Kozubíková Šandová, Jana

Audience involvement in academic book review articles : an English and Czech comparative study

JANA KOZUBÍKOVÁ ŠANDOVÁ

AUDIENCE INVOLVEMENT IN ACADEMIC BOOK REVIEW ARTICLES: AN ENGLISH AND CZECH COMPARATIVE STUDY

Abstract

This study examines the use and distribution of language means expressing authorial presence in the genre of the academic review article. Furthermore, discourse functions of these means expressing audience involvement are explored. The focus is predominantly on the first person singular and plural pronouns and on possessive pronouns. The frequency of these pronouns and their rhetorical functions are compared in the corpus of Czech and English academic book review articles with the aim to find out any cross-cultural variation and possible influences of the Anglophone academic writing tradition on the Czech academic style. The results indicate that the genre of the academic book review article is highly dialogic and subjective and that the Czech academic tradition is strongly influenced by the global Anglophone tradition.

Keywords

Audience involvement; authorial identity; Anglophone academic style; Czech academic style; book review article

---

1. Introduction

Academic authors focus, among other things, on conveying knowledge, presenting outcomes of new research, and on convincing the readers of the validity and importance of their claims and hypotheses. Nevertheless, academic discourse adheres to a great extent to established conventions. This is connected with the traditional view of scientific language as detached, impersonal, and objective,

which prevailed in the second half of the 20th century. Authorial presence was suppressed and the authors became virtually invisible behind hypotheses, arguments, results, and tables (Bennett 2009, Hyland 2001). In the course of the years, the situation has changed. The genres of academic discourse have become more dialogic and by using language means signalling their presence in the texts, academic authors have opened up room for discussion and negotiation of their claims. With this change in the positioning of the writers within academic discourse several decades ago, authorial presence and identity has begun to be systematically examined by scholars, e.g. Hyland (2000, 2001, 2002), Vassileva (2006), Swales (1990, 2004), Harwood (2005), Tang & John (1999), and Ivanić (1998). Their research proves that in today's academic communication authors employ many linguistic features revealing their identity. Thus, academic writing has gradually evolved from being detached and impersonal to a more subjective type of academic communication.

A key feature of academic discourse, which has been examined by scholars, is the ways academic authors express their judgements, attitudes, and viewpoints. These have been called *evaluation* (Hunston and Thompson 2000), *metadiscourse* (Hyland and Tse 2004), or *appraisal* (Martin 2000). This interpersonal approach has been of great interest to both "systemic functional and social constructionist frameworks, which share the view that all language use is related to specific social, cultural and institutional contexts" (Hyland 2005: 174). These frameworks have investigated language means expressing the relationship of the writer to the reader or to the text itself since "interaction in academic writing essentially involves 'positioning', or adopting a point of view in relation to both the issues discussed in the text and to others who hold points of view on those issues" (Hyland 2005: 175). In this respect, two dimensions of academic interaction are important: stance and engagement. Stance is understood as an attitudinal dimension since it is connected with authors' presentation and expressing their opinions and perspectives. "It is the ways that writers intrude to stamp their personal authority onto their arguments or step back and disguise their involvement" (Hyland 2005: 176). Engagement is seen as an alignment dimension because writers acknowledge their readers as discourse participants, recognise their presence, and direct them to accurate interpretations (Hyland 2005). Academic writers rely on these two interpersonal dimensions since they contribute to opening up a dialogic space when authors need to justify their arguments before their readers and also in situations when authors aim at facilitating the text processing.

An important means contributing to a better organisation of the article and guidance of the reader through the text is pronouns. It is especially personal pronouns that may indicate the way academic authors develop their relationship with the audience, i.e. with their potential readers and the academic community. The personal pronouns *I* and *we* may have different pragmatic functions depending on the context of use. Functional pronoun classifications associate the discourse functions of the pronouns with authorial presence. "The visibility of the writer in their text will therefore depend upon the function of the pronoun in each par-

ticular case" (Harwood 2005: 344). Linguistic means of maintaining contact with the audience and dialogic means of discourse have already been mentioned by Mathesius (1947) when he discussed the rhetorical structure of texts.

Authorial identity has been examined by Ivanić (1998), who distinguishes three features of this identity occurring in academic writing: the *autobiographical self* (connected with the "writer's life-history") (1998: 26), the *discoursal self* ("the portrayal of self which writers construct through their deployment of discoursal resources in their own written texts") (1998: 327), and finally the *authorial self* which mirrors the degree to which an author is present in the text and takes over the responsibility for the contents of the writing. It is this third aspect of writer identity in academic texts that is the subject matter of the present paper.

For this reason, the study focuses on an analysis of personal and possessive pronouns, but not exclusively. Since the aim of this paper is not only the examination of the way the writer's presence is formed in academic texts but also the concept of audience involvement in general, the focus is, for instance, on the expression *reader/čtenář* as well. The occurrence and discourse functions of these means are explored in the genre of the book review article, which was chosen as it belongs to the genres of academic discourse and it is not as frequently examined as, for instance, research articles. Another aim of this study is to find out a cross-cultural variation in the use of language means of the audience involvement and their discourse functions. Therefore, book review articles written in English and Czech published in peer-reviewed linguistic journals are examined.

The paper is structured as follows: Section 2 focuses on cross-cultural differences in academic writing styles in general. Section 3 discusses the most important characteristics of the genre of the book review article including its history. The final part of this section briefly mentions authorial presence. Part 4 describes the corpora compiled for the analysis, the methodology, and the classification of rhetorical functions of authorial presence markers. Results of the quantitative analysis are presented in Section 5, while Section 6 offers a qualitative analysis of these results. All outcomes are summarised in the Conclusion.

2. Cross-cultural differences in academic discourse

Today, English is considered to be the lingua franca of modern academic discourse and the Anglophone academic writing style constitutes the norm of global academic communication. Nevertheless, as Chovanec points out, "although the global communication within professional communication may be carried out through the medium of English, it is, however, rooted in the local traditions of academic discourse that frequently operate under different social and discursive norms than the globally dominant Anglo-American system" (2012: 6).

