

Promotional (Meta)discourse in Research Articles in Language and  
Literary Studies

by

Elena Afros

A thesis

presented to the University of Waterloo

in fulfilment of the

thesis requirement for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

English

Waterloo, Ontario, Canada, 2007

© Elena Afros 2007

## Author's Declaration

I hereby declare that I am the sole author of this thesis. This is a true copy of the thesis, including any required final versions, as accepted by my examiners.

I understand that my thesis may be made electronically available to the public.

## Abstract

It is now widely recognized that promotionalism permeates scholarly discourse. Yet a systematic account of rhetorical and linguistic means, which researchers across disciplines deploy to achieve this effect, is still to be developed. The present thesis attempts to contribute to the investigation of strategies and exponents of the promotional (meta)discourse in the humanities. In particular, it compares and contrasts research articles in language and literary studies published in North American academic journals during 2001-2006. This inquiry demonstrates that in both disciplines scholars utilize two rhetorical strategies to publicize their work: first, positive evaluation of one's own study and of those investigations in which the current study is grounded and second, negative evaluation of dissenting views. A combination of both strategies is used to widen the gap between one's contribution and (erroneous) alternative treatments. Among lexicogrammatical and discourse devices employed in both disciplines are evaluative lexis reinforced by derivational and inflectional morphology, coordination, comment clauses, personal pronouns, lexical cohesion, and discourse chunks sequencing. Distribution of promotional elements across article sections and moves in the two disciplines, however, differs. On the whole, the thesis reconfirms the advantage of specificity in teaching academic literacies advocated by many applied linguists and provides actual patterns that can be incorporated into writing curriculum.

## Acknowledgements

I wish to thank my supervisor, Professor Catherine F. Schryer, for her invaluable help and advice. Without support of my family and friends this endeavour would have been unthinkable.

## Dedication

To my family, friends, and teachers

## Table of Contents

<b>Chapter 1: Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Chapter 2: Research Articles in Literary Studies.....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Chapter 3: Research Articles in Language Studies.....</b>	<b>54</b>
<b>Chapter 4: Conclusion.....</b>	<b>96</b>
<b>Appendix.....</b>	<b>110</b>
<b>Works Cited.....</b>	<b>113</b>

## Chapter 1: Introduction

### Scope

It has now become a truism that “[t]oday’s scientists seem to be promoting their work to a degree never seen before” (Berkenkotter and Huckin 43). This phenomenon, Carol Berkenkotter and Thomas Huckin observe, affects academic discursive practices and genres, which acquire as a result the characteristics of boosterism and self-advocacy (Swales, Research Genres). Even though these features are recognized as pervasive in research articles, language resources utilized to publicize one’s research are not systematically described.<sup>1</sup> The present thesis constitutes an attempt to identify and compare the strategies and exponents of the promotional (meta)discourse in research articles in language and literary studies published in North American academic journals.<sup>2</sup> Following in the tradition of Ken Hyland and Polly Tse, this study not only distils the practices of experts, but also explicates “how meanings are conveyed and persuasion accomplished” (“Hooking the Reader” 138).

Incorporating actual current patterns into curriculum can help novice academic writers make informed judgments of promotional (meta)discourse as well as use the lexicogrammatical and discourse

---

<sup>1</sup> For first person pronouns, see, for instance, Harwood; for boosters and self-citation, see, for example, Hyland. See also Lewin, “Hedging” and “From Hedging to Heightening,” Lewin, Fine, and Young, and Swales.

<sup>2</sup> A number of cross-linguistic studies show that research articles written in English exhibit a higher density of promotional metadiscourse; for a brief summary, see, for instance, Shaw. See also Casanave and Swales.

devices accepted in the North American research community “in disciplinary appropriate ways” (Hyland and Tse, “Hooking the Reader” 138).<sup>3</sup> Since language and literary studies often abide under the same roof, such as that of the English or Classics departments, many students have to gain proficiency in both disciplines. Therefore, imparting the differences and similarities between these two closely related fields to students can assist them in gearing their writing toward the target discourse community. Marina Bondi explains the pedagogical significance of a comparative approach:

The relevance of the finer grained studies of closer disciplines can be seen in the context of tertiary education, where students are often exposed to the discourse of a variety of disciplines addressing similar problems and thus need to develop literacy in neighbouring disciplinary fields. This implies awareness of the convergences and divergences of the discourses in terms of basic vocabulary, patterns and argumentative strategies. (50)

Her case study of economics and business reveals “wide areas of overlapping in the use of evaluative adjectives, but also preference for

---

<sup>3</sup> As Hyland, Thompson, Lewin, and many others demonstrate, teaching materials have to be updated to reflect “the actual practices of the scientific community” (Lewin 176) instead of propagating the view that “academic discourse is simply objective and informational, written in an impersonal style with a minimum of overt references to the actions, choices, and judgments of the authors” (Hyland, “Hedging in Academic Writing” 239).

different types of adjectives” (Bondi 69). Similarly, research articles in language and literary studies are expected to share a number of features as well as exhibit several distinctive characteristics.<sup>4</sup>

### **Thesis Organization**

To attain the objectives outlined above, the present thesis builds on the analysis of academic communication provided by the researchers in the fields of linguistics, rhetoric, and sociology of science. Chapter 1 offers a brief overview of the “territory”, corpus, and method (Swales). Chapters 2 and 3 expatiate on the promotional (meta)discourse in research articles in literary and language studies respectively. Chapter 4 draws conclusions and suggests an area for further inquiry.

### **Overview of Current Research**

The myth of unbiased and impersonal character of academic communication has been debunked in applied linguistics and sociology of science.<sup>5</sup> Instead, academic writing is increasingly recognized as a form of social interaction, which not only conveys information, but also signals an author’s attitude towards content and relates to the audience of the text.<sup>6</sup> Linguistic realization of interpersonality and interactivity

---

<sup>4</sup> See also Hyland, “Specificity Revisited,” Yang and Allison, and Ozturk.

