ISSN 1799-2591
Theory and Practice in Language Studies, Vol. 6, No. 7, pp. 1383-1389, July 2016
DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0607.08

A Genre Analysis of Discussion Sections of Qualitative Research Articles in Applied Linguistics

Leila Dobakhti
Tabriz Islamic Art University, Tabriz, Iran

***Abstract*—This paper reports on a genre study of the Discussion sections of 15 qualitative research articles in Applied Linguistics from five high impact journals published from 2003-2009. Based on Swales' (1990, 2004) move structure model, this study aims to develop a description of move structure in this corpus and introduce the available patterns and options. The analysis reveals that there are similarities and differences between the generic structure of qualitative research articles identified in this paper and those found concerning empirical research articles.**

***Index Terms*—move structure, discussion section, qualitative research, applied linguistics**

I. Introduction

Research articles (RAs) are a high valued genre in building and disseminating knowledge in academic communities. Writing a research report is a challenging task for writers as it requires them not only to establish the importance of their research but also to be familiar with the conventions of their discourse communities and be able to apply that knowledge in their writing. One attempt to identify community expectation has been taken through ESP genre analytical approach (Bhatia, 1993; Swales, 1990). The approach is based on the assumption that genres are communicative events which are organized by conventions that belong to discourse communities. There is a vast amount of literature on the generic features of RAs in various disciplines which have investigated either the whole article or one section of RAs within the IMRD (Introduction, Method, Results, and Discussion) framework including: research articles in Applied Linguistics (Yang, 2001); research articles in Biochemistry (Kanoksilapatham, 2005); research articles in Computer Science (Posteguillo, 1999); research articles in Medicine (Nwogu, 1997); Abstracts and Introductions in Conservation Biology and Wildlife Behavior (Samraj, 2005); introductions in Applied Linguistics (Ozturk, 2007); result section in Management research articles (Lim, 2006); discussion sections in History, Political Science and Sociology (Holmes, 1997); and discussion sections in Agricultural Economics (Holmes, 2000).

However, these studies have been concerned with empirical RAs. Empirical research can be defined as “the construction of knowledge by means of systematic observation, analysis, and representation of behavior and/or its artifact” (Silva, 2005, p. 10). Based on this definition qualitative and quantitative deigns fall into empirical research. However, as we know, these two designs are different in the knowledge claim they make, their main purpose, the research questions they impose, their data, and their methods of data analysis (Creswell, 2003; McKay, 2006).

Quantitative research is based on the assumption that the world is governed by rules and knowledge is created when researchers “examine causes that influence outcomes” to verify or refute these rules (Creswell, 2003, p. 5). Thus, reality is broken down into variables and questions or hypotheses are formed. Then, experiments or surveys are conducted to collect data that amends itself to statistical analysis. Based on these numbers and counts, the causal relationships of variables or the context of concern are studied and finally the question is answered or the hypothesis is either verified or refuted. The quantitative research, thus, is based on prediction, hypothesizing, testing and control.

On the other hand, qualitative research is based on the assumption that reality is multiple and constructed socially and can be studied holistically. Thus, knowledge is created by people through the interpretation and understanding of a phenomenon in various social and historical contexts. Instead of “narrowing meanings into a few categories or idea”, the researcher’s aim is to “interpret” the multiple meanings that “others have about the world” (Creswell, 2003, pp. 8-9). Using strategies such as narratives, case studies, ethnographies, phenomenology, discourse studies and ground theories, researcher collects data through open-ended questions, interviews, observations, texts, and image analysis. Instead of analyzing data statistically, as in quantitative research, the qualitative researcher’s aim is to categorize and interpret the data in order to provide a deep verbal description of the “meanings that people attach to things in their lives” (Taylor & Bogdan, 1998, p. 3) to understand how people make sense of their world. In other words, qualitative research “refers to the meanings, concepts, definitions, characteristics, metaphors, symbols and description of things” (Berg, 2001, p. 2).

Considering all these differences, it is not unreasonable to assume that writers use various rhetorical strategies in writing qualitative and quantitative research articles. The study reported in this paper focuses on the discussion section of qualitative research articles in the field of Applied Linguistics. Discussion section enjoys a crucial role in any academic writing. This section is important because "results and interpretations need to be presented in ways that readers are likely to find persuasive" (Hyland, 2005, p. 176). Besides, it is the section that students find the most problematic to write and understand (Bitchener & Basturkmen, 2006; Dudley-Evans, 1994). It is hoped that the findings of this study could facilitate the writing of research articles especially for novice ones.