Cross-cultural differences in academic writing style have been examined in various studies (cf. Clyne 1987, 1991; Duszak 1997; Čmejrková and Daneš 1997; Galtung 1981; Mauranen 1993; Siepmann 2006; Trumpp 1998; Widdowson

1979). Within these investigations two opposing approaches are apparent: one approach claims that academic discourse is universal since "scientists all over the world use the same concepts and procedures in their work" and "science constitutes a 'secondary cultural system' which is detached from the primary linguacultures" (Siepmann 2006: 132). The proponent of this perspective is Widdowson, who maintains that "the discourse conventions which are used to communicate this common culture are independent of the particular linguistic means which are used to realise them" (1979: 51). His view has been challenged by the other approach focusing on cross-cultural differences in academic discourse, namely by those scholars emphasising the culture-specificity of textual structures. The main reason for criticism is that Widdowson's premise relies on hard science texts only, which makes his research rather superficial. The other approach accentuates a greater focus on particular academic disciplines and various text types since only this perspective may arrive at a more fine-grained image of cross-cultural differences.

Since this paper investigates audience involvement in the genre of the academic book review articles from the cross-cultural perspective, we will now move on to a comparison of the Anglophone and the Czech (belonging to the tradition of the Central European) academic rhetorical styles. In the introduction to their paper on Czech academic writing and cultural identity, Čmejrková and Daneš (1997: 41) remind us of the fact that Czech society has often had to accept the norms that "appeared to be the bearers of culture, or to confront them". Czech scholars, probably due to their geographical position in Central Europe, have been constantly developing their rhetorical style in academic discourse to be part of its discourse communities. Furthermore, Čmejrková and Daneš mention Galtung's (1981) classification of intellectual styles, which suggests that in the past Central European tradition was influenced by the Teutonic style. This style typically focuses on theory formation, deductive thinking, and paradigm analysis. It is more monologue-oriented and less democratic. The prototype of the Teutonic style are the Germans with whose reasoning Czech scholars came in direct contact. The result is that the Czech academic discourse shares with the German academic style quite a lot of features, e.g. syntax, terminology, and some thoughts concerning the purpose of academic communication. Another strong influence on the Czech academic tradition was exerted by the Russian intellectual style. Russian, being a Slavic language like Czech, uses a similar terminology and syntactic and textual patterns. In the last decades, the Czech academic style has been under the influence of the Anglo-American tradition (Čmejrková and Daneš 1997: 41).

The Anglophone rhetorical style of academic discourse is based on a long tradition of essay writing. As Hermanns (1985) reminds, British students of language and literature have to write 3000-word essays every week. The essays are then read out aloud and discussed in tutorials. All this may be seen as a root of reader orientation, which is a key feature of the Anglo-American academic discourse. In this tradition, "a paragraph should normally open with a topic sentence, which all other sentences in the paragraph must support. A concluding sentence helps

to end one paragraph and to provide a smooth transition to the next" (Siepmann 2006: 134). Important is full attention to the topic, deviation from it is regarded as a drawback. These aspects build the basis of the reader-oriented Saxonic intellectual style as described by Galtung. As a result, this intellectual style is more dialogic, explicit, and the authorial presence is more apparent.

Compared to the Anglophone tradition, texts of Czech academic authors are less explicit in explaining key terms and concepts, and in the formulation of hypotheses, which, as explained by Čmejrková and Daneš, does not necessarily result in conciseness and condensed style. "Often the reader is reminded again and again of the author's idea, frequently formulated in a slightly different way each time, modified, and as if viewed from a new perspective" (1997 : 55). This is very different from the Saxonic writing style, which does not favour repetitiveness and digression. It is the latter feature which is more typical of German academic writing style together with a stronger focus on subject-matter knowledge and content (Siepmann 2006: 134). This aspect is present in the Czech academic writing as well.

Regarding the writer-reader relationship in the Czech academic discourse, the author is more backgrounded and academic texts do not display such a frequent use of dialogic linguistic means as the Anglophone academic writing. These means may be, for instance, personal and impersonal markers expressing attitude modifying the illocutionary force of propositions and thus "appealing to the reader in seeking agreement with the viewpoint advanced by the author" (Dontcheva-Navrátilová 2013: 12).

Nevertheless, what must be taken into account is the language Czech scholars use when writing their scientific papers and the target audience they address. When writing scientific articles in Czech, the authors address a much smaller, not so numerous, discourse community and their writing habits adhere to those more common in the Czech academic communication. On the other hand, when producing a paper for an international academic journal, they address their target audience in English and try to conform to the norm common in the Anglophone academic tradition. Research into authorial presence in English and Czech academic discourse carried out by Dontcheva-Navrátilová (2013) suggests that even though Czech academic authors are aware of writing conventions of Anglophone academic discourse, their authorial presence is "marked by a lower level of interactiveness and authoritativeness and backgrounded authorial presence. The choices of Czech linguists bear signs of interference from the Czech academic literacy and reflect a lower level of self-confidence resulting from their non-native speaker status and a subjective perception of a lesser degree of expertise stemming from the small size of the Czech linguistics community […]" (Dontcheva-Navrátilová 2013: 28).

The aspects of authorial presence will be discussed in the following section, together with a short history and features of the genre of the book review article.

3. The genre of the book review article and authorial presence

"The wealth and diversity of speech genres are boundless because the various possibilities of human activity are inexhaustible, and because each sphere of activity contains an entire repertoire of speech genres that differentiate and grow as the particular sphere develops and becomes more complex" (Bakhtin 1986: 60). This diversity and heterogeneity relates, of course, to the genres of academic discourse without any exception, be it the research article, thesis, dissertation, grant proposal, or conference presentation. As already stated in the introduction to this study, linguistic means of audience involvement will be analysed in the genre of the book review article.