<sup>5</sup> For applied linguistics, see, for example, Berkenkotter and Huckin, Bernhardt, Crompton, Hyland, Hyland and Tse, Lewin, Myers, Thetela, and Thompson. For sociology of science, see, for example, Gilbert and Mulkay.

<sup>6</sup> For a broader social context, including institutional practices and gender bias, see Casanave and Kirsch.

in academic communication has recently become a subject of scrutiny in rhetoric, composition, applied linguistics, and EAP (English for Academic Purposes).

In a series of corpus-based studies applying a quantitative method in conjunction with linguistic discourse analysis to a sample of various genres from natural and social sciences discourse communities, Hyland demonstrates that metadiscourse, a system of linguistic and rhetorical devices which enables a writer “not only to transform what might otherwise be a dry or difficult text into coherent, reader-friendly prose, but also to relate it to a given context and convey his or her personality, credibility, audience-sensitivity and relationship to message,” is an essential attribute of academic interaction (Hyland, Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing 4).<sup>7</sup> This conclusion is supported with a qualitative account of readers’ perception and writers’ construction of authorial persona.<sup>8</sup> “For the research writer,” Hyland indicates, “metadiscourse contributes to a writer’s voice which balances confidence and circumspection, facilitates collegial respect, and seeks to locate propositions in the concerns and interests of the discipline” (Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing 112).

---

<sup>7</sup> For discussion on the concept of metadiscourse, see Crismore, Markkanen, and Steffensen, Hyland, Mao, and Vande Kopple. See also Sinclair, who objects to the term *metadiscourse* because it distorts the understanding of language as linear.

<sup>8</sup> See, for example, “Academic Attribution” and “Stance and Engagement,” which supplement the discourse analysis with the data from the interviews with experienced writers in eight disciplines.

Building on the work of Hyland and other linguists, Beverly Lewin further investigates the issue of circumspection, or “toning down,” in scientific writing. Lewin contrasts “traditional hedges, i.e. as defined by linguists” (“Hedging” 172) with the constructions which authors (faculty members in physical and social sciences) reported as intended hedges and the constructions the readers (PhD candidates enrolled in an EAP course) recognized as hedges. She demonstrates that linguists and authors disagree on the form and function of interactional resources in scientific texts; what is more, readers’ judgments differ significantly from those of linguists; yet “the divergence is greater between readers and authors than between readers and linguists” (“Hedging” 171).<sup>9</sup> In Lewin’s study, “the dissonance between the possible intentions of the author, the perceptions of the reader, and the theoretical judgments of linguists” (“Hedging” 175) reaches up to 50% in readers vs. linguists and up to 80% in authors vs. linguists comparisons. Since in contrast to the authors, “the readers identified many more structures as toning down, out of the total realized in the text” (“Hedging” 171-2), Lewin suggests that students have to be taught how “to distinguish between intentional hedges and hedges that are inherent in the speech act” (“Hedging” 175). For instance, she points out that her respondents do not consider the verb *suggest* a hedge. “It may be,” Lewin speculates, “that modalised

---

<sup>9</sup> This evidence bolsters Thompson’s and Thompson and Thetela’s argument for a demarcation line between the “real-world” reader and the “reader-in-the-text,” i.e., the reader projected by the writer.

propositions have become institutionalised in the register for research reports and therefore, the ‘unmarked’ form” (“From Hedging to Heightening” 24).<sup>10</sup> The readers’ interpretation of this lexical verb of uncertainty as the author’s “withhold[ing] complete commitment to a proposition” (Hyland, Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing 52) misconstrues the author’s intentions.<sup>11</sup> As Puleng Thetela indicates, “it is very important in the reading of the ARA [academic research articles] to understand not only the content but also the angle from which the writer wants that content to be interpreted and judged... the next step is to use this [knowledge] to improve their own writing skills in the EAP classroom and beyond” (117). Therefore, Lewin and Thetela insist, students have to be explicitly taught the rhetorical and cultural norms of academic writing.<sup>12</sup> Misunderstanding and misuse of these strategies can have a negative impact on novices’ future careers.

As demonstrated by Lewin and Hyland, “toning up” is a strategy frequently used in academic writing in various disciplines. While John Swales cannot admit that a “dramatically self-justificatory” tone is characteristic of the recent scholarly publications, at least in

---

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Hyland’s classification.

<sup>11</sup> Lewin reports that “*uncertainty*, realised by modality, was, in the authors’ view, a reflection of ‘the truth’, rather than a conscious toning down of a claim. *Uncertainty* was expressed when a categorical assertion would not be an honest representation of the data... Instead of saying *less* than they mean, scientists are actually saying *precisely* what they mean. This interpretation is different from suggesting that a scientist has incontrovertible evidence for an unqualified claim but refrains from expressing it as such in deference to interpersonal considerations” (“From Hedging to Heightening” 24). See also Silver, “The Stance of Stance.”

<sup>12</sup> Swales concurs, the “undoubted existence [of promotionalism] in the major journals of certain disciplines may well constitute a problem for JRs [junior researchers], especially those with narrower English proficiencies” (Research Genres 238).

discourse studies or applied linguistics (Research Genres 237), Ann Raimés in her handbook on academic writing for college students advises her readers to “aim for language that reflects accountability and commitment: *as a result, consequently, of course, believe, need, demand, should, must*” (285). “When you are trying to persuade your readers to accept your point of view,” she instructs, “avoid the ambivalence and indecisiveness evident in words and phrases like *maybe, perhaps, it could be, it might seem, and it would appear*. Hedging will not heighten readers’ confidence in you...” (285). Raimés’s advice correlates with Lewin’s observation that “[i]n the real world, scientists worry about their positions and prestige, the need to get grants, be promoted, and so on, which might drive their needs to enhance, rather than mitigate, their research work” (“Hedging” 173).<sup>13</sup> That is not to say that promotionalism dominates the interactional dimension of academic discourse; rather, as Beverly Lewin, Jonathan Fine and Lynne Young indicate, some of the interpersonal strategies “represent an attempt to be polite, modest and objective, while others reflect the contrasting need to show one’s own conclusions in the best possible light. The ensuing text can be seen as an attempt to resolve the constant tension between these two sets of needs” (153). Maintaining this balance is crucial for writers in all academic disciplines, especially in the humanities which foreground “the individual creative thinker, but

---

<sup>13</sup> Swales expresses the same opinion: “In more normal circumstances, authors may feel a need to advance the significance of their work in more positive terms [than Watson and Creek]” (Genre Analysis 174). See also Berkenkotter and Huckin.

always within the context of a canon of disciplinary knowledge” (Hyland, “Academic Attribution” 359).

