SOCIAL SCIENCES & HUMANITIES

Third Person Point of View in EFL Academic Writing: Ventriloquizing

Yazid Basthomi*, Lely Tri Wijayanti, Nurenzia Yannuar and Utami Widiati

Jurusan Sastra Inggris, Fakultas Sastra, Universitas Negeri Malang, Jl. Semarang 5 Malang, Jawa Timur, Indonesia 65145

ABSTRACT

This study examines the use of author self-reference, but pronouns, in the form of third person point of view in academic writing. The data for analysis were retrieved from C-SMILE (Corpus of State University of Malang Indonesian Learners' English), which consisted of 124 theses and 138 research articles of EFL learners, who were undergraduate students of the Department of English, State University of Malang. Results demonstrated abundant uses of *the researcher* as author self-reference. This leads to the possibility to expand the notion of ventriloquizing drawn on spoken discourse for application into written discourse. We hypothetically believe that ventriloquizing, which occurs in academic writing, has a strong relation with self-effacing device as a strategy to disguise authors' identity. We conclude that the authors' (EFL learners') choice of *the researcher* as referent is highly affected by the "ventriloquizing-like" strategy in their L1 and L2 although they are different in terms of purposes.

Keywords: Ventriloquizing, self-reference, self-effacing, referent, C-SMILE

INTRODUCTION

The growing demand for publication in academia has driven academics' attention to doing research on texts with a variety of focuses (Flowerdew, 2001; Basthomi, 2009, 2012; Rakhmawati, 2014). The pressure for publication in reputed international journals has particularly challenged non-native (L2) speakers of English, as these publications often suggest they write in English. Studies of academic texts by L2 speakers have been compared directly or indirectly to native (L1) speakers' work, resulting in an abundance of instructional

guidelines for academic writing circulating among L2 English-language authors. However, some of these writing guidelines tend to produce new problems rather than provide solutions (see Hyland, 2002b).

Hyland (2002b) noticed that many writing textbooks and guidelines have given their readers misconceptions regarding an impersonal tone in academic texts. These guides have promulgated the notion of 'leaving their personality behind the door' (p. 351). In an attempt to evaluate whether these guidelines have had any impact on real practices, this author examined the use of author pronouns by experts and L2 writers. The results suggest that L2 writers have rates of utilising the first person pronouns three times lower than experts. Explicit self-representation in texts strengthens authors' ideas or arguments and makes them more persuasive (see Ivanič, 1998; Hyland, 2001, 2002b; Harwood, 2005). It also shows that authors know what they have accomplished and take responsibility for it. Therefore, choices of whether to use self-representation or impersonality in academic discourse play a primary role in projecting authors' identity. Accordingly, author pronouns are assumed to be the most essential feature in elevating the credibility of writers' research (see Hyland, 2001; Harwood, 2005).

In research pertaining to the aforementioned issues, numerous linguists and academics have also scrutinised the use of author pronouns as the cornerstone of projecting identity in academic writing (e.g., Hyland, 2002a, 2002b; Martínez,

2005; Harwood, 2005; McCrostie, 2008). Nonetheless, most of the research only deals with authorial presence in academic texts produced by L1 or L2 writers. Inspired by Hyland's (2001) study, Harwood (2005) conducted similar corpus-based research to investigate the use of 'I' and 'we' in research articles (RAs) in four different disciplines, without noting whether the RAs' writers were L1, L2 or FL. Focusing most of his work on L2 writers across various disciplines, Hyland's (2001, 2002a, 2002b) research projects offered the seminal conclusion that the use of 'I' is still problematic for L2 writers in academic texts. Subsequently, Martínez (2005) conducted a comparative study on first person pronouns used in biology RAs by L1 and L2 writers.

After reviewing the existing literature, it is worth noting that gaps in authorial presence have been defined by abundant attention to author pronouns, while none of the researchers has focused on author self-references in FL academic writing. Building upon Hyland's conclusions, Wijayanti and Widiati (2013) replicated Hyland's study on undergraduate FL theses, considering not only pronouns but also other self-references (e.g., 'the researcher', 'the author' and 'the writer'), which are called 'author self-references'. In particular, Wijayanti and Widiati attempted to see whether results in L2 are also applicable to FL. Unexpectedly, this study identified a new phenomenon of author presence in academic texts: the dominance of 'the researcher' as the most frequently

occurring self-reference instead of the first person pronoun, 'I' (see Hyland, 2002a). This result, however, found a difference between L2 and FL academic writing in terms of identity projection. In addition, it also suggested that 'the researcher' functions solely as self-reference in Wijayanti and Widiati's (2013) study, while Hyland's (2002a) study found that it acted as both a referent and self-reference to the authors' previous studies.