Hyland and Diani (2009) have explored academic evaluation and defined "review genres" as texts "written with the explicit purpose of evaluating the research, the texts and the contributions of fellow academics and include book reviews, book review articles, review articles, book blurbs and literature reviews" (2009: 1). Review genres play an important role in academic discourse since they evaluate research in a particular field and may serve as a platform for presenting arguments, showing credibility and trustworthiness within a scientific community. Compared to research genres, review genres are usually "more interactively complex" because they "do not simply respond to a general body of more-or-less impersonal literature, but critically engage with particular texts, and therefore their authors" (Hyland and Diani 2009: 2).

Modern review genres date back to the middle of the 17th century as a result of a significant increase in book production. The first book reviews were uncritical and summarised the state of knowledge and learning at that time. A change in rhetorical style came at the beginning of the 19th century, when the reviewers ceased to transcribe long sections of the reviewed texts without any comments and started to evaluate them and express their own judgements. However, sometimes these comments did not have any connection to the original text.

Nowadays, all review genres are of considerable significance for academic communities (Hyland and Diani 2009: 3). The book review article is usually published in a special section of academic journals. An expert in the field critically reviews arguments and viewpoints an author offers in their book. These opinions serve as a basis for a more in-depth assessment of the work, which consists of a discussion of topics explored and consideration of the relevance of the research results for the scientific community. The review usually closes with a recommendation for potential readers and a positive or negative judgement. Nevertheless, it "is presented as debate to construct a dialogue with the reviewed book author and other voices in the community. This debate allows the reviewer to create a 'research space' for his or her own views, exploiting the reviewed authors' reported opinions to construct a 'niche' for his or her claims on the topic" (Hyland and Diani 2009: 3). What the reviewer creates is a metatext dependent on a primary text. In other words, the discourse of the academic book review "is not independent and self-sufficient, but is closely related ideationally to preceding texts and

practices, forming a wide and complex network of intertextual and interdiscursal links" (Vassileva 2014: 288). The other aspect central to the book review article, also mentioned by Vassileva (2014), is the communicative functions of this genre. The question, not yet satisfactorily solved, is whether the purely ideational (i.e. informative) or the interpersonal (i.e. evaluative) function prevails or should prevail. Both of them are represented in the book review articles.

The target audience of the academic book review article consists of a relatively small and homogenous group of researchers who are interested in the same or related discipline. This research genre is driven by "scholarly interest and provides appraisal of the work of a professional peer within the academic community" (Gea-Valor 2010: 118).

With the shift towards a more personal style of academic discourse in recent years, the growing interest of scholars in examining authorial presence in academic writing has been apparent. This phenomenon has been termed in literature in various ways. Bondi (2009), drawing on Bakhtin (1981), speaks of "polyphony", which assumes "the multiplicity of textual voices" (2009: 83) since any discourse is intrinsically dialogic. This perspective is also shared by Diani (2009), who states that despite being a monological genre, the book review article may have a dialogical form since the reviewer is in interaction with the author of the reviewed book, the academic community, and, last but not least, with the reader. The genre of the book review article may thus be regarded as a "polyphonic drama where the reviewer interacts with different parts" (Diani 2009: 136). According to Diani's research, a major role in the construal of a dialogic character of this genre is played by the use of the first and second person pronouns since they contribute to interaction within the discourse-disciplinary community.

Gea-Valor (2010) has investigated the "author's voice" in the corpus of academic and non-academic book reviews expressed by employing first person pronouns, possessives, parentheticals, and other means. In the genre of the academic book review she has identified various pragmatic functions of personal pronouns and possessives such as the introduction of evaluation (either positive or negative), the personalisation of final remarks in the concluding section, or directing the reader's attention. On the basis of her research, Gea-Valor concludes that linguistic means of authorial identity "clearly contribute to enhancing the persuasiveness of the text" (2010: 133). Moreover, her study proves that "author's voice markers are an important interpersonal strategy as they help reviewers uncover their own *persona* in the text and show engagement with the audience" (2010: 134, italics in original). Similarly, Dahl (2009) has employed the term "author identity" and has explored three roles of the author, namely "the author as researcher, as writer, and as arguer" (2009: 123).

4. Data and methodology

As already mentioned, this paper addresses the topic of audience involvement and authorial identity in the genre of the book review article, both in the Anglophone and the Czech academic traditions. Both of these concepts may be expressed by various linguistic means, yet this study concentrates predominantly on the use of personal and possessive pronouns in the first person singular and plural and their discourse functions. Nevertheless, besides the analysis of pronouns, the focus is on the expression *reader/čtenář* because it also contributes to the expression of audience involvement.

The quantitative analysis shows the frequency of occurrence of these markers and indicates cross-cultural differences between the two aforementioned academic writing traditions. The qualitative analysis discusses the ways English and Czech writers of the book review articles uncover their personality in this academic genre, attempting to reveal any intercultural variation between these two academic writing styles.

For this reason, two sets of corpora were compiled. One corpus contains 22 book review articles published in renowned linguistic journals (*Applied Linguistics, Functional Linguistics, Journal of Pragmatics*, and *International Journal of English Studies*) written in English by English native speakers. The other corpus consists of 22 book review articles as well, published in Czech peer-reviewed linguistic journals (*Slovo a slovesnost* and *Časopis pro moderní filologii*), written in Czech by academic authors of Czech origin. All book review articles were published between 2015 and 2017. The extent of the Anglophone corpus is 41,443 words, the Czech corpus contains 44,164 words. Even though there is a certain contrast between the Anglo-American and Czech journals regarding the prestige and size of readership, the book review articles excerpted from them constitute a representative sample for the purposes of current research. While the size of both corpora used for the research could have been larger, as claimed by Flowerdew (2004: 18), smaller, more specialised corpora enable a more qualitative and contextually-informed analysis than general corpora, and are more suitable for comparative studies.