Currently the majority of analysts are concerned with scientific writing, with very few addressing academic communication in the humanities.<sup>14</sup> Exceptions include Sally Jacoby’s inquiry into the reference strategies in literary research articles, Maria Freddi’s analysis of the introductory chapters to linguistics textbooks, and a few cross-linguistic studies, among which Eva Vold’s examination of epistemic modality markers in medical and linguistic research articles in English, French, and Norwegian and Lorena Suárez-Tejerina’s contrastive investigation of book reviews in English and Spanish literary studies journals. Though Freddi provides a valuable account of her corpus, she is primarily interested in statistical methods and the style of individual authors. Jacoby’s findings are more general and purport “to examine how a researcher’s view of his [or her] own research interacts with his [or her] view of previous research and how this ‘distance’ is communicated at the level of each individual reference in a research paper as well as at the ‘global’ level of the article’s overall thesis

---

<sup>14</sup> Lack of interest in the humanities is also evident from Swales’s summary of the textual studies of the English research articles (see especially Table 3 and an overview of research, *Genre Analysis* 130-37). Note also that though Hyland’s work encompasses various disciplines, no reference is made to either literary studies or theoretical linguistics. Applied Linguistics, included in Hyland’s and Thompson’s studies, has arguably more affinities with the social sciences than with other branches of language research. The reluctance to deal with the humanities might issue from the tendency of this camp “to align ... scholarly and research products to ... preferred intellectual schools and scholarly traditions rather than to disciplines as such” (Swales, *Genre Analysis* 175). For distinctions between disciplinary cultures, see Becher.

argument” (34-5). Significantly, Jacoby’s results contrast with Swales’s for biological and medical research articles: “literary research articles,” she concludes, “foreground previous research more ‘substantively’ than research in the sciences and the social sciences” (Jacoby 73).<sup>15</sup> Moreover, in incorporating references to previous research, Hyland contends, soft disciplines employ more explicitly evaluative constructions; this feature he ascribes to “the more disputational style of argument favoured by the humanities” (“Academic Attribution” 362).<sup>16</sup> Hyland also observes that authorial persona is more manifested in the humanities and social sciences than in the sciences and engineering and explains this difference by the fact that:

the resources of language mediate their [the humanities and social sciences] contexts, working to construe the characteristic structures of knowledge domains and argument forms of the disciplines that create them.... There is, moreover, less control of variables and greater possibilities for diverse outcomes, so writers must spell out their evaluations and work harder to establish an understanding with readers. (“Stance and Engagement” 187-8)<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> For detailed account of citation practices in eight different disciplines, see Hyland, Disciplinary Discourses.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Charles, who concludes that even though politics and materials science exploit distinct resources to present their own research, a construction of stance in both fields is “clear and pervasive” (514).

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Vold’s conclusion that “[n]o considerable discipline-specific differences in the frequency of the selected [epistemic modality] markers could be detected between the

This discrepancy between disciplines implies that “students should be taught according to the conventions ... in their own field” (Stotesbury, “Evaluation” 340) and calls for further investigation into the discourse of the underrepresented language and literary studies.

### **Theoretical Background**

As Amy Devitt underscores, discourse is the common object of examination for distinct subfields of English studies. Therefore, this shared ground should be explored by combining rhetorical and literary genre theories, systemic functional linguistics, pragmatics, and discourse analysis. Such multifaceted approach underpins the recently developed interdisciplinary frameworks accounting for metadiscourse (e.g., Hyland), evaluation (e.g., Hunston and Thompson), and rhetorical structure of academic genres (e.g., Swales). Integration of these three models facilitates pinpointing language resources utilized for promotional purposes and mapping them onto the move structure of the article. Combination of linguistic and rhetorical perspectives is crucial, for, as Marc Silver explicates, “[t]he single lexical unit does not just mitigate or intensify a proposition, but points to the way in which propositions become part of a wider argument (in co-text) and get

---

two disciplines [medicine and linguistics]” (“Epistemic Modality Markers” 83). Silver’s analysis of *evidently*, on the other hand, “seem[s] to suggest that there is a significantly different use of the adverbial along disciplinary lines,” history and economics, in his case (“The Stance of Stance” 372).

involved in constructing writer and reader identity” (“The Stance of Stance” 373).

### Evaluation

Geoff Thompson and Susan Hunston define evaluation as “the expression of the speaker or writer’s attitude or stance towards, viewpoint on, or feelings about the entities or propositions that he or she is talking about” (5). In terms of evaluation, promotion manifests itself through ascription of positive value to various aspects of the reported research or negative value to dissenting views.<sup>18</sup> Evaluation has three functions:

- (1) to express the speaker’s or writer’s opinion, and in doing so to reflect the value system of that person and their community;
- (2) to construct and maintain relations between the speaker or writer and hearer or reader;
- (3) to organize the discourse. (Thompson and Hunston 6)

“These functions are not exclusive,” Thompson and Hunston explain, “that is, a single instance of evaluation may well perform two or three of the functions simultaneously” (6). Importantly, evaluation depends on shared values within the discourse community and “can shift

---

<sup>18</sup> For distinction between research-oriented and topic-oriented evaluation, see Thetela.

depending on the referent to which the attribute is being applied” (Channell 43).

