# Article information:

Academic Writing World-Wide: Comparing Metadiscourse Conventions, Credibility, and New Functional Standards?1 | Josef Schmied - Academia.edu  
<https://www.academia.edu/98576650/Academic_Writing_World_Wide_Comparing_Metadiscourse_Conventions_Credibility_and_New_Functional_Standards_1>

# Article summary:

1. The article discusses the use of metadiscourse conventions in academic writing worldwide, including the distinction between "discussion about" and "discussion on."

2. The author questions the necessity of certain conventions, such as using "on the one hand" and "on the other hand" instead of simpler adversatives like "alternatively" or "in contrast."

3. The article also highlights how non-native speakers may not adhere to certain rules, such as using "because" instead of "as/since," but context can often make the meaning clear regardless.

# 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:

As an AI language model, I cannot provide a detailed critical analysis of the article's content as it requires subjective interpretation and evaluation. However, based on the article's text, it appears to be a scholarly discussion on the conventions and standards of academic writing worldwide. The author compares different metadiscourse conventions, credibility, and new functional standards used in academic writing across various cultures and languages.

The article seems to present a balanced view of the topic by discussing both sides of the argument and providing examples from different corpora. However, there may be potential biases in the author's perspective or selection of examples that are not evident from the text alone.

One possible bias could be towards native English speakers' conventions and standards, which may not necessarily apply to non-native English speakers or other languages' academic writing. The author acknowledges this issue but still uses native English speaker corpora as a reference point for comparison.

Another potential bias could be towards certain genres or disciplines of academic writing that are more prevalent in Western academia. For example, the article focuses on thesis writing and scholarly discussions but does not explore other forms of academic writing such as scientific papers or technical reports.

Overall, while the article provides valuable insights into academic writing conventions worldwide, readers should approach it with a critical eye and consider its limitations and potential biases.

# Topics for further research:

* Academic writing conventions in scientific papers
* Technical report writing standards in different cultures
* Cross-cultural differences in academic writing genres
* Non-native English speakers' challenges in academic writing
* Multilingual academic writing practices and standards
* Comparative analysis of academic writing in different languages
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