Both corpora were tagged for personal and possessive pronoun forms in the first person singular and plural (*I, my, me, we, our, us* for English, *já* [*I*], *můj* [*my*], *mi* [*me*], *my* [*we*], *náš* [*our*], *nám* [*us*], *nás* [*us*] for Czech) as markers expressing audience involvement. Czech is a fusional language employing specific verb endings for grammatical person and number. It is thus the corresponding verbal ending, rather than an explicit pronoun, that establishes the identity of the author. Personal pronouns are omitted largely for stylistic reasons. Apart from pronouns, another very frequent marker of audience involvement present in both corpora is the expression *reader/čtenář*. The review authors use it very frequently to address the readers directly, thus creating dialogic space and involving them into ongoing discussion. After excerpting all markers of audience involvement, raw counts were normalised to a frequency per 1,000 words in order to make a comparison of data possible.

The classification for determining pragmatic functions of linguistic means of audience involvement employed in this study is based on Tang and John's (1999) typology of six identities that may be conveyed by first person pronouns. The basic assumption behind these identities is that the first person pronoun in academic discourse is "not a homogeneous entity and that there is a range of roles or identities that may be fronted by a first person pronoun" (Tang and John 1999: 26). Thus, the authorial roles should be seen as a continuum from using *I* with verbs connected with the structure of text, using *I* with verbs describing the research process, to using *I* with cognitive verbs. The discourse function of the personal pronouns in audience-involvement structures changes with the verb used in these phrases. Nevertheless, the Tang and John's taxonomy had to be modified since not all the functions in this taxonomy were represented in the present corpus of book review articles. In concrete terms, the functions of '*I' as the architect of the essay* and '*I' as the originator* were not found in the corpora and therefore not involved in the classification. The reason is that Tang and John when forming their taxonomy identified the discourse functions on the basis of students' essays and published linguistic academic articles and books, which are genres of academic discourse differing from the book review article. Therefore, this study worked with four authorial roles only.

Another thing modified in the above-mentioned classification is terminology. The designations of the four identities in this study correspond to the terminology employed by Dontcheva-Navrátilová (2013: 14) in her analysis of authorial presence in academic discourse. The terms used by her are more convenient and do not suggest that we analyse linguistic means containing the personal pronoun *I* only. The resulting classification looks as follows:

1) *Representative* – the author uses the first person plural pronoun *we* as a substitute for a larger community; it is comprised of two subgroups:
    a)   the description of disciplinary knowledge, routines or state of affairs (e.g. *we regard corpus linguistics as a quickly developing field…*)
    b)   seeking audience involvement (e.g. *we all know what this example suggests*)

2) *Discourse-organiser* – the author guides the reader through the text, turns their attention to the most important findings, points to major connections within the text, and describes the overall structure of the text; this role is indicated by the employment of verbs such as *look, see, observe, discuss, concentrate, examine, explore*, etc. (e.g. *as we shall see, let us look, this paper examines the topic of…, we observed that…*)

3) *Recounter of the research process* – the author describes the different stages of the research process, data collection, and methodology; this role is signalled by the use of first person pronouns with verbs like *collect, interview, record*, etc. (e.g. *the data we collected include…, I interviewed five male and five female speakers of English…*)

4) *Opinion-holder* – the writer expresses their personal opinions and attitudes, evaluates the text, shows agreement or disagreement, etc.; this role is conveyed by the use of the personal pronoun *I* often co-occurring with cognitive verbs (e.g. *I think, I assume, I believe, I suppose*) or by the use of phrases such as *in my/our view, in my/our opinion*; other verbs used to express this role are, for example, *appreciate, agree, determine, assess*.

At this place it must be noted that the order of authorial roles in this classification mirrors a continuum showing the degree of authorial power, from the lowest to the highest.

5. Results

Focusing now on the quantitative analysis, we can see that Czech reviewers utilised more linguistic means of reader involvement than Anglophone reviewers. The frequency of occurrence of personal pronouns and the expression *reader/čtenář* in the Czech corpus is 6.52 per 1,000 words, while in the English corpus it is 4.56 per 1,000 words. This result may be somewhat surprising as it is generally believed that the Anglophone writing style is more reader-oriented. This outcome may be related to the genre examined, which follows slightly different conventions than other research genres, and to the influence of Anglophone writing tradition on the Czech academic discourse. Also, not all possible types of linguistic means expressing audience involvement were examined here. Other means would include questions, hypothetical conditionals, and indefinite article (Hyland 1996).

Table 1. Occurrence of linguistic means of audience involvement in the corpora

ENGLISH CORPUS (41,443 words)			CZECH CORPUS (44,164 words)		
Pronoun/ expression	Raw count	Normalised frequency per 1,000 words	Pronoun/ expression	Raw count	Normalised frequency per 1,000 words
I	43	1.04	*já* [*I*]	60	1.36
my	10	0.24	*můj* [*my*]	8	0.18
me	1	0.02	*mi* [*me*]	4	0.09
we	25	0.60	*my* [*we*]	106	2.40
our	14	0.34	*náš* [*our*]	14	0.32
us	4	0.10	*nám* [*us*]	6	0.14
			nás [*in our..*]	8	0.18
			nás [*us*]	4	0.09
reader	92	2.22	*čtenář* [*reader*]	77	1.74
TOTAL	189	4.56	TOTAL	288	6.52

As apparent from the figures in Table 1, the most frequent means of audience involvement occurring in the English corpus is the expression *reader*. This is in consonance with the general claim that Anglophone writers try to be more personal and emphasise that the review article is directed toward the audience. The second most frequent means of involvement is the first person pronoun *I* followed by the plural pronoun *we*. This corresponds to the attempt of the reviewers to take the readers into account when formulating arguments and involving the readers in the discussion. The reviewer tries to build up a relationship with the reader and to signal that they are equal as regards the expertise in the field. The possessive pronouns *my* and *our* appear in book review articles less frequently, with a slightly higher occurrence of *our*. Both pronouns refer to the reviewer's own experience or opinion. The occurrence of the object forms of personal pronouns, *me* and *us*, is negligible. The pronoun *us* was found four times in the whole corpus, the pronoun *me* occurred only once.