Thompson and Hunston stress that evaluation spans all levels of discourse: it ranges from lexis, morphology (e.g., affixes, such as *un-*) and syntax (e.g., marked clause structures with expletive subjects *it* and *there*) to text (e.g., position of a paragraph rather than the cumulative meaning of each of the clauses in that paragraph). In examining evaluation encoded in citation, Hyland, for example, focuses on report verbs, that is, lexical means: “The selection of an appropriate reporting verb allows writers to intrude into the discourse to signal an assessment of the evidential status of the reported proposition and demonstrate their commitment, neutrality or distance from it” (“Academic Attribution” 361). Maggie Charles, on the other hand, concentrates on the grammatical subject of reporting clause, that is, syntactic resources (“The Construction of Stance in Reporting Clauses”). This distributed nature of evaluation justifies the conceptual approach taken by Thompson and Hunston, for “it does not restrict what [linguistic items] can be counted as evaluation” (14). In addition, this methodology allows for variance of evaluative meaning of a single lexeme in distinct contexts. Paul Tucker, for instance, remarks that “*note*, which Hunston classifies as an ‘arguing’ verb, is used ... [in his corpus] in the non-controversial sense of *observe*, which itself of course assumes a

different sense in art-history as compared with the empirical sciences” (305).<sup>19</sup>

### Metadiscourse

A model of metadiscourse proposed by Hyland is “based on its primary function of negotiating interactions in text” (Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing 59). Like evaluation, it encompasses concepts and methods from diverse fields of knowledge and thus constitutes a useful theoretical framework for the current investigation. Hyland employs metadiscourse as “the cover term for the self-reflective expressions used to negotiate interactional meanings in a text, assisting the writer (or speaker) to express a viewpoint and engage with readers as members of a particular community” (Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing 37). Thus, in the first paragraph of his section 3.6 “Summary and conclusions” quoted below, the concept of metadiscourse refers to the personal pronouns *my* and *I* (labeled “self mention”); the clause *I hope* (“attitude marker”); the indefinite article *a* in the first, second and fourth sentences and the adverb *often* (“hedge”) along with the noun phrase *this chapter* (“endophoric marker”), the conjunction *but*, (“transition marker”), and the modal verb *should not* (“attitude marker”):

(1) **This chapter** has presented **a** model of metadiscourse based on its primary function of

---

<sup>19</sup> See also Silver’s analysis of *evidently* (“The Stance of Stance”).

negotiating interactions in texts. (2) Essentially **my** argument has been that metadiscourse offers **a** way of understanding the interpersonal resources writers use to organize texts coherently and to convey their personality, credibility, reader sensitivity and relationship to the message. (3) There is **often** a tendency in the metadiscourse literature to focus on surface forms and the effects created by writers, especially in pedagogic materials, **but** metadiscourse **should not** be seen as an independent stylistic device which authors can vary at will. (4) **I hope** the model described here overcomes many of these limitations and offers **a** comprehensive and pragmatically grounded means of investigating the interpersonal resources in texts. (Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing 59; sentence numbers and emphasis added)<sup>20</sup>

All these elements contribute to the communicative aspect of the excerpt and its internal organization and connection with the rest of the text rather than to its propositional content. In accordance with the key principles of metadiscourse formulated by Hyland these forms:

1. ... [are] distinct from propositional aspects of discourse;
2. ... [refer] to aspects of the text that embody writer-reader interactions;

---

<sup>20</sup> Unless otherwise indicated, all highlighting with bold is added.

3. ... [refer] only to relations which are internal to the discourse. (Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing 38)

The function of these individual tokens, as Hyland and Luming Mao underscore, can be gauged only within their rhetorical context.

Annelie Ädel points out that evaluation and metadiscourse “belong together in the sense that they foreground *not* the subject matter, but rather (a) the structure of the discourse (in the case of metadiscourse), (b) the interaction between the writer persona and imagined reader (in the case of metadiscourse), and (c) the attitudes of the writer and imagined reader to the subject matter (in the case of evaluation)” (160-61). The crucial distinction between them, however, is that “metadiscourse ties the writer and reader to the current text or world of discourse, while evaluation ties them to the ‘real world’” (Ädel 158). The integrative approach, which combines interpersonal, textual, and the “real world” aspects, that is metadiscourse and evaluation, seems most appropriate for addressing the promotional (meta)discourse in academic writing.<sup>21</sup> An overlap between metadiscourse and evaluation is also evident from the linguistic resources investigated by both models. For instance, among the explicit markers of evaluation Kjersti Fløttum, Torodd Kinn, and Trine Dahl

---

<sup>21</sup> Ädel offers an alternative model of metadiscourse that takes Roman Jakobson’s metalinguistic, directive, and expressive functions of language as a starting point and “excludes stance from the domain of metadiscourse, and instead focuses on its reflexive properties” (161).

name the combination of the first person pronoun with such verbs and constructions as *feel*, *be content to*, *be skeptical about*, *be struck by*, *find something* + evaluative adjective (207). All these structures figure prominently in studies of metadiscourse.<sup>22</sup>

Thus, from the integrative point of view, the excerpt from Hyland's book quoted above can be analyzed as evaluative along a good – bad parameter.<sup>23</sup> As the first paragraph of the “Summary and conclusions” section, it is inherently evaluative in that it reconfirms the accomplishments of the current chapter and thus fulfils the discourse organization function. By highlighting the role of the authorial persona by means of first person pronouns and (intra-textual) endophoric markers, it foregrounds the book contribution to the study of metadiscourse and describes it in positive, albeit hedged, terms.<sup>24</sup> Sentences (3) and (4) are conspicuously comparative, subjective, and value-laden.<sup>25</sup> The shortcomings of alternative approaches are contrasted with the proposed model, which, in the writer's opinion, is superior to its rivals because it “**overcomes many of these limitations** and offers a **comprehensive and pragmatically grounded means** of investigating the interpersonal resources in texts” (emphasis added). It is noteworthy that hedged self-promotion as well as criticism of “a

---

<sup>22</sup> Compare, for example, the list of interactional resources compiled by Hyland (*Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing*) and a sample of evaluation exponents mentioned by Thompson and Hunston.

<sup>23</sup> See Thompson and Hunston 22-26.

<sup>24</sup> Lewin, Fine, and Young indicate that hedging does not mitigate persuasion.