The ample studies of third person pronouns as self-representation in Indonesian texts have hitherto been a contentious topic of discussion (e.g., Cole *et al.*, 2006; Djenar, 2010; Sneddon *et al.*, 2010). Replicating studies by Cole *et al.* (2006) and Sneddon *et al.* (2010), Djenar, an Indonesian scholar, investigated third person pronouns ('dia' and 'ia') using a mini corpus that comprised 57,093 words taken from 84 online news reports. She successfully demonstrated that the notion of 'ia' more commonly occurs as a referent than 'dia' in the subject position. She also uncovered the implications of the predominant co-occurrence of 'ia' by analysing the contexts in which: "a) the referent is treated as a reliable source and an authority on the information being quoted, and b) the referent is presented as an agent who initiates or performs some action" (Djenar, 2010. p. 292).

These studies of the third person points of view in references have produced significant results in the area of identity projection in texts. As either self-projection or referent, a third person point of view

denotes a significant role in L2 (Hyland, 2002b) and FL writings (Cole *et al.*, 2006; Djenar, 2010; Sneddon *et al.*, 2010; Wijayanti & Widiati, 2013). Nonetheless, these findings raise a number of questions, including how authors manage to choose certain references to establish their voice in texts and whether they are fully aware of their choices, considering the effect or voice that might emerge from the use of references.

In this paper, we attempt to investigate further the use of 'the researcher' due to its frequent occurrence as a self-reference (Wijayanti & Widiati, 2013) in academic texts written by Indonesian EFL learners – by collecting data from a comparatively larger corpus than previous studies in order to explore our hypothesis. Giving a primary focus on 'the researcher' in this study, we seek to examine more extensively a variety of functions other than self-reference by studying frequency and instances. Our comparative outlook, as native Indonesians, indicates that the phrase 'the researcher' shares aspects in common with the use of 'peneliti' in academic texts written in Indonesian. This appears to imply the Indonesian daily oral communicative practices of framing and/ or ventriloquizing (Tannen, 2003, 2007), which are also closely related to the notion of referents (Chafe, 1994), which appear in written texts (McCrostie, 2008).

Ventriloquizing is a phenomenon by which a speaker positions him- or herself as another speaker or as another non-speaker by means of pronoun choice, paralinguistic

and prosodic features and other linguistic markers of points of view (Tannen, 2007, p. 55). Regardless of the term's origin, discussed in detail elsewhere (Tannen, 2004), ventriloquizing denotes – to follow Bakhtin (1981) in spirit – words spoken in such a way as to 'appear at a certain distance' from the speakers' lips. The phenomenon of ventriloquizing has been closely attached to the action of framing in verbal communication (Tannen, 2003, 2007). Tannen, who first introduced the term, uses it to address framing phenomenon in family interactions. In a similar vein, Schiffrin (1993) had previously labelled this discourse strategy as 'speaking for another.' Here, the difference lies in the use of pronouns to create a certain meaning in the sentence or dialogue. Tannen (2003) illustrates this by giving an example of a conversation between a married couple visited by their neighbour. In order to help the neighbour, to whom her husband has offered candy, the wife said, 'She's on a diet' (p. 55). That is the example of 'speaking for another' because she uses 'she', which implies that the wife shows her support of the neighbour by speaking on her behalf. It would have a different meaning if she had used 'I' instead of 'she' in the sentence, because, by using 'I', the wife would speak as if she herself were the neighbour, which could be seen as mocking the neighbour's habit of refusing sweets.

In the present study, we take into account some previous studies that have successfully revealed that the third person points of view have a significant role in

projecting authors' presence in texts (see Cole *et al.*, 2006; Djenar, 2010; Sneddon *et al.*, 2010; Wijayanti & Widiati, 2013). We have attempted to confirm whether this phenomenon is correlated with ventriloquizing since, as noted earlier, linguistic markers of point of view are among the features potentially used in ventriloquizing strategies. In terms of the use of the third person singular point of view as author self-reference (Hyland, 2001; Wijayanti & Widiati, 2013) and referent (Djenar, 2010), we consider it important to define the differences between them. In author self-reference, authors clearly use the third person point of view to project their presence in texts. To define 'referent' more clearly – while building on Djenar's (2010) previous study, which scrutinised different objects – the present study explores the notion of referent proposed by Chafe (1994).

