given from Japanese and French).[1] This article therefore documents my exploration of direct and indirect authorial presence in academic articles, beginning with investigation of the writing of Shibasaki. From there observations will be made of similar, or different, stylistic features of other academic writers who I know personally, and who have published in academic journals here in Okinawa during the past ten years.

1. Introduction

Before introducing my methodology of investigation and the tentative hypotheses which I hope to test through investigation of the articles listed, it is best to make a few remarks about factors which may affect the manner in which an author presents himself, or herself. One interesting aspect of this research, for me, has been the fact that after analyzing the works of several authors, I then undertook the same procedures on some of my own publications, and was surprised at the results.

What is important to realize is that there is no one, unique, correct or best way to write a paper. The choices an author makes may be conscious or unconscious, but they reflect aspects of the author's style and are influenced by the author's expectations of readership, the author's familiarity and comfort with the topic, and current conditions that affect the author's likelihood to make the choices made. These next two subsections address, briefly, some of these issues and how I intend to handle this task.

1.1 Presence of the author

How a writer, particularly an academic writer, chooses to present himself (or herself) within the text and accompanying acknowledgements, notes, appendices, etc., is affected by a host of factors, including restrictions by receiving journals. However, the actual presentation, in terms of selection of linguistic forms, is in a very broad sense a matter of style. That is, the style may range from formal to informal, from direct to indirect, from assertive to suggestive, from simple to complex, from transparent to opaque, etc. The writer's ability to write in one or more "styles" may be the consequence of training, experience, inclination, opportunity, etc. It is not in my interest to inquire into issues of authorial intention, nor is it in my interest to attempt to demarcate lines of battle. No value judgment is inherent in the analysis presented here. I merely wish to present the result of my investigation of how a small number of English Department faculty use first-person-singular pronouns and first-person-plural pronouns to advance their observations, arguments, and discussion. I will also, however, extend that analysis to include observation of other ways in which to present a position or idea without using personal pronoun reference.

This article presents the results of primary research: fascinating, exploratory investigation of selected linguistic forms found, or not found, in the sources listed in the references at the end of this article. Secondary sources are not provided. Commentary and analysis are my own and will not include reference to the critical works of others. However, I wish to begin with a few remarks about the evolution of "style" as I have experienced it in nearly half a century of academic floundering.

1.2 Style as fashion

In the late fifties and through the sixties, to the best of my recollection, school children and students were instructed in suitable elements of style appropriate for term papers and serious forms of "objective" writing. Footnotes and references were sprinkled with Latin abbreviations: *e.g., i.e., cf., ibid, op. cit., loc. cit., vid., viz., ad nauseam.* We were chastised for using first-person pronouns, and were told that civilized and educated writers referred to themselves by third-person forms or through other indirection, such as passive construction and other evasive means, as, for example, claiming that the "report notes" and the "article claims" and the "book concludes" whatever it was that the author(s) wanted to say. Rhetoric was not only packaging, it was reality. That was the academic world of the ivory tower that cast its shadow on public education...or perhaps how the shadow was perceived by those not connected to the tower.

In the mid-sixties, when I was employed by Boeing Company in New Orleans, the non-academic, company-sponsored "clear writing" classes knocked out the Latinisms, spelled out under what conditions passive constructions were advisable, and cleaned up our prose so that people could understand what we wrote.

Back again in the academic fold during the late sixties and through the seventies, I found the sheep were being sheared by controversy and economic misfortunes and feminist criticism had begun to neuter the flock. A quarter of a century later, my occasional perusal of *Dissertation Abstracts* suggests to me that my English teachers are not resting in peace. Times have changed.

However, educators are notoriously slow at changing. As will be clear in my documentation of authorial reference, the style selected by contemporary academic writers tends to reflect the fashion of the time of their training. Acorns do not fall far from the tree, and leopards are not adept at changing their spots.

This presentation, however, will begin with two relatively fresh acorns: the writing of Reijirou Shibasaki (hereafter RS) and of Peter Simpson (hereafter PS). Lacking the requisite intellectual acumen that should enable me to understand the content of their writing, I restrict myself to the lowly task of categorizing forms. Both articles appear in the same issue of the *Journal of Foreign Languages* of Okinawa International University, vol.9, no.2 (March 2006). A third article, written by Masatsugu Oitate, appears in the same journal but it is written in Japanese. Therefore, as a substitute, an English-language article written by Oitate (hereafter MO), appearing in vol. 2 no.2 of the same journal (but in 1998, when he was closer to their age) will be similarly investigated.

2. Methodology

The procedures I have used in this investigation are the result of twenty years of humble investigation of pronominal forms, and other gender-identifying forms, both linguistic and visual, occurring in Japanese high school English textbooks approved by the Ministry of Education. During that period of investigation, I found it necessary to establish frameworks and criteria of investigation and notation compatible with the goal of comparative analysis. I therefore present here a similar type of systematic analysis which I used in reading the selected articles, which I identify here by the initials RS, PS, and MO.

Each article was read several times, in an effort not to overlook data, but I readily admit to being prone to human error, for which reason one reading was insufficient. First-person-singular pronouns were marked or circled in red; first-person-plural pronouns were similarly marked in pale blue; instances of impersonal-one which could be interpreted as functionally equivalent to indefinite pronominal reference that might take the form "you" in informal delivery were noted in the margin; instances of passive construction that implied a first-person agent were double-underlined in green; other evasive structures, if noticed, were also marked in green.

Each article was "outlined" according to the headings and/or subdivisions present. The number of paragraphs in each section or subsection was counted. The number of sentences per paragraph was also counted, especially wherever there was a color-ink indication of some linguistic form of interest. In some cases, a rough estimate was undertaken of the number of words. The reason for identification of outline form, number of paragraphs, and number of paragraph-internal sentences will become clear: such information provides important criteria for understanding the occurrence and distribution of forms, and therefore indirectly the potential effect of differences of selection.