<sup>25</sup> See Thompson and Hunston 13.

tendency” and “limitations” of other models rather than fellow researchers reflect the values of the academic discourse community, which in construing the opposition with peers generally abides by the politeness principles.<sup>26</sup>

### Genre of Research Article

Recent reconceptualization of genres as “typified rhetorical strategies communicants use to recognize, organize, and act in all kinds of situations, literary and nonliterary” (Bawarshi 17) underlies research article genre analysis provided among others by Swales, Hyland, and Lewin, Fine, and Young. Based on the understanding of “move” as “a discursal or rhetorical unit that performs a coherent communicative function in a written or spoken discourse” (Swales, Research Genres 228), these studies offer prototypical sequencing of prototypical moves in research articles. As all of them stress, authors “can decide not only which of the prototypical moves to realize (beyond a certain minimum) but also how much to highlight each move, i.e. the proportion of text to devote to each move. In addition, the order can be manipulated and moves can be realized in composite or in cyclical form” (Lewin, Fine, and Young 148). Moreover, all these models are informed by both rhetorical and linguistic evidence: while lexicogrammatical (and graphic) means are often helpful in demarcating the move boundaries,

---

<sup>26</sup> See, for instance, Myers. For violation of these principles, see, for example Lewin (“Contentiousness in Science”) and Hunston (“Conflict and Consensus”).

they do not constitute uniform and unambiguous signals; the moves are therefore distinguished by their function and placement.<sup>27</sup>

Though reluctant to postulate a “macrogenre” of the research article, Swales stresses that in any discipline:

RAs [research articles] are rarely simple narratives of investigations. Instead, they are complexly distanced reconstructions of research activities, at least part of this reconstructive process deriving from a need to anticipate and discountenance negative reactions to the knowledge claims being advanced. And this need in turn explains the long-standing ... and widespread use of “hedges” as rhetorical devices both for projecting honesty, modesty and proper caution in self-reports, and for diplomatically creating research space in areas heavily populated by other researchers. (Genre Analysis 175)

In the later revision of his account of research article genre, Swales points out that not all research articles are experimental or empirical. Many papers in theoretical physics, mathematics, biostatistics, and linguistics, among other disciplines, are argumentative, that is, they “have a top-down general-specific structure” (Research Genres 207). As a result, Swales claims, “it is not surprising that the standard IMRD

---

<sup>27</sup> See Swales, Research Genres and Lewin, Fine, and Young. Cf. Shaw, who indicates that in his economics corpus, “[t]he boundaries between moves or steps [in the CARS model] seem to be clearly marked by the onset of a new type of evaluation” (356). See also Tucker.

[Introduction-Methods-Results-Discussion] pattern does not apply; that, in direct consequence, prospective metadiscourse (or ‘roadmapping’) is frequent; and that there is accordingly – despite the highly technical subject matter – a widespread acceptance of first-person pronouns” (Research Genres 207).<sup>28</sup>

Importantly, Swales demonstrates that in the sciences, the distribution of metadiscourse markers varies across the four standard sections of research article – Introduction, Method, Results, and Discussion (Genre Analysis 136).<sup>29</sup> Stephen Bernhardt likewise observes the concentration of “personal intrusions” “at junctures where the argumentative nature of the report heightens. It is when a writer feels the need to justify choices, decisions, interpretations, and suggestions that the writer intrudes. When matters are settled, when results follow expectations, the need for the forcefulness of personal, agentive constructions diminishes” (173). Occurrence of these “junctures” then can be determined by moves rather than article sections.<sup>30</sup> Swales, for example, identifies Introduction Move 3 as an appropriate site “for the writers of research papers to expatiate upon the news value or interestingness of their work” (Research Genres 232).

In Hyland’s view, abstracts are especially well suited for highlighting the author relevance and credibility (Disciplinary

---

<sup>28</sup> Ruiying and Allison likewise remark that in applied linguistics articles, “a section heading is not always explicit about the rhetorical function of a section and there are also differences in authors’ uses of even conventional headings” (265).

<sup>29</sup> For abstracts, see Hyland, Disciplinary Discourses, especially Chapter 4.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. Salager-Meyer.

Discourses 63). Of the five moves Hyland distinguishes in his investigation of research articles abstracts across disciplines – Introduction (“Establishes context of the paper and motivates the research or discussion”); Purpose (“Indicates purpose, thesis or hypothesis, outlines the intention behind the paper”); Method (“Provides information on design, procedures, assumptions, approach, data, etc.”); Product (“States the main findings or results, the argument, or what was accomplished”); and Conclusion (“Interprets or extends results beyond scope of paper, draws inferences, points to applications or wider implications”) – Product move is most pervasive: it is included in almost all (94 per cent) papers (Disciplinary Discourses 67-8).<sup>31</sup> While the combination of moves differs across disciplines (there is “a general preference for the P-M-Pr [Purpose-Method-Product] pattern among the physicists and engineers (60 per cent of all cases), and the I-P-Pr [Introduction-Purpose-Product] model among the humanities/social sciences writers (75 per cent of cases)”), Product statement figures prominently in both soft and hard fields (Disciplinary Discourses 70).<sup>32</sup> This finding Hyland connects with the writers’ anxiety “to underline their most central claims as a means of gaining reader interest and acceptance” (Disciplinary Discourses 68).

---

<sup>31</sup> Hyland reports that all five moves are encountered in less than five per cent of the papers; most frequent are three-move abstracts (Disciplinary Discourses 68-9).

<sup>32</sup> The Introduction move is frequent in soft disciplines, Hyland suggests, “because research in the humanities and social sciences tends to be more diverse and have more permeable boundaries” (Disciplinary Discourses 72).

In addition, Hyland identifies a number of lexicogrammatical means utilized to promote research accomplishments and author credibility. For example, he points out that merging of Purpose and Method moves into a single sentence “insinuate[s] the appropriacy of the technique by strategically linking the approach in a unproblematic and reasonable way to accomplishing the research objective” (Disciplinary Discourses 73-4). He also remarks that to signal results in Product move, researchers choose the presentation verbs *show*, *demonstrate*, *find*, and *establish* generally regarded as boosters in academic discourse (Disciplinary Discourses 69).<sup>33</sup> This combination of rhetorical and discursive devices reconfirms usefulness of the analytical framework grounded in rhetorical genre theory and enriched with the insights provided by evaluation and metadiscourse models.