II. Methodology

The present study builds on a corpus of 15 qualitative research articles' discussions from five high impact journals in the field of Applied Linguistics published from 2003 to 2009.

A. The Selection of the Journals

In order to select the journals, first the list of high impact journals in the field of Linguistics reported in Journal Citation Reports (Social Sciences Edition) 2008 was printed which included a total of 68 journals. The criteria considered for selecting journals included their availability (either electronic version or hard copy) in University of Malaya library and their relatedness to Applied Linguistics rather than Linguistics per se. It was also important to ensure that the journals published qualitative RAs. To ensure this matter, a few issues of remaining journals were checked out one by one and the journals that were concerned with mostly quantitative articles such as *Modern Language Journal* and *Language Learning* were excluded. From the remaining journals, these five journals were selected: *Applied Linguistics* (APP), *English for Specific Purposes* (ESP), *Journal of Pragmatics* (PRAG), *Language Teaching Research* (LTR), and *TESOL Quarterly* (TESOL).

B. The Selection of the Articles

Each article in each issue of the five journals published from 2003 to 2009 were checked in order to select the corpus. The first criterion was the inclusion of a separate discussion section. If the articles matched this criterion, then it was checked for being qualitative or quantitative. The first priority was given to the writers' own explicit statement about the design they had used. If they had not mentioned it explicitly, the method, the title, the abstract and the methodology section were examined carefully to categorize the articles as qualitative or quantitative. Those that were experimental or dealt with completely statistics were identified as quantitative and those articles that relied mainly on verbal description were classified as qualitative. Those articles that used both qualitative and quantitative designs were classified as mixed method studies and were excluded. Finally, classifying all articles in the journals as qualitative or quantitative, three articles from each journal (making 15 in all) were selected randomly for analysis (see Appendix 1 for list of articles and Appendix 2 for the particulars of the corpus).

C. Data Analysis

The sample articles were examined in terms of type of Moves, Steps and Sub-steps. Move can be defined as a communicative unit which carries the specific communicative purpose of a particular part of the text under study. A Move may be realized by one or more subsequent elements called Steps. Prior to attempt to analyze the texts, first, the whole articles were read to obtain a general idea about them. Identification of Moves was made on the basis of linguistic evidence and knowledge about the content of the text (Dudley-Evans, 1994; Nwogu, 1997). The identification of Moves and Steps in the corpus was done recursively. In other words, re-readings or re-analyses of any part of the RAs were carried out until the identification of the communicative units of Moves and Steps were satisfactorily done. In order to ensure the reliability of the analysis, twenty percent of the corpus (three RAs) was analyzed by a Professor who is a specialist in genre analysis. The Cohen kappa inter-rater agreement showed a kappa value of 0.81.

III. Findings

The preliminary analysis of 15 qualitative research articles revealed 11 moves in the corpus. The characteristics of these moves and the steps that realize them are described in this section.

A. Move 1- Reporting Findings

This move which occurred in all of the RAs in the corpus was realized through two steps: *Stating Findings* and *Summarizing Findings*. While all the Discussions included Move1-Step1, Step2 of Move1 occurred only at the end of one of the sections where the writer summarized the main findings as a concluding point.

Move 1- Step1: Stating Findings

(1) <u>The findings reveal</u> some important differences in the nature of the oral interaction experienced by Soon Yi and Ivan in the classroom and real-world contexts. (LTR1)

(2) <u>The present study has revealed</u> a difference between the JNSG and the LJG in the interpretation of the key meaning feature 'shinmi/sympathetic'. (PRAG2)

Move 1-Step2: Summarizing Findings

(3) Claudia presented an architectural self seemingly more closely aligned to an objective orientation; similar in presentation style to that identified by Darling (2005) in engineering design discourse, in which speaking competently was associated with attention on the object and away from the self. Both the successful students, Adam (first year) and

Ben (fourth year), conveyed an architectural self that fits well with what Coyne, Snodgrass, and Martin (1994) refer to as a romantic orientation… (ESP1)

B. Move 2: Referring to Data to Provide Evidence for Findings

Occurring in 11 RAs, this move appeared immediately after Move1-Step1 (Presenting Findings). After presenting their findings, writers referred to their data to support, illustrate or provide evidence for their findings. In excerpt 4, for example, the writers first present the finding (in NOM sessions the teacher was an important player) and in the following sentences they refer to their data to illustrate and support this finding (… *the teachers in this study used several interactional moves during the NOM sessions… First, they had… At the same time they were sensitive to… Third, they directed the audience… Finally, they supplied…)*.