The collection of forms (sometimes within the complete sentence, but sometimes with truncated sentences) is available in the attached appendix, which can be compared to the original, published texts. The data in that appendix are what is later tabulated to provide the results reported here. For purposes of abbreviation, sections are indicated by "S.", paragraphs by #, and sentences by "s." A sequence of two numbers divided by a virgule is sometimes used for providing additional information about paragraphs and sentences. For example, "S.4, #2/2, s.5/7" represents the location "Section 4, paragraph 2 (of two paragraphs in section 4), sentence 5 (of seven sentences in that paragraph)."

3. Initial findings and interpretation

Inasmuch as the RS paper was my first effort of pronominal analysis of academic argumentation (tabulation of personal pronouns that referred to or implied reference to the author), I begin my comparative research by first presenting the results of tabulation of RS forms and my tentative interpretation of the significance of selection and context of the pronominal forms. I then investigate the other two papers, PS and MO, to see whether they have followed similar patterns of presentation.

In general, the following were my initial findings based on an analysis of the RS forms.

1. Singular (*I* and *my*) marks assertion, intention, activity
2. Plural (*we, our,* and *us*) marks suggestions, prevarication or uncertainty, passivity
3. Negation is more likely to be associated with the plural than with the singular
4. Singular forms are more likely to appear in notes and acknowledgements.

My working hypothesis is that usage of first-person-pronominal forms by other academic authors is likely to support these observations. However, these findings, derived from analysis of the RS forms, are to be reformulated and restated as hypotheses after more detailed explanation of the data in RS.

The RS text is notable in that singular and plural first-person pronouns are relatively balanced in number (14 and 16 respectively) and also relatively balanced in terms of distribution within the article. However, there are some interesting discrepancies.

That is, aside from a rather cautious and modest abstract (which uses only the plural pronoun), the early part of the RS article is heavily laden with singular pronouns. However, following the author's review of the works of others and his claims about what he intends to show, we can observe that the discussion section, with the exception of the opening paragraph, is entirely within the domain of the weaker, inclusive, first-person-plural pronoun.[2]

Analysis of the stylistic effect of usage of first-person pronouns in RS suggests that the inclusive plural pronoun is used in order to invite support and acceptance from the reader in an attempt to persuade the reader to accept the "discussion" as valid. Then, assuming no argument or disagreement is advanced by the reader (!), the author concludes the article with an assertive (first-person-singular) but modest claim, followed by an acknowledgement which is strongly self-directed with its sequence of three first-person-singular pronouns dominating the last two sentences of the article.

My interpretation of this sequencing of pronominal forms is that the author himself lacks confidence in the validity of his assertions which are discussed in section four of his

article. The placement of pronominal forms is designed, consciously or unconsciously, to convey the appearance of reliability while depending on acceptance from the reader, who is "invited" to participate implicitly in the findings presented by the author.

4. Test case #1: RS

RS uses both first-person singular and first-person plural pronouns. Inasmuch as there is no mention of joint authorship or team-based analysis, I interpret the usage of first-person plural pronouns as being an invitation to include the second-person reader. Usage of first-person plural as inclusive of the second-person addressee tends to encourage comradeship, support, reduction of hostility, and, perhaps, is an unconscious borrowing of the techniques that Coleridge claims to provide the fundamental base for fiction: the suspension of disbelief.

Analysis of the distribution of first-person singular and first-person plural pronouns in RS suggests that the singular pronoun is the <u>dominant pronoun</u> and the plural pronoun is the <u>secondary (non-dominant) pronoun</u>. Results of my long-term investigation of women's image in high school English textbooks, along with involvement in statistical analysis of stratified labor, has revealed to me recurrent tendencies in the representation of secondary or non-dominant persons (a term I prefer over "minority"). The results of my research include such matters as dominant persons being more likely to occur pronominally in the nominative case, non-dominant persons in oblique (non-nominative) cases; also, there are statistically recurrent "peaks" for dominant:non-dominant ratios in restrictive domains, centering principally around the respective ratios 60:40, 75:25, 85:15, particularly where total non-dominant members may outnumber dominant members.

RS contains five pronominal forms which appear to be used in reference to the author or the author-reader dyad: first-person singular (nominative "I" and genitive "my"), and first-person plural (nominative "we," genitive "our," and accusative "us"). Those five items appeared a total of 30 times, including the abstract, the text, one of five footnotes, and acknowledgements. The distribution of those pronouns is given here in Table 1. It should be noted that the first-person plural pronoun has a greater inventory of forms used than does the singular pronoun; also the total number of incidences is slightly greater. It is the distributional patterns of the singular and plural pronouns that suggest to me that the plural pronouns are non-dominant.

TABLE 1: Inventory and Distribution of Pronouns

Location	Para/Sent	First-person singular		First-person plural		
		Nom.	Poss.	Nom.	Poss.	Acc.
Abstract	1/5				1	
1	3/13	1		1		1
2	4/21	1	1	1		
3	4/10	5		1	1	
(footnote)		1				
4	1/4	2				
4.1	3/15			1	3	1
4.2	2/12			5		
5	1/7	1				
Ackn.	1/2	1	1			
TOTAL	20/89	12	2	9	5	2
		14		16		

NOTE: The column "Location," at left, divides the article into sections, with section four having two additional subsections. The column "Para/Sent" provides for each section, or subsection, the total number of paragraphs and the total number of sentences contained therein. The other columnar numbers refer to the number of incidences of the given form labeled at the top of the column. There are a total of 30 first-person pronouns, classifiable as singular or plural, nominative or possessive (i.e. genitive) or accusative.

