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# Article summary:

1. This study examines the differences in utilizing textual metadiscourses in translated and non-translated Letters to Shareholders.

2. The analysis shows that non-translations use more comparison transitions, while translations use more addition transitions.

3. Non-translations also use more reformulation code glosses than translations, which could be explained by different writing practices in the two cultures.

# Article rating:

Appears moderately imbalanced: The article provides some useful information, but is missing several important points or pieces of evidence that would be required to present the discussed topics in a balanced and reliable way. You are encouraged to seek a more balanced perspective on the presented issues by exploring the provided research topics and looking at different information sources.

# Article analysis:

The article titled "Reader-writer interaction in translated and non-translated Letters to Shareholders with an Analysis of Textual Metadiscourse" aims to explore the differences in utilizing textual metadiscourses in translated and non-translated letters to shareholders. The study analyzes the linguistic resources used by writers to help readers understand and interpret the text as intended.

One potential bias in this article is its focus on comparing Korean-to-English translations with English originals, which may not be representative of all translation scenarios. Additionally, the study only focuses on one genre of business discourse, which limits its generalizability to other genres.

The article claims that non-translations use more comparison transitions while translations use more addition transitions. However, it does not provide evidence or explanation for why this might be the case. Similarly, the claim that English writing culture assumes responsibility for successful communication while Korean culture places responsibility on readers is unsupported and lacks evidence.

The article also notes a difference in the use of reformulation code glosses between translations and non-translations but does not explore potential reasons for this difference beyond cultural differences. It would have been useful to consider other factors such as audience expectations or genre conventions that could influence these differences.

Furthermore, the article does not present counterarguments or alternative explanations for its findings. For example, it could be argued that differences in textual metadiscourse usage are due to individual writer preferences rather than cultural differences.

Overall, while this article provides some insights into reader-writer interaction and textual metadiscourse usage in translated and non-translated business discourse, it has limitations in terms of generalizability and lack of exploration of alternative explanations for its findings.

# Topics for further research:

* Cross-cultural differences in business communication
* Genre conventions in business discourse
* Linguistic resources for successful communication
* Writer preferences in textual metadiscourse usage
* Audience expectations in business communication
* Translation strategies for effective communication
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