The most frequent means of audience involvement in the Czech corpus is the verbal ending referring to the first person plural. The pronoun *we* (in Czech *my*) remains hidden in the verb form. Its occurrence is 2.40 per 1,000 words, which is higher than that of the verbal ending indicating the first person singular appearing 60 times in the Czech corpus (i.e. 1.36 per 1,000 words). The reason for employing these forms is the same as in the Anglophone corpus, the reviewers aim at engaging the readers in argumentation and they want the readers to become part of the debate. The position that the audience belongs to the process of argumentation and validation of the reviewer's claims is further strengthened by the frequent use of the expression *čtenář* [*reader*]. As in the English corpus, the possessive pronouns *můj* [*my*] and *náš* [*our*] occur less frequently than the first person personal pronouns (or their corresponding verbal forms). When using them, the author refers to his/her experience or attitude. The object forms of first person pronouns appear rarely even though more frequently than in the English corpus. Interesting is the occurrence of the pronominal form *nás* (in English *in our …*) referring to the location, in all cases to the Czech Republic. Such a type of pronominal reference does not appear in the Anglophone corpus at all. This may be explained by different favoured ways of referring to one's native environment in English and Czech.

Table 2. Discourse functions of linguistic means of audience involvement

Discourse function	ENGLISH CORPUS		CZECH CORPUS	
	Raw count	Normalised frequency per 1,000 words	Raw count	Normalised frequency per 1,000 words
Discourse-organiser	6	0.14	50	1.13
Representative a)	2	0.05	23	0.52
Representative b)	141	3.40	154	3.49
Opinion-holder	40	0.97	53	1.20
Recounter of the research process	0	0	5	0.11

The discourse functions of pronominal forms and the expression *reader/čtenář* are summarised in Table 2. The most frequent function in both corpora is *Representative – seeking audience involvement* with a very similar occurrence (the frequency in the English corpus 3.40 per 1.000 words, in the Czech corpus 3.49 per 1,000 words), which proves the assumption that this genre is personalised and reader-oriented. The second most frequent rhetorical role, again in both corpora, is *Opinion-holder*. In the Czech corpus its occurrence (1.20 per 1,000 words) is more frequent than in the Anglophone corpus (0.97 per 1,000 words). This result shows that Czech reviewers express slightly higher degree of involvement with their assertions and viewpoints. The third most recurrent authorial identity in both corpora is *Discourse-organiser,* however, with a totally different distribution. In the Czech corpus it is very similar to the role of Opinion-holder (1.13 per 1,000 words), but in the English corpus this role occurred only six times (0.14 per 1,000 words). Czech reviews are, in this way, more explanatory, descriptive, and explicit than Anglophone reviews.

The next authorial role in both corpora, as regards the frequency of occurrence, is *Representative – the description of disciplinary knowledge, routines or state of affairs.* However, its distribution in the Anglophone corpus with a mere two appearances is insignificant. In the Czech corpus it appeared 23 times (i.e. 0.52 per 1,000). This low occurrence may be explained by the genre of the book review article itself since a description of disciplinary knowledge is not its objective. This role may be found in the genre of the research article more often. The same applies to the last authorial role, *Recounter of the research process*, which does not occur in the English corpus at all, in the Czech with a rare occurrence of five instances (0.11 per 1,000 words).

6. Discussion of the results

In this section we will look at the particular authorial roles more closely and discuss them in greater detail with the help of examples from both corpora.

The rhetorical function with the lowest degree of authority is *Representative* describing disciplinary knowledge, routines or state of affairs. As already said, in the genre of the book review article this function is not that frequent as, for instance, in the research article, where the authors explain disciplinary practice or state of affairs, and relevance to a particular field of study. Below we can find two instances from the Czech corpus and the only two instances occurring in the Anglophone corpus, even in one and the same review. This function is performed most frequently by the first person plural verbal ending indicating the discourse community or fellow researchers. The author conveys their viewpoint by using inclusive *we* and thus showing their membership in the particular discourse community. In the English examples, this role is expressed by the singular pronoun referring again to the author as part of a research community, as exemplified below.

(1)   Na straně druhé <u>pojímáme</u> [*we conceive of*] běžně produktivitu *kvantitativně,* tj. jako určitou *výnosnost* (rentabilitu, opět po vzoru Corbinové, angl. *profitability*). [CMF4]

(2)   […] neboť, jak i sám autor uvádí, substrátem <u>rozumíme</u> [*we under-stand*] jazyk původního obyvatelstva, který zanikl. Baskičtina se sice na území Portugalska v současnosti nevyskytuje, nicméně v oblasti Pyrenejí je stále jazykem živým. [CMF6]

(3)   We hear and see actual sentences, and study how they are constructed using whatever terminology we can muster. <u>I call</u> that dimension of *structure*. And we hear and see the circumstances in which the sentences are used, feel their effect, and judge their appropriateness to the situation. <u>I call</u> that the dimension of *use*. [IJES5]

The second type of the role of *Representative,* namely *Representative – seeking audience involvement*, is more frequent not only than the first type of this identity just described, but the most frequent in both corpora altogether. It is realised by the plural pronoun *we* in the English corpus, or by a corresponding verbal ending in the Czech corpus. In the English corpus, the pronoun *us* is used with this function as well. In Examples (4)–(7) the author opens dialogic space, invites the reader to discussion, and seeks their involvement. All these uses of the pronoun *we* are, therefore, inclusive, which results in a higher level of dialogicity and persuasiveness.