As can be seen, the total number of singular and plural first-person pronouns is nearly identical, with only two more plural pronouns than singular (47% of the first-person pronouns are singular). However, 86% of the singular pronouns are in the nominative case, while only 56% of plural pronouns are in the nominative. Put another way, the non-nominative plural forms outnumber the non-nominative singular forms more than three-to-one. Accepting nominative forms as hierarchically dominant, it is clear that though numerically the plural forms slightly outnumber the singular forms, the first-person-singular pronoun is dominant. This matter of "dominance" will be seen again below.

In the following subsections, attention will be given first to the non-nominative cases, accusative before genitive, simply because the lesser number will be dealt with first.

4.1 Accusative pronouns

It is noteworthy that RS has no instance of *me* though *us* appears twice. In both cases, the pronoun is the patient of the verb: (bold is added here; underlining represents italics in the original; elsewhere here, added emphasis will be shown by bold and by underlining).

Before going any further, let us consider the following example.
((S.1, #2/2, s.2/3; followed by a sentence explaining the function of boldface, and then the article's first cited example.)

This example challenges us to take a fresh look at Descartes' Cogito, ergo sum or Socrates' Know Thyself.
(S.4.1, #1/3, s.2/9; the sentence immediately follows the seventh cited example)

In numerous studies of gender differences, such as in the use of gender in examples cited by linguists, it has often been noted that males tend to be agentive and females are in the accusative, often the patient of the verb (males do, females are done to). In RS, the weaker, less specific, plural pronoun is subjected, if I may put it that way, to being subordinated into objective case whereas the stronger singular pronoun is singularly protected from such potential abuse.

4.2 Genitive (possessive) pronouns

RS presents two instances of *my* in contrast to five instances of *our*. The first occurrence of *our* is in the last sentence of the abstract: *Our survey results propose....* Three other instances of *our* are each followed by the noun *proposal*, all three occur in section 4.1:

Our proposal...may give insight... (First of nine sentences)
If our proposal is correct... (Third of nine; note that this is a subordinate clause)
Our proposal proves to be appropriate. (Last of nine)

Clearly, four out of five of the instances of the genitive plural *our* are associated with the noun proposal or the verb propose, indicating a condition of uncertainty or suggestion. Three of those instances are strong in the sense that the pronoun *our* begins the sentence. Of the three instances of the expression *our proposal*, two are subjects of the main clause. The remaining instance of *our* is the following, which is the last of four sentences in the opening paragraph of section three (underlining added here).

Although premature conclusions are to be avoided ...I will show that referential shifting can contribute to our understanding of intersubjectification.

As can be seen, *our understanding* is the object of the preposition *to*, while the subject of the higher clause is the first-person singular pronoun.

The collocation *our understanding* contrasts sharply with the two instances of the pronoun *my*: *my knowledge* (section 2), and *my own* (in the last sentence of the acknowledgements). Although the phrase *my own* there means *my fault*, it still contains the stronger sense of definiteness and ownership. Similarly, *knowledge* can be seen as stronger and more specific than *understanding*: one can have misunderstanding, but there is no similarly negated form of *knowledge*.

It is worth noting, again, that of the five instances of *our*, three are modifiers of the subject of the main clause. By contrast, both instances *my* are not subjects of the main clause, but both fall within superlative or all-inclusive modification:

> *...to the best of my knowledge...*
> *Any remaining fault is all my own...*

Thus we can see that the possessive pronoun our is associated with uncertainty (proposals and understanding) whereas the possessive pronoun *my* is associated with definiteness (knowledge) and with emphasis of a complete or full nature (*best* and *all*). Inasmuch as *our* includes the addressee (the *you*) whereas *my* excludes the addressee, it is clear that the speaker/writer is presented to be in a stronger position than the listener/reader.

4.3 Nominative pronouns

As mentioned previously, RS presents twelve instances of the usage of *I* but only nine of the usage of *we*. Of the twelve, nine are instances of the phrase *I will*. The associated verbs are, in order: *examine, illustrate, treat, show, add, probe, address, propose, examine*. In total, there are only nine instances of phrases with *we*. Of the nine instances of the word *we*, only two occur with the modal *will* (section 4.1 *we will turn to...* and section 4.2 *we will not pursue...*).

It is noteworthy that nearly half (four of nine) instances of *we* occur with the negative *not*. No negative expression occurs with the first-person singular nominative pronoun.

> *we cannot assume* (Sect.1, para.#1, sent.5/5)
> *we cannot ignore* (Sect.3, para.#4/4, sent.2/2)
> *we cannot assume* (Sect.4.2, para.#2/2, sent.5/7)
> *we will not pursue* (Sect.4.2, para.#2/2, sent.6/7)

It is noteworthy that the assertive *will* (a simple indication of future which carries additionally an implication of intention) is associated with 75% of the instances of first-

person singular, but with only 22% of first-person plural. Also, the negative *not*, which is absent from connection with first-person singular, is connected with nearly 50% of the instances of first-person plural.

4.4 Other features of distribution

RS can be analyzed as having 20 paragraphs in total, ranging from one to nine sentences in length, excluding internal citations or tables, but including the abstract and acknowledgements. Having noted for each instance of first-person pronouns the position of the containing sentence within the respective paragraph, I noticed some interesting characteristics of distribution, shown in Table 2.

TABLE 2. Incidences of first-person pronouns according to sentence position within a paragraph

	Singular	Plural
In first sentence of a paragraph	7	2
In last sentence of a paragraph	5	6
In interior sentences of a paragraph	2	7
In a one-sentence paragraph		1
Total incidences	14	16

NOTE: This table shows the number of first-person pronouns, regardless of case, occurring in first or last sentence (or other sentence for paragraphs of more than two sentences). One paragraph had only one sentence, the third and final paragraph of subsection 4.1 (which contained the phrase *we will turn to...*)

A mere glance at Table 2 reveals a notable inversion: the numbers seven and two occur in the distributional count of both singular and plural first-person pronouns, but in complementary distribution. For singular pronouns, the greatest frequency is in a paragraph-initial sentence, and the smallest frequency is in paragraph-interior sentences. The reverse is true for plural pronouns.