Before expounding upon Chafe's (1994) concept of referent, it is essential also to take a brief look at Ariel's (1990) earlier study. Referring to a hierarchy of referents, which he calls 'accessibility', Ariel argues that pronouns are highly accessible while noun phrases (NP) are positioned in intermediate to low rank in the hierarchy. This argument reveals that pronouns are considered semantically empty because they do not provide new information to readers. In his later study, Chafe (1994), while not necessarily focusing on pronouns, provides a wider view on referents. He asserts that 'identifiable' referents are exploited to

fulfil verbalising functions without wasting words by stating the same information repeatedly or redundantly. Although in some cases authors choose repetition as a rhetorical strategy to achieve certain agendas (see Fox, 1987; Wales, 1996; Tannen, 2007), Chafe (1994) deliberately refutes the term 'identifiable' to emphasise that, in order to be 'active', the referent should include three components of identifiability: salience, shared knowledge and verbalisation (p. 94). Apart from the above differences in arguments, we conclude that both Ariel and Chafe pointed out the same idea: that referents are already mentioned in previous discourse and do not contain new information. Therefore, they equate to high saliency in texts. This view underpins our analysis of third person points of view, which, as NPs, are understood as referents in the present study.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

For greater efficiency, we used corpus-based analysis. We found this to be a suitable and valuable method for this study since it provides real instances of daily language use. A corpus offers naturally occurring linguistic patterns that we can use as evidence. The present corpus study combines quantitative and qualitative methods (Baker, 2006; Biber *et al.*, 1998).

In order to achieve our goal of analysing language use in academic texts, we decided to analyse C-SMILE (Corpus of State University of Malang Indonesian Learners' English), a small corpus we have built which includes theses and RAs comprising around two million words. The theses and articles are final projects submitted by students in the Department of English, State University of Malang, in their final year of undergraduate studies. We took data only from this department since the other departments do not require students to write theses and articles in English. While the theses were obtained from the past three years (2011, 2012 and 2013), the articles were collected from the past four years (2010, 2011, 2012 and 2013). For the theses, we focused on the main academic texts' sections – introduction, literature review, methods, findings, discussion and conclusion – and more parenthetic academic sections – abstract, acknowledgements and curriculum vitae (see Wijayanti & Widiati, 2013), excluding appendices and references for RAs, which mostly adopted the IMRD model (Swales, 1990). Table 1 shows more detailed information about the data used in this study.

TABLE 1
C-SMILE: The corpus

	Text	Words
Theses	124	1,549,453
Research articles	138	525,870
Total	262	2,075,323

The corpus was then analysed using free, open concordance software for Windows, AntConc 3.4.0w. Taking into account the importance of the third person point of view in academic writing (Djenar, 2010) and considering the high saliency of 'the researcher' as author self-reference in EFL writing (Wijayanti & Widiati, 2013), we conducted a pilot research focusing on non-pronoun third person self-mentions – 'the researcher', 'the writer' and 'the author'. For that purpose, we included both singular and plural forms since most of the students co-authored articles with their thesis advisors. Although we considered the plural forms of each multi-word unit, these did not become our main concern since the uses of author self-references were the primary focus of this research. The pilot study was necessary to decide further steps in our analysis, after attaining the frequency of each keyword.

The overall search for the three references – 'the researcher', 'the writer' and 'the author' – resulted in the absolute dominance of 'the researcher' in EFL academic writing, reaching almost 90% of all occurrences as compared to 'the writer' and 'the author'.

TABLE 2
Co-occurrences of third person points of view in EFL academic writing

References	No. of Occurrences	Percentage
'The researcher(s)'	7,848	89.75%
'The writer(s)'	738	8.44%
'The author(s)'	158	1.81%

Based on the results of the above-mentioned pilot search, we reached the important conclusion that the use of 'the researcher' warranted further examination. Hence, for the next step of the analysis, we decided to investigate the functions of 'the researcher' in texts by looking at the patterns of use. As Baker (2006) suggests, concordance analysis enables researchers to look closely at how particular words function in written discourse. We also consider this an effective way to confirm if the self-references really project the author and not someone else, since reading only one sentence in which it occurs may result in misunderstandings. In this step, we exploited a feature of AntConc software, Concordance, which facilitates the process of concordance analysis. As shown in Table 1, we had 7,848 entries of 'the researcher' for manual examination.