(4)   Co je to "být něčemu podobný," <u>víme</u> [*we know*] všichni: pokud se debaty zmocní teoretikové, rázem vyplyne na povrch složitost kritérií. [SS1]

(5)   Zdá se mi však diskutabilní, zda <u>bychom</u> na otázky typu "čím dítě tleskalo?" nebo "čím panenka mrká?" <u>mohli</u> [*we could*] vůbec v nějakém kontextu odpovědět "nevím" […]. [CMF5]

(6)   As the summary above suggests, much is added to what <u>we know</u> about the ELT textbook from the 10 studies reported in this book. [AL2]

(7)   Based on her quantitative findings she convincingly contests the previous argument that DCT data give <u>us</u> a metapragmatic approximation to naturally occurring language use […]. [JP4]

Apart from personal and possessive pronouns, or corresponding verbal forms, other means of seeking audience involvement very directly is the expression *reader* in the English corpus and *čtenář* [*reader*] in the Czech corpus. This is a very dialogic means of expressing involvement with the readership, especially

the Anglophone reviewer in Example 9 below is very explicit. The Czech review-
er in Example 8 addresses the reader also very directly, however, this address is
hedged by the use of the modal verb *may* (*může si uvědomit* [*he may realise*].

(8) Na tomto místě si <u>čtenář</u> [*reader*] může uvědomit, že známá bohemi-
     stická díla nejsou pouhé položky v seznamu studijní literatury, ale že
     mohou mít i velmi pohnutou historii. [CMF6]

(9) Identifying oneself as a linguist or applied linguist can be, I am sure
     many <u>readers</u> of this journal know, something of a conversation stopper.
     [AL2]

Another interesting means of audience involvement occurring in the Czech cor-
pus, but absent in the English corpus, is a verbal phrase whose equivalent in
English corresponds to the structure *let <u>us</u>* + verb phrase. This structure belongs
to means the authors use when seeking reader involvement, therefore, it may
be included within the role *Representative – seeking audience involvement.* The
object form *us* occurs when the writer attempts to develop a relationship with the
reader and to include them in the process of text creation. Example 11 below il-
lustrates the way the reviewer directly attempts to include the reader in the ongo-
ing discussion on tautology.

(10) To jsou z dnešního pohledu značně vágní termíny, mluvili bychom tu
     spíše o hovorovém a řečnickém stylu (<u>vzpomeňme</u> [*let us recall*] však
     i Havránkových pohybů mezi funkčními "jazyky" a "styly"). [SS5]

(11) S využitím autorčiných příkladů <u>zkusme</u> [*let us try*] v tomto kontextu
     interpretovat tautologickou výpověď "fotbal je fotbal" a výpověď kon-
     tradiktorickou "dnešní situace je i není lepší". [SS2]

The authorial identity of *Discourse-organiser* is the third lowest type on the con-
tinuum of linguistic means expressing the degree of authority. This role is real-
ised by the first person plural *I* in the English corpus, or by the corresponding
verbal form in the Czech corpus. Occasionally, it is expressed by the first person
plural verbal ending in the Czech corpus. The reviewer guides the reader through
the text by drawing their attention to the structure of the review and the transi-
tion points within the text. This role may be indicated by the explicit use of verbs
expressing mental processes such as *see, look,* or *observe.* The Czech reviewers
adopt this role very often, which may explain their effort to organise discourse
clearly and in a reader-friendly way. This may clearly be seen in Example 12.

(12) Než <u>vyložím</u> [*I expound on*], jak a nakolik kniha tyto cíle naplňuje,
     stručně <u>shrnu</u> [*I will summarise*], co v ní čtenář nalezne. [SS6]

(13) Podnítit může i specializované úvahy, o jakou <u>jsem se pokusila</u> [*I attempted*] zde […]. [CMF1]

(14) <u>I will comment on</u> those two assertions in turn. [AL1]

(15) The limitations <u>I have discussed</u> here should however not detract from the many contributions of the volume. [JP3]

The identity of *Discourse-organiser* has to a certain extent the character of meta-discoursal comments. Compared to this role, the identity of *Recounter of the research process* is more authoritative. Nevertheless, as already mentioned above, given the character of the genre of the book review article, this role does not occur very often. It does not appear in the English corpus at all, in the Czech corpus a mere five occurrences were found. This function may be expressed by the singular or plural personal pronouns collocating with verbs such as *collect, work*, or *analyse* referring to the methodology or research process, or by corresponding nouns, as in Example 17.

(16) V následujících odstavcích stručně <u>komentujeme</u> [*we comment on*] jendotlivé kapitoly ČNSG. [SS5]

(17) <u>Můj předchozí výzkum</u> [*My previous research*] na podobné téma vykazuje určitou podobnost. [CMF3]

The rhetorical function with the highest degree of authority and the second most frequent in both corpora is that of *Opinion-holder*. A high distribution of this role is not that surprising if we consider one of the most important communicative functions of the book review article, which is the evaluative function. Reviewers express their personal opinions of evaluated books, convey their attitudes and formulate claims. They invite the reader to adopt a stance as well, confirm the reviewer's claims or refute them. The reviewer opens space for negotiation and seeks reader involvement.

This identity is realised by the personal pronouns *I* and *we* in the Anglophone corpus, while in the Czech corpus it is expressed by the corresponding verbal endings. Verbs fulfilling this authorial role denote predominantly mental processes of cognition (e.g. *think, assume, believe, suppose, guess, myslet* [*think*]*, domnívat se* [*assume*]). Authors in both corpora also use possessive pronouns *my, our, můj* [*my*]*, náš* [*our*] collocating with the nouns *opinion, view, mínění* [*opinion*]*, názor* [*opinion*], and *pohled* [*view*]. In some face-threatening acts, the reviewers do not express their beliefs directly and opt for more indirect means of expression to hedge their assertions (Examples 19 and 23).