In research on the position of females, the less-dominant gender, I observed that females tended to be found in interior positions. Here also, the "weaker" pronoun occurs disproportionately often in interior positions. The singular pronoun tends to occur in the opening or closing sentence of a paragraph, and the plural pronoun tends to occur in an interior or final sentence of a paragraph.

Another feature of the distribution of males and females in high school textbooks was that females tended to be clustered in fewer places whereas males tended to be distributed more widely. The same type of distribution can be found here, as Table 3 reveals.

TABLE 3. Number of instances of first-person pronouns in each (sub) section

	Singular	Plural
Abstract		1
Section 1	1	2
Section 2	2	1
Section 3	6	2
Section 4	2	
Subsection 4.1		5
Subsection 4.2		5
Section 5	1	
Acknowledgements	2	

As can be seen from the above table, most of the sections have one or two of each of the two types of pronouns, first-person singular or first-person plural. Nonetheless, Section 3 contains six, or 43% of the total number of singular pronouns whereas ten of sixteen, or 62.5%, of plural pronouns are found in Section 4 (specifically the two subsections, not the introductory paragraph),

Another notable distribution is that the initial appearance of a first-person pronoun is in the abstract (and in section 1), but it is a plural pronoun, whereas the singular pronoun appears to the exclusion of the plural in section 5 and in the acknowledgements. Similarly, in high school textbooks, females tended to appear more prominently in early chapters, only to fade out entirely by the end of the book.

5. Reformulation of hypotheses

Based on the preceding discussion and detailed analysis of the 30 instances of first-person pronominal forms occurring in RS, it is possible to specify more precisely the hypotheses to be tested.

Hypothesis #1   There will be notable differences between the usage of first-person-singular and first-person-plural pronouns in terms of function and/or distribution.

Hypothesis #2   First-person-**singular** forms are likely to be used if the writer is attempting to be assertive, is expressing the intention to demonstrate something, is presenting an opinion with a sense of assurance, is exhibiting qualities of activity.

Hypothesis #3   First-person-**plural** forms are likely to be used if the writer is presenting a suggestion in a tentative manner, or is suggesting uncertainty or unreliability, or is exhibiting qualities of passivity.

Hypothesis #4   In the presence of **negation,** the probability is that the chosen first-person pronoun will be **plural.**

Hypothesis #5   Appearance of first-person pronouns in the **abstract** and/or **introduction** is likely to be **plural.**

Hypothesis #6   Appearance of first-person pronouns in **acknowledgements** and **notes** is likely to be **singular.**

Hypothesis #7   Regarding matters of case, first-person-**singular** is likely to be dominantly **nominative** while the plural forms are likely to show greater occurrence in the non-nominative case.

6.   Test Case #2: PS

The format of presentation of PS is notably different from that of the previous article, RS, which covered slightly more than eight pages of the journal, excluding the references, and was presented in twenty paragraphs (as I counted them), including abstract and acknowledgement, but not counting the paragraphs of notes nor, of course, the references. RS also included ten numbered citations and two tables.

PS covers eleven pages, including the abstract at the beginning, an introduction, four titled but unnumbered sections, a conclusion and a brief acknowledgement. Notes and references follow. The body of the text, from Introduction to Conclusion, is comprised of 51 paragraphs, the majority of which are single-sentence paragraphs; less than a third of the paragraphs in PS contain more than two sentences, a fact which could limit the type of distributional analysis employed in this research. PS begins with a page of three extended quotations accounting for about 25 lines of text, the shortest of the three being the last, comprised of two lines and two sentences, the first of which includes the first and second appearances of a first-person pronoun. Those pronouns, however, are artifacts of quotation and are not to be attributed to the author, though they were presumably selected by the author of PS. However, it is worth noting that both are plural. The sentence itself is as follows:

We need a new way of knowing and being organisms that will prevent us from mistaking organisms for instruments and machines.

The abstract of PS appears at the top of the second page, and is distinct from the rest of the article because it is in italics. It contains no reference to the author. The initial sentence begins with the words, "The following article revisits...." The second, and final, sentence of the abstract opens with an extended, complex participial phrase ("By returning...."), following which the main clause begins with the words "the article is intended to draw attention...." The author is hidden, subordinate to the article itself.

There are substantial differences in style between RS (with its seven numbered sections or subsections, ten citations, and two tables) PS (with unnumbered but titled sections and half a dozen block quotations) that might affect analysis such as that undertaken here. As it turns out, whereas analysis of the distribution of the thirty first-person pronominal forms in RS provided interesting results when paragraph-internal sentence-position was considered, a similar approach is not as easily undertaken with PS. However, that is almost a moot issue: only six of the 51 paragraphs in PS contain a first-person pronominal form (for a total of eight such pronouns), and only one of those paragraphs is a single-sentence paragraph.

More importantly, of the eight first-person pronominal forms in the text of PS, excluding acknowledgements and notes, only one is a singular pronoun. It appears in paragraph seven of a thirteen-paragraph section. Within that paragraph, it appears in the first of five sentences; that sentence is quoted entirely here (given here in italics, the first-person pronoun emphasized here in bold):

#7/13 s.1/5 *In fairness to the authors, limited concessions are made to the concept of schematic knowledge, central to the forms of linguistic enquiry loosely described as 'experientialist' - and from which **my** own approach is derived.*

The other, seven first-person pronominal forms are plural.

The introduction and the four-paragraph section that follows are without first-person pronominal forms. The first appearance of the pronoun is in the next section, a fourteen-paragraph section, with two occurrences, as presented here.