### **Corpus**

The corpus consists of twenty single-authored articles published during 2001-2006 in North American peer-reviewed journals devoted to language and literary studies.<sup>34</sup> The papers are selected to cover a wide spectrum of subfields of language and literary research ranging from Theoretical Linguistics to Dialectology, and from Textual Analysis to Genre Theory. Each discipline is represented by ten publications of comparable length (ten-to-sixteen pages) written by

---

<sup>33</sup> See, for instance, Hyland, Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing.

<sup>34</sup> The corpus is listed in Appendix.

male and female scholars. The diversity of the corpus is assured by selecting the articles of the scholars with different seniority and affiliation, the underlying assumption being that level of promotionalism is determined by the journal (primarily through peer-review), not by an individual author.<sup>35</sup>

### **Method**

As mentioned above, the present research adopts a synthetic theoretical framework which includes elements from functional linguistics, pragmatics, discourse analysis, metadiscourse, evaluation, and genre theory. Studied from this perspective, inclusive first person pronouns, for example, can be shown to

help to describe and/or critique common disciplinary practices, and elaborate arguments on behalf of the community.... [They] can also be used to organize the text, and to advertise the writer's claims and findings right from the start, as well as to map the structure of the paper out for the reader. Finally, inclusive pronouns can also be used to flag up the current problems and subject areas which preoccupy the discipline. (Harwood, "We Do Not Seem to Have a Theory..." 365)<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup> For discussion of the possible influence of the author's status on the use of the personal pronouns, see Harwood, "Nowhere Has Anyone Attempted..." 1215.

<sup>36</sup> Fanhestock outlines the benefits of pursuing this type of analysis for the rhetoric of science.

To minimize terminological discrepancy, the thesis adopts the classification of metadiscourse developed by Hyland in his recent publications.<sup>37</sup> According to Hyland, interactional resources, which include hedges, boosters, attitude markers, engagement markers, and self-mentions, “focus on the participants of the interaction and seek to display the writer’s persona and a tenor consistent with the norms of the disciplinary community” (Hyland, “Disciplinary Interactions” 139). “They help control the level of personality in a text as writers acknowledge and connect to others, pulling them along with their argument, focusing their attention, acknowledging their uncertainties and guiding them to interpretations” (Hyland, Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing 52). Special emphasis is placed on hedges and boosters. Following Hyland, the devices that “mark the writer’s reluctance to present propositional information categorically” are classified as hedges and the elements that “express certainty and emphasise the force of propositions” as boosters (“Disciplinary Interactions” 139).

The inventory of linguistic constructions investigated by evaluation and metadiscourse scholars provide a starting point for analysis of the linguistic means by which authors promote their work. This pool of resources is augmented with morphological, syntactic, and

---

<sup>37</sup> Drawing on Thompson and Thetela, Hyland expands their model “by including both stance and engagement features” (Hyland, Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing 49). See also Thompson for further elaboration of his and Thetela’s conception.

discourse structures identified in the present corpus. As Lewin indicates, the concept of hedging has to be extended beyond specific lexicogrammatical forms since complete assertions can serve as downtoners and the act of hedging can be accomplished without realizing a specific lexicogrammatical hedging structure (“Hedging” 173). What is more, some hedging techniques are invisible to the analyst: the author might refrain from making a claim or from expressing a stronger evaluation by using, for instance, a weaker adjective *good* instead of a stronger *excellent* (Lewin, “Hedging” 169).<sup>38</sup>

To facilitate a comparison with the data obtained for the natural and social sciences and engineering articles, the publications in the present corpus are tentatively divided into Introduction, Discussion, and Conclusion sections. Abstracts and footnotes / endnotes are analyzed as well. Each article is initially studied separately and then compared with other articles in its discipline. This close examination is expected to uncover the similarities and differences between the promotional (meta)discourse patterns used in language and literary studies.

---

<sup>38</sup> Hyland points out that these moves might be opaque to an external reader but are obvious to the members of the disciplinary community (“Stance and Engagement” 177). Martin explicates the methodological complications which arise in the absence of explicit markers: “evaluation is implied even where it is not directly realized and this creates something of a coding nightmare, especially for a qualitative analysts. Sticking to overt categories means that a great deal of the attitude implied by texts is missed...” (173).

## Chapter 2: Research Articles in Literary Studies

This chapter examines the literary studies research articles to identify the strategies and exponents of promotional (meta)discourse and map them onto the rhetorical structure of the papers. A brief overview of the selected publications is followed by the detailed analysis of distribution of promotional linguistic and rhetorical resources across moves in abstracts, introductions, discussions, conclusions, and endnotes / footnotes. The chapter closes with a summary of generalizations yielded by this inquiry.

### An Overview

Research article genre, as emphasized by Swales, encompasses distinct types of texts ranging from experimental or data-driven reports with the IMRD structure to argumentative essays. Presentation is determined by many factors among which are disciplinary conventions, research questions, and even, as Lewin, Fine, and Young observe, “more personal rhetorical agendas of the author” (146).<sup>39</sup> This possibility of individualization, which includes such options as a choice between the “straight-shot” and cyclical structure of Introduction and Discussion; inclusion or omission of certain moves or steps; as well as incorporation or avoidance of “self-referring positive evaluations,” accounts for diverse realizations of research article genre (Swales, Research Genres 232).

---

<sup>39</sup> See also Hyland and Ruiying and Allison.