RESULTS

Through this concordance analysis, we unveiled two functions of 'the researcher(s)' in EFL learners' academic writing. The functions found in our study included self-reference and referents that represent other, future and general (all) researcher(s). The frequencies of each function's occurrences are presented in Table 3.

TABLE 3
Frequency of 'the researcher' according to functions

	Occurrence	Percentage
Self-reference	7,942	98.5%
Referent	118	1.5%
Total	8,060	100%

As is clear from Table 3, the function of 'the researcher' as self-reference stands out as the most popular in EFL learners' academic writing, achieving 98.5% of the overall frequency. It occurs 7,942 times across the texts. This indicates that EFL learners have a strong tendency towards utilising 'the researcher' to refer to themselves in academic texts. This fact contributes further to discussions about the function of 'the researcher' in academic writing (see Hyland, 2001; Wijayanti & Widiati, 2013). Instead of confirming the previously-mentioned phenomenon in the function of 'the researcher' as self-reference in L2 academic writing – indicating previous works by the author him- or herself (Hyland, 2001) – the results strongly support the counterargument that 'the researcher' functions as self-reference pointing to the author him- or herself in the current text (Wijayanti & Widiati, 2013).

Furthermore, examining the context enables us not only to analyse to whom 'the researcher' refers but also to disclose how EFL learners utilise 'the researcher' in texts. As a tool for projecting authors' presence, 'the researcher' performs various types of reference.

Excerpt 1

a) In this stage, **the researcher** conducted the try-out outside the class by involving 10 students from class 8D chosen randomly. (BGF2013RA)

b) In the discussion, there were only a few students who answered **the researcher's** question [sic] about the difficulties they faced during [sic] doing this activity. (A2011C3T)

c) The camera helped **the researcher** to record what happened in the class and helped **the researcher** observed [sic] the teaching and learning process. (PS2012C3T)

Excerpt 1 illustrates various clear instances of 'the researcher' as self-reference spotted with Key Word in Contexts (KWIC), which was part of File View, both features of AntConc. These instances exemplify the use of 'the researcher' as: a) subject reference, b) possessive reference, and c) object reference. By providing these examples, we intend to show that EFL learners utilised 'the researcher' for all the aforementioned functions, without concerning ourselves further with the number of each function's occurrences.

Furthermore, the concordance data also revealed five other discourse functions of self-mention, in this case 'the researcher', which included stating a goal/purpose, stating results or claims, expressing self-benefits, elaborating an argument and explaining methodological procedure (Hyland, 2002a).

Excerpt 2

a) In this stage, **the researchers** prepared the materials, the research instruments, the lesson plans, and determined the criteria of success. (NN2013RA)

b) **The researcher assumes** that students in Indonesia commonly **make errors** in using past tense [sic] because there are some differences between *Bahasa Indonesia* and English when we talk about something in the past. (F2013C1T)

c) **The researcher believes** that Alay phenomenon is **interesting** to be studied [sic] due to its unique writing style by [sic] using different choices of lexicons to express a word in standard language. (BAN2012C1T)

d) Besides, **the researcher** would conduct bigger group or class discussion [sic] **to strengthen** the ability of the students in stating thesis statement [sic], arguments [sic] as well as recommendation [sic] by using the Four-Square Writing Method. (APD2013RA)

e) Based on the validator's suggestions on the display aspect, **the researcher**

decided to replace the previous theme of the website with a patterned theme which made it look more **pleasant**. (NZ2013RA)

The above examples confirm that 'the researcher' as self-reference is used to achieve all the discourse functions in academic writing proposed by Hyland (2002a). Thus, these excerpts emphasise that EFL learners have an extremely strong tendency to represent themselves in texts using 'the researcher'.