(4) Our analysis of NOM sessions also showed clearly that the teacher, although not the sole factor in improving stories, was a critical player. As described above, the teachers in this study used several interactional moves during the NOM sessions that seemed to be effective in improving the stories told. First, they had an ear for the storyteller to provide it. At the same time, they were sensitive to interpretations and presuppositions on the part of the tellers that came from their cultural knowledge and that might have confused the audience. Third, they directed the audience by encouraging members to ask questions, checking what the audience members had understood of the story, and making sure that the conversation did not stay too far from the point of the story. Finally, they supplied words, phrases, and idiomatic expressions when storytellers needed them and helped with pronunciation difficulties that interfered with the storyteller's meaning (Providing Evidence for Findings from Data). (TESOL3)

C. Move 3: Commenting on Findings

In this move, which occurred in 12 RAs, the writers went beyond the "objective" presentation of findings and offered their own understandings of them. This move was realized by three steps of *Explaining Findings* (where the comment was an attempt to provide a reason for why the findings were obtained); *Interpreting Findings* (where the comment was a speculation about what the findings meant); and *Evaluating Findings* (where the comment was an evaluation of findings).

Move3- Step 1: Explaining Findings

This step was realized through two sub-steps: Providing an Explanation or Alternative Explanations and Rejecting a Possible Explanation. In Step1A writers provide one or several reasons to explain the findings.

Move 3- Step1A: Providing an Explanation or Alternative Explanations

(5) This uncertainty among outer-circle speakers may be the result of their experience with multiple and conflicting norms for English. (TESOL1)

(6) How do we explain this difference between idealistic desire and critical evaluation of speech and silence?[...] First, the difference between the two sample groups may appear to be a product of differing English proficiency level… Another factor impacting on the different evaluations of speech and silence may be the educational goals of each cohort … (TESOL2)

Move 3- Step1B: Rejecting a Possible Explanation

(7) Nor does familiarity with the workshop content seem to be a reasonable explanation for the reduced attention to language in the real world context. (LTR1)

Move 3- Step 2: Interpreting Findings

This step was realized by two sub-steps: Providing an Interpretation by writer or Providing an Interpreting by Referring to Literature.

Move 3- Step 2A: Providing an Interpretation

(8) *It appears that Fengchen saw the essence of genres as repeated social actions, as evidenced in his recognition of the item-by- item and the review-evaluation patterns as recurring generic features that other researchers use to organize their literature reviews, and thus patterns that he could use to organize his own literature reviews.* (ESP2)

Move 3- Step 2B: Providing an Interpretation by Referring to Literature

(9) *The use of specific grammatical constructions to counter the static quality of visual representations in academic presentations has been noted by several researchers. Ochs, Gonzales and Jacoby (1994, pp. 162–163) report how the use of dynamic grammar and gesturing in the presentations of physicists served as devices to help an audience accept the credibility of a scientific experiment through a sort of ''virtual witnessing" of the procedure. In the field of architecture, Medway (1996) reports that architects in professional practice discuss features of their designs using a dynamic grammar (e.g. ''pressing against one another" ''pulling back from a square"), and concludes that such language that ''graphically expresses the dramas and dynamics occurring between shapes and masses" is typical of architectural discourse (p. 497). In this sense, Ben's use of verbs of motion (e.g. where the building or elements of the building are described as stretching, folding, moving through, and popping up) can be seen as helping to convey the dynamic quality of his design...* (ESP1)

Move 3-Step 3: Evaluating Findings

(10) *However, any direct link between culture and behavior must be questioned. Just as cultural explanations may be used erroneously by teachers to explain student silences, cultural explanation can also be used by students to justify their silences or even to identify as silent students...* (TESOL2)

D. Move 4: Supporting the Explanation/Interpretation/Evaluation/Rejected Explanation

This move which was present in 7 RAs occurred after Move 3 (Commenting on Data) where the writers attempted to support or provide evidence for the explanation/ interpretation/evaluation and/or rejected explanation by referring to data or referring to literature. For example, in excerpt 11, after providing an explanation for the findings in the first sentence, the writers refer to the data to support or provide evidence for their explanation. In excerpt 12, after presenting the interpretation of the findings in the first sentence, the writer refers to the literature to support the interpretation.