(18) Velmi přínosná je <u>podle našeho názoru</u> [*in our opinion*] kapitola pojednávající o Šmilauerově činnosti lexikografické. [CMF6]

(19) Otázkou je, zda <u>můžeme souhlasit</u> [*we may agree*] s názorem, že i v současnosti stojí nesklonná propria a nepřechýlená příjmení spíše na periferii deklinačního systému. [SS3]

(20) Více než 90% shoda s původním Nekvapilovým textem je však, <u>domnívám se</u> [*I assume*], na parafrázi přece jen příliš. [SS6]

(21) The complete disregard for the implications of the theoretical complexity of quotation for variation of quotatives across registers of spoken interaction is, <u>in my view</u>, the main theoretical limitation of the book. [JP3]

(22) Although the book is not specifically aimed at applied linguists and, indeed, the applied dimension of the ideas is not extensively discussed, <u>I believe</u> that applied linguists may benefit from at least perusing this collection […]. [AL2]

(23) Still, as a reader <u>I would have appreciated</u> to be prepared for her treatment of statistical results earlier. [JP4]

From the qualitative analysis it is apparent that the book review article belongs to the genres of academic discourse in which the authors do not remain utterly hidden behind their claims and opinions. On the contrary, they very often express their viewpoints quite directly. This assertion may be confirmed by the fact that the most authoritative role, *Opinion-holder*, occurs in both corpora with the second highest frequency, the most recurrent being *Representative – seeking audience involvement*.

7. Conclusion

This paper investigated the degree of audience involvement in the genre of the book review article in the Anglophone and Czech academic writing traditions. Albeit an informative genre describing an academic book, the book review article belongs among evaluative genres with a high degree of involvement and interaction between the reviewer and the readers. Therefore, the way interpersonal dynamics affect the selection of rhetorical and linguistic means can be studied in great detail. The present study has focused on a quantitative and qualitative analysis of the first person singular and plural pronouns, possessive pronouns, and the expression *reader/čtenář,* as well as their discourse functions. The distribution and discourse functions of these means have then been compared looking for any cross-cultural variations and possible influences of the Anglo-American tradition on the Czech one.

The high occurrence of linguistic means expressing audience involvement has confirmed the general tendency of academic communication being/as more subjective and personal. The results also suggest that the genre of the book review article is no exception in this context since it is highly evaluative and has become more interactive and dialogic than it used to be in the past, when the impersonal style was favoured. Reviewers attempt to interact with the reader and include them in the issues under scrutiny.

The cross-cultural quantitative analysis has revealed that Czech review authors used more linguistic means indicating authorial presence than English writers. This may be connected with the already proven Anglophone influence on the Czech academic discourse. The English book review articles may serve as a model for Czech review writers who attempt to follow this example of a more personalised and dialogic writing. They try to conform to the rhetorical style of the Anglophone tradition and combine personal and impersonal means of expression so that the result is a more subjective piece of writing. A typical example of the Anglophone influence may be the use of the plural *we* in the Czech corpus, which reflects the shift to a more personal expression. Another reason for finding more linguistic devices of audience involvement in the Czech corpus may be the fact that the focus of this study has been on the personal and possessive pronouns and the expression *reader*, not on parentheticals or attitudinal markers of the writer's stance towards propositions, which could have skewed the results slightly.

The cross-cultural analysis of rhetorical roles showed a similar frequency of occurrence of the roles of *Opinion-holder* and *Representative – seeking audience involvement* in both corpora. This result also confirms the claim that this genre is reader-oriented. A very different distribution of the role of *Discourse-organiser* in both corpora suggests that Czech review writers focus on the structure of the book review article to a great extent, which was not so apparent in the English corpus.

In conclusion, cultural differences can be said to manifest themselves in academic style to a great degree and seem therefore to affect the rhetorical styles used in academic discourse. This paper offers further proof that linguistic means expressing authorial voice are part and parcel of an important rhetorical strategy showing involvement with the readers and uncovering the reviewer's personality. Nevertheless, the results of this analysis must not be overgeneralised since only one genre of academic discourse has been investigated, and also a larger corpus for a more in-depth analysis is needed. Last but not least, apart from the personal and possessive pronouns, other means expressing the author's voice are also worth analysing.

References

Bakhtin, Mikhail M. (1981) *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Austin and London: University of Texas Press.

Bakhtin, Mikhail M. (1986) The problem of speech genres. In: Emerson, Caryl and Michael Holquist (eds.) *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 60–102.

Bennett, Karen (2009) English academic style manuals: A survey. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 8, 43–54.

Bondi, Marina (2009) Polyphony in academic discourse: A cross-cultural perspective on historical discourse. In: Suomela-Salmi, Eija and Fred Dervin (eds.) *Cross-Linguistic and Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Academic Discourse*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 83–108.

Chovanec, Jan (2012) Written academic discourse in English: From local traditions to global outreach. *Brno Studies in English* 38 (2), 6–16.

Clyne, Michael. (1987) Cultural differences in the organization of academic texts. English and German. *Journal of Pragmatics* 11 (2), 211–247.

Clyne, Michael. (1991) The sociocultural dimension: The dilemma of the German-speaking scholar. In: Schröder, Hartmut (ed.) *Subject-Oriented Texts. Languages for Special Purposes and Text Theory.* Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 49–67.

Čmejrková, Světla and František Daneš (1997) Academic writing and cultural identity: The case of Czech academic writing. In: Duszak, Anna (ed.) *Culture and Styles of Academic Discourse*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 41–61.

Dahl, Trine (2009) Author identity in economics and linguistics abstracts. In: Suomela-Salmi, Eija and Fred Dervin (eds.) *Cross-Linguistic and Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Academic Discourse*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 123–134.

Diani, Giuliana (2009) Exploring the polyphonic dimension of academic book review articles in the discourse of linguistics. In: Suomela-Salmi, Eija and Fred Dervin (eds.) *Cross-Linguistic and Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Academic Discourse.* Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 135–150.

Dontcheva-Navrátilová, Olga (2013) Authorial presence in academic discourse: Cross-cultural analysis of the use of author-reference pronouns. *Linguistica Pragensia* 1, 9–30.