In contrast to the self-reference function, 'the researcher' as a referent only occurs 118 times or 15% of all instances. We identified instances of 'the researcher' that refer to other or future researchers as referents, based on Chafe's (1994) three identifiability criteria, although in terms of information, these instances are likely to constitute what people might not already know. They occurred in the data mostly in the form of citations. Excerpt 3 captures the difference of 'the researcher' as referent and self-reference.

Excerpt 3

According to Latief (1999:110), "the collection of data in a qualitative research should be done by *the researcher* him/herself since it is *the researcher* who knows a lot about his/her own research, especially in terms of how much data that [sic] should be collected." So, in this research, **the researcher** herself will be the main instrument in collecting the data. (IF2013C3T)

As can be seen in Excerpt 3, 'the researcher' in both bold and italics is what we identified as referent, whereas 'the researcher' in the last sentence (without italics) functions as self-reference. We distinguished between the two by paying attention to reflexive pronouns that refer to 'the researcher'. The use of 'him/herself' in the sentence indicates that the author utilises 'the researcher' to address every individual who conducts research (researchers), be they male or female. Meanwhile, the last sentence is the opposite. The 'herself' that follows 'the researcher' denotes that the author is referring to herself, the author being female. However, before determining to whom 'the researcher' refers, we needed to be aware of the possibility that, regardless of the authors' gender, they might also use the general term 'he' or even 'himself' with the aim of either being neutral or disguising their gender. Hence, we had to check the writer's gender.

The emergence of the referent phenomenon in this study corresponds to the previously mentioned notion that NPs at the intermediate to low levels in the hierarchy of accessibility (see Ariel, 1990; Ledin, 1996). Instead of performing an anaphoric function – referring back to previously mentioned referents –'the researcher', as an NP, serves the function noted earlier of providing new information to readers. This strategy is actually prone to creating ambiguity for readers, whether 'the researcher' refers to the author or another researcher, unless the author provides a hint (e.g., reflexive pronoun) in the sentence.

In conclusion, all the salient facts we attained from the concordance analysis regarding 'the researcher' indicate that this is the most popular self-reference in EFL academic writing, as discussed further in the following section.

DISCUSSION

The present study has captured in detail the phenomenon of 'the researcher' as the most prominent third person point of view that EFL learners frequently employ as self-reference in academic writing, in contrast to its other function as a referent. This result, we believe, strongly correlates to the action of 'framing' in academic written discourse. Out of six kinds of text framing suggested by Becker (as cited in Tannen, 1986, p. 107), 'framing of the text by interpersonal setting (i.e. social constraint)' might provide the answer to why this phenomenon happens. However, as a framing concept, we found that 'ventriloquizing' is more adequate for evaluating our study's results, particularly given that 'the researcher' is the most prevalent author self-reference used by EFL learners.

Although ventriloquizing is more popular in studies of spoken discourse, where it has been used to analyse phenomena in verbal family interactions (see Tannen, 2003, 2007), it is apparent that the use of 'the researcher' as a self-reference also implies the application of ventriloquizing in academic written discourse. Tannen (2007) points out

that ventriloquizing is a combination of constructed dialogue and framing in discourse. As noted earlier, the function of 'the researcher' in the present study differs from previous, similar corpus-based studies (e.g., Hyland, 2001) in that the dominance of 'the researcher' as self-reference in FL writing as compared to L2 or even L1 speakers is notable. Hypothetically, this phenomenon presumably happens as a result of Indonesian cultural influences, in which ventriloquizing often occurs, especially in spoken language.

Despite the fact that ventriloquizing may refer to 'framing other people' (see Tannen, 2003), we can apply both concepts to identify the self-reference use of 'the researcher' in academic writing since both involve framing agents. The difference, however, lies in the idea that ventriloquizing frames others, as Tannen (2003) has proposed, while in the present study, the ventriloquizing phenomenon is self-framing. To see the phenomenon of ventriloquizing in written discourse more clearly, we refer to Excerpt 4, which is taken from the present study's corpus.