Thus, even though all the ten papers on literary criticism examined in this study adopt the essay form, they differ in move structure and metadiscourse patterns. Four papers in the present corpus are primarily revisionist, that is, they reconsider the previous hypotheses and advance their own by adducing the new evidence or by reinterpreting the data (Jim Barloon; Jessica Dietrich; Elisabetta Tarantino; Frederick Williams). Three papers are devoted to theoretical considerations: Laura Stahman and Peter Schwenger apply a certain theory to a text(s), whereas Michael Benton attempts to establish a theoretical foundation for the analysis of literary biography. Closely related to this type is Jonathan Gottschall's article that tackles methodological (and ideological) issues, yet without recourse to any specific text or genre. Finally, two essays – Elsie Michie's and Elizabeth Hodgson's – offer a (new) perspective on the text(s) without an explicit reference to a theory or extended polemics against alternative readings.

Furthermore, some articles are divided into sections (Benton; Gottschall; Hodgson; Schwenger) with (Benton) or without content headings (Gottschall; Hodgson; Schwenger); others are organized into a continuous narration. Three articles (Hodgson; Michie; Stahman) are preceded with an epigraph. Other three articles (Barloon; Benton; Gottschall) open with a metaphor recurring throughout the paper:

There are no prizes for guessing who are two ugly sisters: Criticism, the elder one, dominated the literary studies for the first half of the twentieth century; theory, her younger sister, flounced to the fore in the second half. Meanwhile, ‘Cinders,’ who had been doing the chores for centuries, has been magically transformed in recent times, decked out in new clothes by Richard Holmes, Claire Tomalin, Juliet Barker, Peter Ackroyd et al., and, as the millennium approached, celebrated and admired on all sides. (Benton 44)

The branches of knowledge are not strewn randomly on the ground; they are part of a coherent, interconnected tree. (Gottschall 255)

As can be seen, there is no consensus on whether the initial appeal should be that of logos or of pathos. Even though all examined articles present the scholarly research and address the professional audience rhetorical flourish seems to be acceptable in the field of literary studies.<sup>40</sup> As Madeline Haggan observes with regard to the titles, literary research articles are often “aimed at the aesthetic sensibilities of the reader” (301).

---

<sup>40</sup> Cf. Haggan’s observation that “[t]he literature [research article] title characteristically sets out to attract the reader through a kind of verbal flirtation, enticing the reader with suggestive and tantalizingly enigmatic hints of the delights that follow” (313).

Following the guidelines of the respective journals, two papers (Stahman; Williams) include an abstract. One article (Tarantino), in accordance with the tradition of the text transmission studies, employs a chart to present some of the findings; others avoid visuals. Most papers use footnotes or endnotes of varying length to list references and / or supply parenthetical comments.

### **Abstracts**

Given that the abstract of Williams's article (104 words) is twice as long as Stahman's (47 words), it is not surprising that the former provides a more detailed account of the paper. In contrast to Stahman, who limits her one sentence abstract to the outline of her theoretical framework and the central argument, Williams delineates the scope of the paper in a general-to-specific manner, explains the approach, summarizes results, and finally states the proposal and mentions its congruence with the reading of the poem advocated in the paper. Hyland indicates that though in his corpus, the move structure Purpose – Method – Product found in Williams's abstract is the most frequent, high numbers of two move abstracts, like that of Stahman (Method – Product), occur as well (Disciplinary Discourses). In both abstracts, clause and move boundaries coincide.

The literary studies abstracts, like “virtually all papers [in Hyland's corpus of 800 abstracts in eight disciplines published in ten

journals in 1997] included a Product statement (94 per cent) which foregrounded the main argument or findings” (Disciplinary Discourses 68).<sup>41</sup> Interestingly, the literary studies abstracts are not in accord with Hyland’s findings that Introduction is more common in the humanities and social sciences; the literary studies abstracts move structure concurs with the hard knowledge disciplines such as physics and engineering. Moreover, like Hyland’s hard knowledge abstracts, both literary studies abstracts highlight the novelty of their disquisitions (which lies in a new reading for Stahman and a textual emendation for Williams) rather than their importance, as characteristic of softer disciplines (Hyland, Disciplinary Discourses 76).<sup>42</sup> In the present corpus, this effect is attained not by means of “‘promotional’ items” (Hyland, Disciplinary Discourses 76), but either by not mentioning any analogous attempts (Stahman)<sup>43</sup> or by explicitly disputing the dissenting views (Williams: “Current interpretations of *obscuras* are considered and found inadequate...”).<sup>44</sup> Stahman even hedges her Product statement with the modal verb *may*: “...Franz Kafka’s ‘The Burrow’ **may be read** (post-Heidegger) as a critique of the fundamental ontology...” (19). Whereas Williams does employ intensification to underscore the ingenuity of his suggestion, he phrases

---

<sup>41</sup> This strategy is also consistent with the main purpose of the abstract – to convey the quintessential information about the publication. See also Swales, Genre Analysis.

<sup>42</sup> Hyland observes that “writers in marketing, applied linguistics, and sociology largely drew on the notion of importance to promote their work (60 per cent of all cases)” (Disciplinary Discourses 76).

<sup>43</sup> That Stahman’s approach is original can be gleaned from her very short Works Cited list more than half of which is comprised of primary sources.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. Hyland, Disciplinary Discourses.

the paper's outcome as a hypothesis "...the **very slight** change of **only two** letters **is proposed** to yield the adjective *obscenas...*" (Williams 225). In other words, "an increasingly competitive market situation" does not seem to be translated into boosterism in the literary studies abstracts in contrast with "a considerable increase in the use of the promotional features" in many other disciplines (Hyland, Disciplinary Discourses 82).

### **Introductions**

Of all the articles, only Benton's, Barloon's, and Gottschall's follow the Swalesian revised CARS [Create a Research Space] model in the introduction: they proceed from a more general account of their "territory" towards "[e]stablishing a niche" and conclude with "[a]nnouncing present research ... purposively [or descriptively]" (Swales, Research Genres).<sup>45</sup> These articles, however, differ in the amount of citations and references to the previous research. Whereas Benton and Gottschall enhance "Indicating a gap" move (Move 2 Step 1A) with multiple quotes, Barloon illustrates the "generally accepted view" (6) held by "many critics" (5, 6) and "several other critics" (5) with a single citation of Philip Young (5). The most specific and detailed account of the state of the art is provided by Benton, who refers both to literary and critical sources. Gottschall, on the other hand,

---

<sup>45</sup> Gottschall offers "Definitional clarifications" (Move 3 Step 3 in the Swalesian model) as part of his "Establishing a territory" move (Move 1).

presents the approaches of schools rather than individual theorists to provide a positive justification for his stand. Barloon, in contrast, situates himself in the opposition camp whose analysis is not a continuation of the ongoing discussion (very briefly sketched), as in Benton's and Gottshcall's case, but a reading distinct from that of other scholars.