#3/14 s.3/4 *In addition, if **we** are to go along..., what, then....?*
#6/14 s.1/3 *One such example...predicated on **our** physical experience of the world, is then extended....*

In neither of these, however, does it appear that the author is using the plural form as a cover of authorial intention. Both refer to a reader's interpretation or analysis of a

metaphorical analysis external to the text. However, inasmuch as the first of these two includes a conditional, it is valuable here to recall RS S.4.1 s.3/9: *If our proposal is correct....* Conditional forms did not occur with the first-person singular in RS.

The next section in PS, thirteen paragraphs in length, contains in the seventh paragraph the only first-person singular pronoun, cited above, as well as another plural pronoun:

> #7/13 s.3/5 ...*the nature of this limitation is <u>never</u> explored, and all **we** are left with ...is an interim conclusion....*

Here the negative adverbial "never" is underlined. Recall that in RS no negative forms appeared with the singular first-person pronoun, only with the plural pronoun.
The next appearance of a plural first-person pronoun is more indirectly connected with a negative construction. The pronoun appears in a clause introducing a block quotation:

> #13/13 s.3/4 *Thus, **we** are informed:*
> *<u>Only</u> when the cognitive workload is reduced does one get...*

Notice that the quoted statement (given here, as in PS, in a smaller font size) begins with a negative adverbial expression (underlined here) which triggers the subsequent subject-verb inversion.

In the next section, eleven paragraphs in length, there are two more instances of the first-person-plural pronoun, both appearing in the third paragraph, a three-sentence paragraph. The first is a suppositional opening of the paragraph. The next introduces the consequences of the supposition.

> #3/11 s.1/3 *Let **us** suppose for the sake of argument that...*
> #3/11 s.2/3 ***We** are <u>nevertheless</u> left with the problem of motivation.*

This last pronominal form is quoted in its entirety. There is an implication of something negative or insufficient in the emphatic expression "nevertheless."

Finally, there is one last first-person plural pronoun, and it appears in the last two words of the first sentence-paragraph of the conclusion:

> #1/5 s.1/1 ...*very much a product of its time, and, <u>unfortunately</u>, of **our** own.*

Again, the pronoun occurs in the context of negativity, in this case, modified by an adverb with a negative prefix.

As has been seen, among eight first-person pronominal forms in the body of the article, excluding the two first-person-plural forms in the quoted sections which appeared before the abstract, there was only one first-person-singular pronoun, and it occurred in an oblique case: *my own approach*. It is perhaps worth taking a moment to compare that instance, which clearly refers to the author, with this last cited, genitive expression of the first-person plural pronoun: *of our own*. Not only is the pronoun in the genitive, modifying *own*, it is also subordinate to the preposition *of*, and is thus doubly weakened. Recall that the first-person-singular form appeared in the relative clause, *from which my own approach is derived*. We now have two instances of first-person-pronoun + *own* to compare. Which of the two is stronger?

First of all, the singular form is unequivocally identified with the author, whereas the plural form clearly includes both author and reader and presumably others. If there is strength in numbers, the question is answered, but the concern here is a "strength" comparable to the hypotheses presented earlier which suggest that the first-person-singular pronoun is in various ways dominant in relationship to the first-person-plural form. Here the singular pronominal form is within a clause, though introduced by a preposition. The plural pronominal form is introduced also by a preposition, but is merely part of a noun-phrase within a prepositional phrase:

My own approach is derived from [certain] forms of linguistic enquiry ⇒

...forms of linguistic enquiry...from which my own approach is derived.

Both instances, *my own* and *our own*, are part of a sentence-terminal constituent. However, in the case of the singular form, the expression *own* is adjacent to the noun it modifies: *approach*. In the case of the plural form, the modifier *own* is distanced from the noun it modifies, which, in fact, is elided. That which the first-person-singular pronoun "owns" is at hand, but that which the first-person-plural pronoun "owns" is only implied, it is not there at hand, and its earlier, parallel appearance (*time*) is far removed from the expression *our own*, separated by three words (which do not participate in a syntactic unit) and three pause-inducing commas, with intonational drop in pitch and an intrusive negative modifier. The expression *our own* is left dangling at the end of a sentence in a much less cohesive manner than what we find in the sentence-terminal unit which contains the phrase *my own*.

However, we have not finished with collecting instances of first-person pronouns in PS. As it turns out, the acknowledgements begins with the first-person-singular pronoun in nominative case, *I would like to thank*.... The word *would* is not part of a conditional construction to be followed with "if I could...," but provides appropriate distance for the purpose of conveying politeness. The first-person-singular pronoun occurs also in the first note, in nominative case, within a relative clause:

...the article, which I was initially encouraged to read....

Although the pronoun is in the nominative case, semantically it is the patient of the verb *encourage*, and as such it is perhaps hierarchically "weaker" than the agent of the verb, which, in this case, is unexpressed. The author provides the locative expressions, but does not inform the reader who (which teacher) actually "encouraged" him to read the identified article.

The complete list of ten instances of first-person pronominal forms is given in the appendix where the items are assigned a reference number, PS1 through PS10, for ease of reference.

The following are the hypotheses previously listed, and shown here as being supported or countered by the 10 occurrences of first-person forms found in PS.

Hypothesis #1   There will be notable differences between the usage of first-person-singular and first-person-plural pronouns in terms of function and/or distribution.
    Supported by the findings in PS.

Hypothesis #2   First-person-**singular** forms are likely to be used if the writer is attempting to be assertive, is expressing the intention to demonstrate something, is presenting an opinion with a sense of assurance, is exhibiting qualities of activity.
    Supported by PS3, PS9

Hypothesis #3   First-person-**plural** forms are likely to be used if the writer is presenting a suggestion in a tentative manner, or is suggesting uncertainty or unreliability, or is exhibiting qualities of passivity.
    Supported by PS1, PS6

Hypothesis #4   In the presence of negation, the probability is that the chosen first-person pronoun will be **plural.**

Supported by PS4, PS5, PS7, PS8

Hypothesis #5   Appearance of first-person pronouns in the **abstract** and/or introduction is likely to be **plural.**

No support, but not rejected.