Excerpt 4

In this step, **the researcher** evaluated the result of the speaking test and observation. (HI1011EDU)

Although not containing paralinguistic and prosodic features such as those in spoken discourse, the above example can be defined as a ventriloquizing phenomenon since the highlighted words function as a self-framing of agents that allows the writer to communicate (e.g., describe a procedure) as a second party. By employing this strategy, the author manages to maintain a distance from his or her own sentence. This is an example of the phenomenon of striking the right balance between Bakhtin's (1981) notion of polyvocality and Tannen's (2007) ventriloquizing. Even though the 'keeping at a certain distance' strategy enables the author to enhance his or her tone of objectivity (Bakhtin, 1981), the possibility that this can also decrease the author's responsibility for his or her argument (Tannen, 2007) is worth noting. This aspect captures the similar phenomenon of a 'self-effacing' strategy (see Hyland, 2001; Wijayanti & Widiati, 2013). In other words, we can determine that the self-effacing strategy uses ventriloquizing, in particular, self-framing in academic written discourse, whereby the authors tend to use 'the researcher' (third person reference) to disguise their presence in the text.

Following McCrostie's (2008) argument about the interference of L1 in L2 writing, we also considered this aspect, that is, L1 and L2 (Indonesian and Javanese) presumably influence the EFL academic writing in this study. In relation to ventriloquizing, we can safely assume that the EFL learners in this study have consciously or unconsciously used the self-framing strategy in their daily communication. In an attempt to test this idea, we evaluated examples of language use in Indonesian and Javanese. For the purpose of providing examples from our

data, we take into account Chomsky's (1984) argument that linguistic studies comprise introspection and explanation. He noted that native speakers have the power of introspection, writing that 'if you sit and think for a few minutes, you're just flooded with relevant data' (Chomsky, 1984, p. 44). Consequently, we, as native speakers of Indonesian and Javanese, have provided self-introspective examples of utterances based on our daily conversations, without conducting any fieldwork.

In Javanese, the term that we are aware of for 'ventriloquizing' is 'mernahno'. This term also refers to the action of framing both the other and the self. People often use this in both spoken and written language. To give an illustration of what we mean by the 'mernahno' or ventriloquizing phenomenon in Javanese discourse, we provide an example of a Javanese conversation below (constructed from daily conversations in Javanese). The following example is of a father ordering his son to buy him medicine.

Excerpt 5

'Le, tulung Bapak pundhutno obat ning Apotek'
 *N   Ex   N   V   O
Prep   N*
'Son, please buy   father medicine
 at   the   chemist.'
(literal English translation)

By using 'Bapak' or 'father' instead of 'aku' or 'me' in English, the father purposely addresses himself as a 'father' to place an emphasis on his position as the father. This is not necessarily showing politeness since a father is not required to be polite to his son, but it effectively reduces the tone of coerciveness in giving order. Hence, the son will not feel like he is being forced to obey an order. Instead, he will think of it as helping his father. Besides the pronoun, the choice of lexicon in the above example also serves a certain purpose. As Javanese is a multi-level language covering three levels of speech – 'krama', 'madya' and 'ngoko' (Poedjosoedarmo *et al.*, 1979; Suharno, 1982; Sudaryanto, 1991; Kadarisman, 2009) – the use of the word 'pundhutno' (i.e., 'buy' in English), which is at the most formal level of speech in Javanese, warrants further discussion. In Javanese, the interlocutors determine the speaker's level of speech. Normally, fathers speak using the lowest level of speech ('ngoko') to their sons. Yet, in Excerpt 5, the father's choice of the word 'pundhutno' ('krama') instead of 'tukokno' ('ngoko') in speaking to his son indicates a sense of educating; he intends to teach his son by giving an example of the level of speech the son should use to speak to his father and other elderly people. This strategy denotes ventriloquizing, and it is in line with the idea of 'reframing for or as other in the presence of that other'. In this instance, the father reframes for the son directly in front of him.

In addition, in Bahasa Indonesia, the ventriloquizing-like phenomenon also occurs widely. The following example (Excerpt 6) illustrates how people usually reframe others to show their politeness. This is a conversation between a senior lecturer and a student, who are addressing another lecturer via short message service.

Excerpt 6

'Mengenai hal itu, Saya akan berkoordinasi lebih lanjut dengan Bu Renzi'
'Regarding this matter, I will have a further discussion with Bu Renzi. (English version)

In this example, the speaker, a senior lecturer, uses the term 'Bu' in front of the name to address the other lecturer on behalf of the student, whereas, in direct conversation, he might not necessarily address her using 'Bu' and might directly use her name. This phenomenon emphasises that, in the above utterance, the senior lecturer does not talk as and for himself, instead he reframes for the other lecturer by addressing her from the student's point of view. Despite showing politeness, by employing the ventriloquizing strategy, he also shows an intention to teach the student the norm, that is, always to give respect to other people even though they may be in a lower position than we are.