Move 4- Step1: Referring to Data to Support the Explanation / Interpretation / Evaluation / Rejected Explanation

(11) *A more plausible explanation for the limited overt attention to language in the tutoring context is that Soon Yi and Ivan realized that despite the non-native aspects of their language, they could be understood well enough to achieve their objectives in the workshops and help the high school students with their homework. The high school students tolerated a range of non-native aspects of the tutors' language, including grammatical errors and accented speech, only reacting when pronunciation impeded comprehension, or word-search interfered with the pace of the conversation. Evidence in support of this interpretation comes from the tutors' journal entries which, as the volunteer program progressed, focused more on descriptions of task execution than on concerns over their level of language.* (LTR1)

Move 4- Step 2: Referring to Literature to Support Explanation/Interpretation

(12) *This implies that it is difficult for learners to apply the Japanese rule, even if they have the necessary knowledge. The following quotation supports this view:*

In fact, I was warned before I came to Japan to be cautious of hai, that it didn't necessarily mean ''yes, I will do that.'' It meant ''yes, I understand that.'' And even with knowing that, I still found difficulties at first in understanding between the people in my company that speak very good English. (JETRO, 1980 cited from Miller, 1991:125) (PRAG2)

E. Move 5: Comparing Findings with Literature

In this move writers related their findings to previous works. They either compared their findings with the findings from other studies, as in excerpts 13 and 15, or indicated the consistency and/or inconsistency of their findings with a claim, contention or theory in the literature, as in excerpts 14 and 16. This move occurred in nine of the RAs as an independent move; although, in several cases it was embedded in other moves such as Stating Findings.

Move 5- Step1: Indicating Consistency of Findings with Literature

(13) *Previous research on spoken academic genres has illustrated that narrative typically functions to create rapport with an audience and to draw them into the speaker's world* (Thompson, 2002). *In our data, a narrative rhetorical style seemed to be one of the more important components of a successful design presentation*. (ESP1)

(14) *Heyman (1986:40) further claims that what is 'essential for the topical organization of the talk and orientation to this topic by members is clarification of the task demands, i.e., describing the gist of the task at the beginning of the talk'. Kasper (2004) has also shown how the definition of characteristics of task is procedurally consequential in topic initiation of talk. In our data, it can be seen that formulation of the task demand was well integrated into the discussion*. (APP1)

Move 5- Step2: Indicating Inconsistency of Findings with Literature

(15) *In their analysis of topic shift in OPI, Kasper and Ross (2007: 2061) suggest that topic shifts are a fragile environment where test candidates may have difficulties providing relevant answers. The peer participants in the group oral discussion task in our study had no identifiable trouble handling topic shifts from the ongoing sequence.* (APP1)

(16) *One of the criticisms of task-based communicative language pedagogy has been that students' preoccupation with finishing a task may result in minimal use of language, and little attention to language form (Seedhouse, 1999; see also Swan, 2005). The findings of this study suggest that for adult learners, particularly those with some proficiency in the language, attention to language during oral interaction may in fact compromise task completion*. (LTR1)

F. Move 6: Referring to Data to Provide Evidence for Inconsistency of Findings with Literature

This move which was found in one case in the corpus occurred immediately after Move5- Step2. In excerpt 17, a continuation of excerpt 16, the writer refers to the data to provide evidence for the inconsistency of findings (*attention to language during oral interaction may in fact compromise task completion)* with a criticism in literature towards task-based pedagogy (*finishing a task may result in minimal use of language, and little attention to language form)*.

(17) *Although Soon Yi and Ivan were given interactional opportunities that had the real-world feature of a defined ending point, this point was often not reached. They appeared to regard all activities, however interesting, as pretexts for practicing language rather than as tasks that had to be completed. Soon Yi and Ivan actively reflected on language, even when otherwise engaged with the intended communicative purpose of the task. Classroom tasks are often implemented to give students practice in rehearsing for an exchange they might have in the real-world, and the pair and group management of the tasks suggested that they too understood they were rehearsing…* (LTR1)

G. Move 7: Recommendation for Practice

In this move, which was present in the five RAs, the writers went beyond their results and made some recommendations for practice based on their findings from the study. Conditional clauses, hedging words and suggestive words were used in this move.