Hypothesis #6   Appearance of first-person pronouns in **acknowledgements** and notes is likely to be **singular.**

Supported by PS9, PS10

Hypothesis #7   Regarding matters of case, first-person-**singular** is likely to be dominantly **nominative** while the plural forms are likely to show greater occurrence in the non-nominative case.

Supported by the findings in PS.

As can be seen, though there are few instances of first-person pronouns in PS, and there are substantial organizational and stylistic differences between PS and RS, nonetheless the data from PS support the hypotheses suggested by analysis of RS, or at least do not challenge them.

7. Test Case #3: MO

The article referred to here as MO is substantially longer than either of the previous articles, and it was published eight years earlier. The abstract for MO is in Japanese. The acknowledgements exhibit only first-person-singular forms, one in the nominative (*I am appreciative*) followed by three in the genitive (*my seminar classes; my thanks; and my paper*). As for the notes, note one has the phrase *my concern in this paper*, and note two has the expression *my analysis*. This data supports Hypothesis 6.

As for the introduction, though there is no labeled introduction, MO does have an initial three paragraphs which function as an introduction. The initial paragraph has no first-person pronoun. The second paragraph begins with the words:

In this paper I will demonstrate...(p.92, #2/3 s.1/3)

The third paragraph begins with the following words (emphasis added):

> *Addressing first the implications of the protagonist's name Mann, we find two sets of
> ...contrasts: (1) man as a human being vs a sub-human..., and (2) ...a man with
> ...vs a man with....* (p.92, #3/3 s.1/6)

The first example of first-person-singular supports Hypothesis 2, while the example of first-person-plural, a bit further into the third paragraph, supports Hypotheses 1 and 3.

Support for the other Hypotheses may be more difficult to obtain from MO. As can be seen in Table 4, occurrences of the presumably dominant pronoun, the first-person-singular pronoun, are strikingly outnumbered by occurrences of the first-person-plural pronoun. Moreover, as regards case, the situation in MO is not as striking as that in RS. That is, in RS there was a wider range of case forms for the plural pronoun, and a smaller percentage of plural forms occurred in the nominative, in comparison with the singular forms. In MO, however, there is only one non-nominative instance of the first-person-plural pronoun, the remaining 26 being in the nominative case. It is the first-person-singular which exhibits proportionately more variation in case. That is, in the body of the text, 60% of the first-person-singular forms are nominative, 40% genitive. There is no plural genitive, but there is one accusative form. This means that although Hypothesis #1 is supported by MO, Hypothesis #7 must be modified. An important consideration, discussed with regard to RS, is that the accusative case is not represented in MO in the singular but only in the plural first-person forms. It may be advisable to modify Hypothesis #7 in that regard.

A striking feature of MO is that in the progress of the article, that is, in the body of the text, the nominative first-person singular pronouns give way to the genitive form, and across the board, the singular pronouns yield position of dominance to the plural pronouns. This is quite noticeable in Table 4.

TABLE 4. Placement (frequency) of pronominal forms

	Size	I	my	we	us
(Introduction)	(5%)	1		1	
I	(22%)	1		1	
II	(3%)	1		2	
IIA	(16%)		1	3	
IIB	(23%)		1	6	1
IIC	(21%)			10	
III	(10%)			3	
Acknowledgements		1	3		
Notes			2		
Total		5	7	26	1

As indicated earlier, even in the acknowledgements, though there is no occurrence of the plural pronoun, the number of genitive instances of first-person-singular outnumber the nominative three-to-one.

Although in terms of frequency of occurrence, relative position within the text, and inflectional form (case), the first-person-plural pronoun seems to dominate the first-person-singular, it is important to consider collocation with verbs and, in the case of the genitive, with nouns. The relevant information is provided in Table 5.

TABLE 5. Verbs and expressions associated with the pronouns

	I	my	we	us
contention		1		
interpretation		1		
demonstrate	1			
point	1			
interpret	1		1	
consider			3	
think			3	
conclude			1	
recall			1	
might) call			1	
see			5	
recognize			4	
notice			1	
find			1	
give attention to			1	
might imagine			1	
learn			1	
return			1	
remind				1

NOTE: Nouns are listed first, and the verb which has the pronoun in the accusative is listed last. The other verbs are arranged (1) by association with the singular form, and (2) in rough semantic grouping. The verb "see" shows five appearances with "we", but actually there are another two where "seen" appears adjectively in a preceding phrase or clause.

In MO it is noteworthy that active performative behavior, such as indicated by the expressions "demonstrate" and "point," are associated only with the singular pronoun. Curiously only one verb is shared by both singular and plural forms, and that is the verb "interpret." Many of the verbs associated with the plural form are ones which might be expected to occur with the singular form, but they are nonetheless mostly in the realm of cognition or passive reception of information, and to that extent there is at least weak support here for Hypotheses #1, 2, and 3.

MO provides no examples of negative constructions associated with first-person pronouns, though as is evident in the collection of data listed here in the appendix, MO contrasts with RS by linking the future/assertive "will" with the plural pronoun. In this context, the assertiveness is presumed not to be the essential feature. What was so notable in RS was the absence of "will" associated with the plural form. In this regard, it may be advisable to modify the hypotheses accordingly.

8.   Conclusion: Other test cases and future research

Time and space do not permit detailed presentation of other test cases, though I might remark that I have so far found support for at least some of the hypotheses in all the sources I have checked, others being listed in the references.