In order to confirm whether 'the researcher' is a transfer phenomenon through which the author projects his or her presence in academic texts, we sought to identify theses written in Indonesian comparable to the data used in this study. We randomly selected ten theses accessed from the State University of Malang's online library. After analysing the data using the same method as the main data search in this study, the random data provided clear evidence showing the occurrence of 'peneliti' ('the researcher' in English) as authors' self-reference (see Excerpt 7).

Excerpt 7

*Instrumen utama dalam penelitian ini yaitu **peneliti**, sedangkan instrumen penunjang dalam penelitian ini adalah lembar observasi dan pedoman penilaian hasil belajar siswa.* (DEN2008ASID)
(The main instrument of the study is the researcher, while the supporting instruments are the observation sheets and scoring rubric of the students' performance.)

The uses of 'peneliti' in Excerpt 7 and 'the researcher' in Excerpt 4 have exactly the same function. In addition to projecting the authors' presence, the authors utilise this word as an agent of framing to disguise their identity. Thus, it also implies that both 'peneliti' and 'the researcher' entail self-framing, which we proposed as an expanded concept of ventriloquizing.

These excerpts (4, 5, 6 and 7) clearly exemplify the various actions of framing that happen in both spoken and written discourses. Of particular importance in the discussion of the examples are the framing actions in Excerpts 5 and 6, which show that daily communication reveals different functions from those in academic writing, be they in English or Indonesian. This suggests that, in principle, no difference in ventriloquizing phenomenon in spoken and written discourses exists in the Indonesian context, yet what makes them possibly different are the authors' goals.

CONCLUSION

From the ample uses of 'the researcher' by EFL students in their writing, it appears that they are influenced by the habitual practices

of ventriloquizing in their everyday (oral) communication using either their L1 or L2. Having proposed this, we attempted to apply Tannen's (2003, 2007) concept of ventriloquizing, which focuses only on spoken discourse, by paying attention to the paralinguistic and prosodic features of utterances (e.g., the speaker's tone/pitch). Tannen (2003) states that 'my notion of ventriloquizing is a related phenomenon by which a person speaks not only for another but as another' (p. 55). In contrast to Tannen's proposed approach, we conclude that the use of 'the researcher' denotes that the term ventriloquizing includes not only 'speaking for another and others' but also for and as the speaker him- or herself.

The use of self-reference, whether in the form of pronoun or noun phrase, as the symbol to project authorial presence is a crucial matter in academic writing. Deliberately concentrating on author's third person point of view in academic writing written by Indonesian EFL learners, the present study has unveiled the abundant uses of the researcher as self-reference operated for some functions in the texts. The analysis of *the researcher* in its context has enabled us to highlight its focal function, that is, as self-framing or more popular as 'self-effacing device' (see, Hyland, 2001, p. 217). This phenomenon is basically similar to what is referred to as ventriloquizing (Tannen, 2003, 2007). This also suggests that ventriloquizing that is conceptualised from spoken discourse is also applicable to written discourse. This corpus linguistic study, especially by virtue of concordance

analysis, has helped us significantly comprehend what voice the Indonesian authors want to deliver by linking it to their social and cultural practices.

Although being different in terms of purpose, ventriloquizing-like practices, which have been consciously or unconsciously used in Indonesian and Javanese in daily communication, give a high contribution to influence the self-framing strategy in academic writing written in English. However, this study has not answered a pertinent question as to whether the authors purposely employ such strategy to achieve a certain goal, for the purpose of effective strategy in communication, or they simply follow the previous researchers who have hitherto overused the researcher or *peneliti* as author's self-reference in academic texts.

REFERENCES

Ariel, M. (1990). *Assessing noun-phrase antecedents*. London: Routledge.

Baker, P. (2006). *Using corpora in discourse analysis*. London/New York: Continuum.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). Discourse in the novel (C.Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.). In M. Holquist (Ed.), *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M. M. Bakhtin* (pp. 259-422). Austin: The University of Texas Press.

Basthomi, Y. (2009). Examining spaces in doctoral prospectuses. *TEFLIN Journal*, *20*(2), 140-158.