(18) *If it is indeed difficult to attend to both form and fluency at once, then the first step may be to separate the two and to stop attempting to assess both at once.* (LTR2)

H. Move 8: Deduction

Occurring in 10 RAs in the corpus, the writers usually presented a claim with reference to the main points of the study. It usually occurred at the end of a section within Discussion after a particular finding had been presented and discussed or at the end of the Discussion section. Appearing at the end of a particular finding, the deduction was limited to that specific finding but when it occurred at the end of the Discussion section it was more general and the writer made a conclusion about the findings.

(19) *Thus, one often overlooked aspect of the construct of scaffolding is the essential role played by the learner in guiding the scaffolding process. Without the ability or willingness to engage with the more knowledgeable other or a readiness to incorporate and appropriate what has been revealed in interaction with the more knowledgeable other, the learner cannot make progress—at least not immediately.* (TESOL3)

I. Move 9: Providing Information

This move, which occurred in four RAs, was used to provide readers with information. It was either used to provide *Background Information* (e.g. aim of the study) or present *Preview* information (what is coming next). The writers provided background information (e.g. restated the aim of the study) either in the starting part of the Discussion or at the ending part of it before summarizing their findings.

Move 9-Step 1: Background Information

(20) *In this study, we were interested in how students contextualised their designs – expressed in terms of the stance they conveyed towards their design artefacts, the design process, themselves as architects-in-training and their audience*. (ESP1)

Move 9-Step 2: Preview

(21) *In what follows we will interpret our students' (novice scientists') practices and beliefs by first acknowledging the novice's perspective, which then leads to a discussion of the formulaicity of scientific writing and originality in science.* (APP2)

J. Move 10: Stating Limitations

This move which occurred only in two RAs was present towards the end of the Discussion section where the writers stated the limitations of their study.

(22) *As with all forms of research, limitations are inherent in this present study*. (APP3)

K. Move 11: Recommending Further Research

This move, found in six RAs, usually occurred after Move10 (Stating Limitations) where the writers suggested new lines of inquiry and how these limitations could be improved.

(23) *Further research is needed to explore task types that encourage a focus on fluency and meaning, such as interactive tasks and information transfer, as suggested by Robinson (2001).* (LTR2)

IV. Discussion

The purpose of this study was to identify the rhetorical structure of Discussion section of qualitative RAs in Applied Linguistics. The analysis of the Discussion section of 15 RAs revealed a total of 11 moves in the corpus. The only move that was present in all of the RAs was Move1-Step1 (Stating Findings). The next most frequent moves were Move3 (commenting on findings) which occurred in 12 RAs, Move2 (Referring to Data to Provide Evidence for Findings) which occurred in 11 RAs and Move5 (Comparing Findings with Literature) which was present in 9 RAs. As was expected, there are similarities and differences between the moves and steps that were identified in this study and those found by investigating empirical RAs. Possibly the most significant difference was the continuous reference of qualitative RA writers to their data. The analysis revealed one new move (Move2) which appeared after the writers stated their findings (Move1-Step1). In this move the writers referred to their data to provide evidence and support their findings. Another new move found was Move4 (Supporting the Explanation/Interpretation/Evaluation/Rejected Explanation) where the writers provided evidence for their comments on findings by referring to their data and/or literature.

This frequent reference to data as evidence and support can be explained in the light of characteristics of qualitative research. Qualitative research is a thick description of the phenomenon under study where the researcher is the primary source of data collection, analysis and interpretation. It seeks to understand and provide insight into a given issue from the vantage of other people. While description provides factual and accurate information on the phenomena, in Discussion section, researcher goes beyond the 'objective' description and tries to provide reasonable insights into the issue. Thus, the researcher interprets the findings and "gives meaning to the raw data" (Stead, 2007, p. 172). However, the analyst needs to balance between this description and interpretation and display "that the explanations and conclusions presented are generated from, and grounded in the data" (White, Woodfield, & Ritchie, 2003, p. 289). It seems that the writers of qualitative research try to justify and validate their findings and comments on findings by frequent reference to their data. Smith (1996) suggests that two important criteria for evaluating the internal validity and reliability of qualitative research are internal coherence and presentation of evidence. The internal coherence refers to whether the argument presented within a study is consistent and supported by the data. The presentation of evidence refers to inclusion of sufficient raw data to enable readers to evaluate the findings and interpretations. The analysis of our corpus suggests that the writers use illustration as a means of convincing their audience so that the audience could have some understanding of the processes of thinking that have led to the conclusions. This allows the reader to examine the data and process to confirm the findings and interpretations.