Duszak, Anna (ed.) (1997) *Culture and Styles of Academic Discourse*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Flowerdew, Lynne (2004) The argument for using English specialized corpora to understand academic and professional language. In: Connor, Ulla and T. Upton (eds.) *Discourse in the Professions.* Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 11–33.

Galtung, Johan (1981) Structure, culture and intellectual style. *Social Science Formation* 20, 817–856.

Gea-Valor, Maria-Lluisa (2010) The emergence of the author's voice in book reviewing: A contrastive study of academic vs. non-academic discourse. In: Rosa Lores-Sanz, Pilar Mur-Duenas and Enrique Lafuente-Millan (eds.) *Constructing Interpersonality: Multiple Perspectives on Written Academic Genres.* Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 117–135.

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

Hermanns, Fritz (1985) Schreiben im Vergleich. In: Wierlacher, Alois (ed.) *Das Fremde und das Eigene: Prolegomena zu einer interkulturellen Germanistik.* München: Iudicium, 123–139.

Hunston, Susan and Geoff Thompson (eds.) (2000) *Evaluation in Text*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hyland, Ken (1996) Talking to the academy: Forms of hedging in science research articles. *Written Communication* 13, 251–281.

Hyland, Ken (2000) *Disciplinary Discourses: Social Interactions in Academic Writing.* Harlow, UK: Pearson Education.

Hyland, Ken (2001) Humble servants of the discipline? Self-mention in research articles. *English for Specific Purposes* 18, 207–226.

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

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

Hyland, Ken and Giuliana Diani (2009) *Academic Evaluation: Review Genres in University Settings.* London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hyland, Ken and Polly Tse (2004) Metadiscourse in academic writing: A reappraisal. *Applied Linguistics* 25 (2), 156–177.

Ivanić, Roz (1998) *Writing and Identity: The Discoursal Construction of Identity in Academic Writing*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Martin, J.R. (2000) Beyond exchange: APPRAISAL systems in English. In: Hunston, Susan and Geoff Thompson (eds.) *Evaluation in Text*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mathesius, Vilém (1947) *Čeština a obecný jazykozpyt.* Praha: Melantrich.

Mauranen, Anna (1993) *Cultural Differences in Academic Rhetoric: A Textlinguistic Study*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Siepmann, Dirk (2006). Academic writing and culture: An overview of differences between English, French and German. *Meta* 51 (1), 131–150.

Swales, John (1990) *Genre Analysis.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Swales, John (2004) *Research Genres.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tang, Ramona and John Suganthi (1999) The 'I' in identity: Exploring writer identity in student academic writing through the first person pronoun. *English for Specific Purposes* 18, 23–39.

Trumpp, Eva Cassandra (1998) Kultur- und textsortenspezifische Vertextungsstrategien. Eine kontrastive fachtextlinguistische Untersuchung zum Kommunikationsbereich der Sportwissenschaft: Englisch – Deutsch – Französisch. Tübingen: Narr.

Vassileva, Irena (2006) Author-Audience Interaction. A Cross-Cultural Perspective. Sankt Augustin: Asgard Verlag.

Vassileva, Irena (2014) Bulgarian 'we' and audience involvement in academic writing. In: Pavlidou, Theodossia-Soula (ed.) *Constructing Collectivity. 'We' across Languages and Contexts*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Widdowson, Henry G. (1979) *Aspects of Language Teaching,* Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Sources

Applied Linguistics (2015), 36 (1). [AL1]
Applied Linguistics (2016), 37 (1). [AL2]
Časopis pro moderní filologii (2015), 97 (1). [CMF1]
Časopis pro moderní filologii (2015), 97 (2). [CMF2]
Časopis pro moderní filologii (2016), 98 (1). [CMF3]
Časopis pro moderní filologii (2016), 98 (2). [CMF4]
Časopis pro moderní filologii (2017), 99 (1). [CMF5]
Časopis pro moderní filologii (2017), 99 (2). [CMF6]
Functional Linguistics (2015), 2 (10). [FL1]
Functional Linguistics (2017), 4 (8). [FL2]
International Journal of English Studies (2015), 15 (2). [IJES1]
International Journal of English Studies (2016), 16 (1). [IJES2]
International Journal of English Studies (2016), 16 (2). [IJES3]
International Journal of English Studies (2017), 17 (1). [IJES4]

International Journal of English Studies (2017), 17 (2). [IJES5]
Journal of Pragmatics (2016), 101. [JP1]
Journal of Pragmatics (2016), 103. [JP2]
Journal of Pragmatics (2016), 98. [JP3]
Journal of Pragmatics (2017), 107. [JP4]
Slovo a slovesnost (2015), 76 (1). [SS1]
Slovo a slovesnost (2016), 77 (1). [SS2]
Slovo a slovesnost (2016), 77 (3). [SS3]
Slovo a slovesnost (2017), 78 (2). [SS4]
Slovo a slovesnost (2017), 78 (3). [SS5]
Slovo a slovesnost (2017), 78 (4). [SS6]

JANA KOZUBÍKOVÁ ŠANDOVÁ is Assistant Professor of English Linguistics at the University of South Bohemia in České Budějovice, Czech Republic. Her research interests lie within the fields of pragmatics, semantics, and discourse analysis, focusing on political and academic discourse. The topics she explores include pragmatic functions of linguistic means in political interviews, intersubjective positioning in political and scientific discourse, rhetorical structure of academic book reviews, etc. She has published several research articles on these topics and is also the author of the monograph *Speaker Involvement in Political Interviews* (2014, Peter Lang). She has held guest lectures at universities in Milano, Italy, and Vitoria-Gasteiz, Spain.

Address: Mgr. Jana Kozubíková Šandová, Ph.D., Department of English, Faculty of Arts, University of South Bohemia, Branišovská 31a, 370 05 České Budějovice, Czech Republic. [e-mail: sandova@ff.jcu.cz]