Basthomi, Y. (2012). Curriculum vitae: a discourse of celebration with narcissistic allusions. *TEFLIN Journal*, *23*(1), 1-28.Biber, D., Conrad, S., & Reppen, R. (1998). *Corpus linguistics: Investigating language structure and use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chafe, W. (1994). *Discourse, consciousness, and time: The flow and displacement of conscious experience in speaking and writing*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Chomsky, N. (1984). *Modular approaches to the study of the mind*. San Diego: San Diego University Press.

Cole, P., Hermon, G., & Tjung, Y. (2006). Is there 'Pasif Semu' in Jakarta Indonesian? *Oceanic Linguistics, 45*(1), 64-90.

Djenar, D. (2010). Reliable words: third person pronouns in Indonesian news reports. *Wacana: Journal of the Humanities of Indonesia*, *12*(2), 269-294.

Flowerdew, J. (2001). Attitudes of journal editors to nonnative speaker contributions. *TESOL Quarterly*, *35*(1), 121-150.

Fox, B. (1987). *Discourse structure and anaphora; written and conversational English*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Harwood, N. (2005). 'Nowhere has anyone attempted… In this article I aim to do just that'. A Corpus-based study of self-promotional I and We in academic writing across four disciplines. *Journal of Pragmatics, 37*, 1207-1231.

Hyland, K. (2001). Humble Servants of the Discipline? Self-mention in Research Articles. *English for Specific Purposes*, *20*, 207-226.

Hyland, K. (2002a). Authority and Invisibility: Authorial Identity in Academic Writing. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *34*, 1091-1112.

Hyland, K. (2002b). Options of Identity in Academic Writing. *ELT Journal*, *56*(4), 351-358.

Ivanič, R. (1998). *Writing and Identity: The Discoursal Construction of Identity in Academic Writing*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Kadarisman, A. E. (2009). *Mengurai Bahasa, Menyibak Budaya: Bunga Rampai Linguistik, Puitika, dan Pengajaran Bahasa*. Malang: Penerbit Universitas Negeri Malang.

Ledin, P. (1996). The Prime Minister Ingvar Carlsson, he or Ingvar? Anaphoric expressions in newspaper discourse. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics*, *19*(1), 35-54.

Martínez, I. A. (2005). Native and non-native writers' use of first person pronouns in the different sections of biology research articles in English. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *14*, 174-190.

McCrostie, J. (2008). Writer visibility in EFL learner academic writing: A corpus based study. *ICAME Journal*, *32*, 97-114.

Poedjosoedarmo, S., Kudjana Th., Soepomo G., & Alif, S. (1979). *Tingkat tutur bahasa Jawa*. Jakarta: Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa.

Rakhmawati, A. (2014). *A Comparison of Indonesian and English Research Articles Written by Indonesian Academics: Integrating Perspectives on Genre and Rhetorical Diversity*. (PhD thesis). Armidale: University New England.

Schiffrin, D. (1993). "Speaking for another" in sociolinguistic interviews: Alignments, identities, and frames. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Framing in Discourse* (pp. 231-263). New York: Oxford University Press.

Sudaryanto. (1991). *Tata baku bahasa Jawa*. Yogyakarta: Duta Wacana University Press.

Suharno, I. (1982). *A descriptive study of Javanese* (No. 45). Department of Linguistics, Research School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University.

Sneddon, J. N., Adelaar, A., Djenar, D. N., & Ewing, M. C. (2010). *Indonesian Reference Grammar* (2nd Edn.). St. Leonards, NSW: Allen and Unwin.

Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre Analysis: English in academic research settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tannen, D. (1986). Frames revisited. *Quaderni de Semantica*, *7*(1), 106-109.

Tannen, D. (2003). Power maneuvers or connection maneuvers? Ventriloquizing in family interaction. *University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics* (pp. 50-62). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Tannen, D. (2004). Talking the dogs: Framing pets as interactional resources in family discourse. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *37*(4), 399-420.

Tannen, D. (2007). *Talking voices: Repetition, dialogue, and imagery in conversational discourse* (2nd Edn.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wales, K. (1996). *Personal pronouns in present-day English*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Wijayanti, L. T., & Widiati, U. (2013). Author self-references: Authorial Voice. In M. Huda & A. Ghozi (Eds.), *Proceeding of The 1st International English Linguistics and Literature (ELITE) Conference* (p. 206-214). Malang: Maulana Malik Ibrahim State Islamic University.