As mentioned earlier, it is not necessary for authors to resort to first-person pronominal forms for self-expression; there are other alternatives available to authors for representing their views. One alternative is reference to the author in terms of a third-person expression such as "the (present/current) author/writer." This alternative is the one used by William T. Randall, whose 52-page article (WTR), published in 1996, has no first-person-singular pronouns, though he presents about twenty instances of the plural pronoun. WTR uses the expression "the writer" even in the notes. It may be noteworthy that he opens his article with the following paragraph which is striking for the variety of cases in which the plural pronoun appears. Further research may show that an author reveals his or her pattern of pronominal usage early in the article.

> The choice of whether or not we shall live in a global village is not ours to make. Rather, that is established and the only choices left to us in this matter relate to how we may adjust to life on planet earth—which has already become one village.(WTR, p.52)

As has been made abundantly clear to me in undertaking this research, writers have many options to them in their presentation of self. One of the more interesting papers which I

read and analyzed for usage of pronominals was the one by my former student, Katsuyuki Miyahira (KM), who is now on the faculty at the University of the Ryukyus. Unlike WTR, the expression "the author" in KM refers only to other authors, of works cited. KM uses very few pronominal expressions of self, specifically *we* and *one,* and seemingly reserves the first-person-singular form until the very final, concluding paragraph of his article, though he curiously buries the pronoun in the middle of that final paragraph.

The usage of pronominal reference, or alternative expressions, including impersonal and passive forms, exhibits wide variety among writers. A closer examination of usage, however, may reveal recurrent tendencies. It may also reveal a very great deal about the author's self-image or his/her confidence in what is being presented in the article being written. I found that an analysis of my own writing showed substantial variation from article to article, but also revealed a great deal more than I had anticipated communicating. I hope in the future to mine my own writing for this very purpose of coming to a better understanding of authorial usage of pronominal forms of reference.

NOTES

1   The first quotation, identifying the meaning of "referential shifting" is taken from Shibasaki's abstract on page 43; the second quotation is from the last section, "Envoi," on page 50. On 12 July 2006, I presented Mr. Shibasaki with a copy of my analysis of his usage of pronominal forms, but he has been too busy to respond to my comments; six months later, therefore, I requested his permission to publish my analysis. He asked only that my analysis not be limited to his prose alone, for which reason I undertook a similar analysis of a number of other university-published articles written in English by both native speakers of English and by native speakers of Japanese.

According to the Shibasaki article referred to here, Shibasaki's interest in pronouns includes synchronic, cross-linguistic, and diachronic perspectives with a view towards challenging the assumption that "the formal properties of personal pronouns in European languages represent ...relevant standard[s] for deciding whether personal pronouns in Asian languages constitute a grammatical category" (p.43). This article that I am presenting stays clear of all such discussion and merely presents a myopic view of the data at hand, obtainable and verifiable by anyone who has access to the articles listed in my references.

2   The identification of the first-person-plural pronoun as "weaker" than the first-person-singular pronoun may be contested. Later in this article, I present some of the reasons for this claim. However, I may also remark that the notion of pronominal hierarchy, with first person being higher on the hierarchy than second person, is included in Shibasaki's work. Second person, of course, is potentially included semantically within the plural form of first-person pronouns.

APPENDIX: The Data

Presented here are truncated sentences taken from the primary sources. Sentences were selected which provided instances of first-person pronominal forms.

In the case of RS, since sections were named and numbered, the presentation here follows that sysem. Before each entry there is a designation of location. Roman numerals are subsections. The lower case "s" means "sentence" with two numbers following referring to the sentences in the paragraph. Thus "s.4/5" means that the sentence used as source was the fourth of five sentences. In the case of RS, all examples are given in sequence. In the case of MO, the placement of "[italics mine]" was not significant, and there were three such placements; they are not placed in order of the other examples but are instead gathered together at the end of the listing. Additionally, in the case of MO, paragraph number per section is indicated by "#" such that #3/5 means third paragraph of five. For MO, a much lengthier article, page numbers are indicated also.

Data from RS

Note: In the following, "X" refers to the appearance of any cited form; the sentence-count for paragraphs is separated by commas. Thus section 1 has three paragraphs, of five, five, and three sentences, with cited material appearing within paragraphs two and three.

Abstract (one paragraph, 5 sentences)

> s.5/5 *Our* survey results propose...

1. Referential Shifting (3 paragraphs: 5, 3+X+2, 1+X+2)

> I.s.4/5 ... I will examine...

> s.5/5 ... *we* canNOT assume...

> II.s.2/3 ... let us consider...

2. First Person Forms and Referential Shifting (4 paragraphs: 2+X+5, 5, 7, 2)

> I.s.1/5 ... I will illustrate...

> s.3/5 ... *we* have examined...; however, *to the best of* my *knowledge*...

3. Intersubjectification (4 paragraphs: 4, 2+X, 1+X+1, 2)

> I.s.1/4 ... I will treat...

> s.4/4 ... I will show... *to our understanding*...

> III.s.1/2 ...which I *have schematized*...

> III.foot ... I will add...

> IV.s.1/2 ... I will probe...

> s.2/2 ... *we* canNOT ignore...; however, I will here address...

4. Discussion (1 paragraph: 1+X+3)

> s.1/4 ... I will first propose...

> s.4/4 ... I will first examine...

4.1 Referential Shifting from First to Second Person (3 para: 1+X+4+X+4, 5, 1)

    I.s.1/9 *Our* proposal...may give insight...

    s.2/9 This example challenges *us* to take...

    s.3/9 *If* **our** *proposal is correct...*

    s.9/9 *Our* proposal <u>proves</u> to be appropriate.

    III.1/1 ... *we* will turn to...

4.2 Referential Shifting from Non-First to First Person (2 para: 2+X+3, 3+X+4)

    I.s.1/5 ... *we* have <u>considered</u>...

    s.5/5 *We* take up examples...