V. Conclusion

Writing Discussion section particularly in qualitative research has been considered as a demanding task. This study aimed to identify and introduce the available patterns and options in writing discussion section of qualitative RAs in Applied Linguistics. It is hoped that the findings could help writers, particularly novice ones, to overcome the problems they may encounter in academic writing. However, as we know, genre is dynamic and this study does not claim that the generic structure introduced here is the one and only way of writing discussion section in Applied Linguistics.

The corpus demonstrated that the generic structure of discussion section of qualitative RAs are both different and similar to those identified in literature investigating empirical RAs. These differences can be attributed to the different characteristics of qualitative research. Previous researchers have identified disciplinary differences in generic structure of RAs. This study suggests that while Applied Linguistics is considered as a discourse community, it seems that research design (qualitative, quantitative) influences the conventions and norms within a disciplinary discourse.

Appendix 1. List of Research Articles Used in Analysis

Applied Linguistics (APP):

Gan, Z., Davison, C. & Hamp-Lyons, L. (2009). Topic negotiation in peer group oral assessment situations: A conversation analytic approach. *Applied linguistics, 30*(3), 315-334. **(APP1)**

Flowerdew, J. & Li, Y. (2007). Language Re-use among Chinese Apprentice Scientists Writing for Publication. *Applied linguistics*, *28*(3), 440-465. **(APP2)**

Farrell, T. S. C. & Tan Kiat Kun, S. (2007). Language Policy, Language Teachers' Beliefs, and Classroom Practices. *Applied linguistics, 29*(3), 381-403. **(APP3)**

English for Specific purposes (ESP):

Morton, J. (2009). Genre and disciplinary competence: A case study of contextualisation in an academic speech genre. *English for Specific Purposes, 28,* 217-229. **(ESP1)**

Cheng, A. (2007). Transferring generic features and recontextualizing genre awareness: Understanding writing performance in the ESP genre-based literacy framework. *English for Specific Purposes, 26,* 287-307. **(ESP2)**

Shi, L. & Kubota, R. (2007). Patterns of rhetorical organization in Canadian and American language arts textbooks: An exploratory study. *English for Specific Purposes, 26,* 180-202. **(ESP3)**

Journal of Pragmatics (PRAG):

Schnurr, S., Marra, M. & Holmes, J. (2007). Being (im)polite in New Zealand workplaces: Maori and Pakeha leaders. *Journal of Pragmatics, 39*, 712-729. **(PRAG1)**

Ishida, I. (2006). Learners' perception and interpretation of contextualization cues in spontaneous Japanese conversation: Back-channel cue Uun. *Journal of Pragmatics, 38,* 1943-1981. **(PRAG2)**

Fukuda. C. (2005). Children's use of the masu form in play scenes. *Journal of Pragmatics, 37*, 1037-1058. **(PRAG3)**

Language Teaching Research (LTR):

Springer, S. & Collins, L. (2008). Interacting inside and outside of the language classroom. *Language Teaching Research, 12*(1), 39-60. **(LTR1)**

Murphy, L. (2005). Attending to form and meaning: The experience of adult distance learners of French, German and Spanish. *Language Teaching Research, 9*(3), 295-317. **(LTR2)**

Nkosana, L. (2008). Attitudinal obstacles to curriculum and assessment reform. *Language Teaching Research, 12*(2), 287-312. **(LTR3)**

TESOL Quarterly (TESOL):

Higgins, C. (2003). "Ownership" of English in the outer circle: An alternative to the NS-NNS dichotomy. *TESOL Quarterly, 37*(4), 615-644. **(TESOL1)**

Ellwood, C. & Nakane, I. (2009). Privileging of speech in EAP and mainstream university classrooms: A critical evaluation of participation. *TESOL Quarterly, 43*(2), 203-230. **(TESOL2)**

Ko, J., Schallert, D. L. & Walters, K. (2003). Rethinking Scaffolding: Examining Negotiation of Meaning in an ESL Storytelling Task. *TESOL Quarterly, 37*(2), 303-324. **(TESOL3)**