    III.s.5/7 ... *we* canNOT <u>assume</u>...

    s.6/7 *We* will NOT pursue...; *we* need to be cautious...

5. Envoi (one paragraph: 7)

    s.7/7 **I** hope that this report will serve...

Acknowledgements (1 paragraph: 2)

    s.1/2 **I** am grateful to....

    s.2/2 Any remaining <u>fault</u> is all **my** own....

Data from PS

The following are the first-person pronominal forms in PS (excluding the quoted sentence that appeared before the abstract). They are also assigned here a reference number, PS 1 through PS 10, for ease of referral.

    PS1   #3/14 s.3/4 *In addition, if* **we** *are to go along...,what, then....?* (p.30)

    PS2   #6/14 s.1/3 *One such example...predicated on* **our** *physical experience of the world, is then extended....* (p.30)

    PS3   #7/13 s.1/5 *...the forms of linguistic enquiry...from which* **my** *own approach is derived.* (p.34)

    PS4   #7/13 s.3/5 *...the nature of this limitation is <u>never</u> explored, and all* **we** *are left with...is an interim conclusion....*

    PS5   #13/13. s.3/4 *Thus,* **we** *are informed:*

        <u>Only</u> when the cognitive workload is reduced does one get... (p.35)

    PS6   #3/11 s.1/3 *Let* **us** *suppose for the sake of argument that...* (p.36)

PS7   #3/11 s.2/3   *We are nevertheless left with the problem of motivation.* (p.36)

PS8   #1/5 s.1/1   *...very much a product of its time, and, unfortunately, of **our** own.* (p.38)

PS9   Acknowledgements: *I would like to thank....* (p.38)

PS10   Notes, 1.   *...the article, which **I** was initially encouraged to read....*

Data from MO

(From the headingless introduction)

...we find two sets of...contrasts... (p.92, #1/3 s.1/6)

(From section I)

...*I can point to three instances...* (p.95, I.#7/10 s.2/8)

As we will see... (p.97, I.#10/10 s.3/3)

(From section II, introduction)

When we see...the frequent use of...words...which I interpret as symbol[s]..., we can conclude.... (p.97, II.#1/1 s.1/7)

(From subsection IIA)

In contrast to the rowboat...there are what we might call...motorboats.... (p.98, IIA.#3/8 s.1/6)

As we have seen, although Mann has a deep fear...Mann nevertheless seems to have...attachment.... (p.99, IIA.#6/8 s.1/7)

*Though other critics have observed..., it is **my** contention that....* (p.100, IIA.#6/8, s.5/7)

We will return to... (p.100, IIA.#8/8 s.5/5)

(From subsection IIB)

*Further supporting **my** interpretation...* (p.101, IIB.#2/7 s.2/4)

When we think of Mann's fear..., we also have to think about... (p.102, IIB,#4/7 s.1/9)

Moreover, having seen..., we recognize that... (p.103, IIB.#5/7 s.5/11)

...the description of which reminds us... (p.103, IIB.#5/7 s.11/11)

And seen in this context, we notice that.... (p.104, IIB.#6/7 s.12/13)

...we can see... (p.104, IIB.#6/7 s.13/13)

...we now give attention to... (p.105, IIB.#7/7 s.7/7)

(From subsection IIC)

*The image...is seen...*when *we* <u>learn</u> that.... (p.105, IIC.#2/11 s.1/3)

In this context,...,we <u>read</u> *that...* p.107, IIC.#5 s.6/6)

When we <u>consider</u> *Mann..., not only do we have to* <u>think</u>.., *but we must also* <u>recognize</u>... (p.107, IIC.#6/11 s.1/1)

When we <u>interpret</u>... (p.107, IIC.7/11 s.1/2)

And in the description...we can <u>see</u>... (p.107, IIC.#7/11 s.2/2)

And when we <u>consider</u>...*we should* <u>recognize</u>... (p.107, IIC.#8/11 s.4/5)

...*when we* <u>consider</u> *the meaning of Man's whole journey*... (p.108, IIC.11/11 s.2/2)

(From section III)

When we recall...we can <u>recognize</u>.... (p.109, III.#3/4 s.2/9)

And <u>considering</u>...*we* <u>might be able to imagine</u>.... (p.110, III.#4/4 s.4/69

[italics **mine**] 3 times: (p.98, IA.#2/8); (p.101, IB.#3/3); (p.107, IC.#5/11)

[All italics **mine**, except as noted.] (p.102, IB.#3/4)

REFERENCES

Arakaki, Minoru. 2000. A Structural Study of Verb Phrase It Idioms. Journal of Foreign Languages. Okinawa International University. Vol.5 No.1 (July)

Lupardus, Karen. 1998. Social Control, Children's Books, and Foreign Language Instruction. Journal of Foreign Languages. Okinawa International University. Vol.3 No.1 (June)

Lupardus, Karen. 1995. The 60:40 Principle and the status of Females in Education in Japan. Transactions of the Institute of General Industrial Research, Okinawa International University. No.3.

Miyahira, Katsuyuki. 1998. Facework in Intercultnral Directive Discourse, Scripsimus. No.7.

Oitate, Masatsugu. 1998. Symbolism of the Naming and Setting in Richard "Wright's Down by the Riverside." Journal of Foreign Languages. Okinawa International University. Vol.2 No.2 (March)

Randall, William T. 1996. Beyond Internationalization Toward Global Education at Okinawa International University. Bulletin of the Department of English, Okinawa International University. Vol.15 No.1 (July)

Simpson, Peter. 2006. Muddling metaphors: the case against the information processing model of linguistics and language acquisition. Journal of Foreign Languages. Okinawa International University. Vol.9 No.2 (March)

Shibasaki, Reijirou. 2006. Where Does First Person Go across Time and Space? Journal of Foreign Languages. Okinawa International University. Vol.9 No.2 (March)