APPENDIX 2. PARTICULARS OF THE CORPUS

Journal	No. of Text	Year	Average Length of Text (in word)	Total Size of Texts (in word)
Applied Linguistics	3	2007, 2008, 2009	1,125	3,375
English for Specific Purposes	3	2007 (2), 2009	970	2,909
Language Teaching Research	3	2005, 2008 (2)	853	2,560
Journal of Pragmatics	3	2005, 2006, 2007	706	2,118
TESOL Quarterly	3	2003 (2), 2009	1,020	3,059
Total Number of Texts in Corpus= 15		Total Size of Corpus (in words) = 14,423		

REFERENCES

[1] Berg, B. L. (2001). Qualitative research methods for the social sciences (4th ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
[2] Bhatia, V. K. (1993). Analysing genre: Language use in professional settings. London: Longman.
[3] Bitchener, J., & Basturkmen, H. (2006). Perceptions of the difficulties of postgraduate L2 thesis students writing the discussion section. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 5(1), 4-18.
[4] Brett, P. (1994). A genre analysis of the results section of sociology articles. *English for Specific Purposes,* 13(1), 47-59.
[5] Creswell, J. W. (2003). Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (2nd ed.). Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage.
[6] Dudley-Evans, T. (1994). Genre analysis: An approach to text analysis for ESP. In M. Coulthard (Ed.), *Advances in Written Text Analysis* (pp. 219-228). London: Routledge.
[7] Holmes, R. (1997). Genre analysis, and the social sciences: An investigation of the structure of research article discussion sections in three disciplines. *English for Specific Purposes*, 16(4), 321-337.
[8] Holmes, R. (2000). Variation and text structure: The discussion section in economics research articles. *ITL: Review of Applied Linguistics,* 131-132, 107-135.
[9] Hyland, K. (2005). Stance and engagement: a model of interaction in academic discourse. *Discourse Studies*, 7(2), 173-192.
[10] Kanoksilapatham, B. (2005). Rhetorical structure of biochemistry research articles. *English for Specific Purposes,* 24(3), 269-292.
[11] Lim, J. M. H. (2006). Method sections of management research articles: A pedagogically motivated qualitative study. *English for Specific Purposes,* 25(3), 282-309.
[12] McKay, S. (2006). Researching second language classrooms. London: Routledge
[13] Nwogu, K. N. (1997). The medical research paper: Structure and functions. *English for Specific Purposes*, 16(2), 119-138.
[14] Ozturk, I. (2007). The textual organisation of research article introductions in applied linguistics: Variability within a single discipline. *English for Specific Purposes,* 26(1), 25-38.
[15] Posteguillo, S. (1999). The Schematic Structure of Computer Science Research Articles. *English for Specific Purposes,* 18(2), 139-160.
[16] Samraj, B. (2005). An exploration of a genre set: Research article abstracts and introductions in two disciplines. *English for Specific Purposes*, 24(2), 141-156.
[17] Silva, T. J. (2005). On the philosopical bases of inquiry in second language writing: Metaphysics, inquiry paradigms, and the intelectual zeitgeist. In P. K. Matsuda & T. J. Silva (Eds.), *Second language writing research: Perspectives on the process of knowledge construction* (pp. 3-15). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
[18] Smith, J. A. (1996). Evolving issues in qualitative psychology. In J. R. (ed) (Ed.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research Methods in Psychology and the Social Sciences* (pp. 189-201). British Psychological Society: Leicester.
[19] Stead, G. B. (2007). Planning, designing and reporting research (4th ed.). South Africa: Pearson Education.
[20] Swales, J. M. (1990). Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings. New York: Cambridge University Press.
[21] Swales, J. M. (2004). Research Genres: Explorations and applications. Cambridge: Cambridge University Presss.
[22] Taylor, J. R., & Bogdan, R. (1998). Introduction to qualitative research methods (3rd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
[23] White, C., Woodfield, K., & Ritchie, J. (2003). Reporting and Presenting Qualitative Data. In J. Ritchie & J. Anelewis (Eds.), *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers* (pp. 287-320). London Sage Publications.
[24] Yang, R. (2001). A genre analysis of research articles in applied linguistics. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis. National University of Singapore, Singapore.
[25] Yang, R., & Allison, D. (2003). Research articles in applied linguistics: moving from results to conclusions. *English for Specific Purposes*, 22(4), 365-385.

Leila Dobakhti is an assistant professor at Islamic Art University of Tabriz, Iran. She earned her PhD in Applied Linguistics from the University of Malaya, Malaysia. Her areas of interest are genre analysis, discourse analysis, material evaluation and ESP.