Significantly, other authors do not seem to question "the need to re-establish in the eyes of the discourse community the significance of the research field itself" and "the need to 'situate' the actual research in terms of that significance" (Swales, Genre Analysis 142). Most literary studies papers omit what Swales labels Moves 1 and 2 and after general observations about the text(s), which can range from a few sentences (e.g., Tarantino) to a few paragraphs (e.g., Williams), proceed directly to Move 3 "Presenting the Present Work" (Research Genres 232):<sup>46</sup>

In the second recension of the *Confessio Amantis*, John Gower added an anecdote on the Florentine poet Dante Alighieri as an example in his discussion of flattery in Book VII... **In this article I investigate the origins and early history of this anecdote and the most likely channels for its transmission to Gower.** (Tarantino 420)

---

<sup>46</sup> Only one paper (Schwenger) in the introduction constructs an extensive literary and philosophical background for the ensuing discussion.

In this context **the seemingly unexceptionable phrase** *obscuras ... manus* (“dark hands”) **requires examination.** James McKeown, in his learned commentary on the *Amores* (McKeown 1998, 132, on 2.6.39-40), tells us that “the image of Death’s hands is commonplace,” citing this passage and van Dam on Statius *Silu.* 2.1.137-39. **This assertion calls, however, for considerable refinement.** (Williams 229)

In contrast to Williams, who after presenting his major thesis (Step 1) immediately plunges into discussion, Benton reinforces the purposive announcement of his inquiry (Step 1) by a brief statement of the theoretical approach (Step 4),

**The purpose of this article** is to examine literary biography as a form by considering its main generic characteristic – its concern to document facts – in the light of its narrative impulse – its concern to tell its story through the dynamic biographer / biographee relationship unique to every biography.... This formulation [“a lasting imaginative truth based on a selection of facts”] seems to me to catch the character of this hybrid form and to invite **a theoretical exploration that ranges its historical necessities against its narrative character.** (Benton 46)

Barloon, Hodgson, Michie, and Schwenger, on the other hand, offer a preview of the principal outcomes / conclusions (Step 5) after Step 1:<sup>47</sup>

**It is not my purpose to debunk this generally accepted view**, whether true or not, but it does seem remarkable that in a book reputedly about war, so little of war or its aftershocks are dramatized to any great extent. With the important exception of a few vignettes, **the action in Hemingway's *In Our Time* tends to occur well behind the front lines.** (Barloon 6)

In addition to Steps 4 and 5, Stahman also employs Step 7 (“Outlining the structure of the paper”):<sup>48</sup>

**My essay begins** with a very brief summary of the traditional subject-object opposition as it has been posited by Descartes. **I then recount** Kafka's narrative by highlighting specific moments in the text. **Next, I present** several key elements of Levinasian theory to show parallel notions that may be mapped onto a reading of Kafka's text. (20)

This roadmap assists the reader in navigating the quirks of Stahman's “burrow” and, given an overwhelming number of self-mentions in this

---

<sup>47</sup> In contrast with others, Barloon states his purpose negatively.

<sup>48</sup> More precisely, Step 4 is embedded into Steps 5 and 7: “Taking my interpretive cues from several of Kafka's aphorisms, excerpts from his letters, and Emmanuel Levinas's philosophy (which I appropriate for exegetical purposes), I suggest that... the traditional subject-object opposition as it has been posited by Descartes...” (Stahman 20)

paragraph (7 first person pronouns in 9 sentences), maybe even echo “the first-person narrative of a mole-like creature” (19).<sup>49</sup>

Remarkably, only Tarantino includes the implications of her investigation (corresponding to Step 6 “Stating the value of the present research”) in the introduction: “These findings **offer support** for a revision of the chronology of recensions 2 and 3 of the *Confessio Amantis*, and **also raise wider questions** about the use of source material **not only** by Gower **but also** by other medieval and early modern poets” (420). The lexical booster (*offer support*) is strengthened grammatically by means of a comparative form of the adjective *wide*, the additive conjunct *also*, and the correlative coordinator *not only ... but also*, which amplify the scope of the current research applicability. As pointed out by Swales, “*early* positive evaluations, *early* justifications, and *early* classifications can work to both impress and reassure the reader that the paper is worth pursuing further” (Research Genres 232).<sup>50</sup>

Authors employ boosters not only to promote their findings, but also to heighten the reader’s interest in the subject of investigation, that is, as early as in Move 2. Thus, Benton embarks on the study of “a **significant** and, in some respects, a **unique** subgenre” (45)<sup>51</sup> because “[i]t is **evident** ... that literary biography offers a **rich** and **varied** area of study that raises issues about the relationships among biography,

---

<sup>49</sup> Dietrich incorporates navigation into the discussion.

<sup>50</sup> Cf. Benton’s “Educational Implications” section following the summary.

<sup>51</sup> Note the hedge “in some respects” (Benton 45).

history, fiction, and poetry that are **fundamental to aesthetic education**” (45). Similarly, Gottschall advocates the Darwinian approach to literary studies for it has already “provided **startling new insights into a host of topics**” (256) in biology and social sciences and promulgates the “achievement of mutual consistency” as “a **worthy goal** because it represents an **excellent method of evaluating the trustworthiness of knowledge**” (257). Highlighted lexemes and phrases cast unambiguously positive light on the object of inquiry.

In Move 3, however, most authors are emphatically circumspect using litotes and delimiting the applicability of their assertions: “This oscillation ... is **not unlike** the dynamics of the Freudian death drive. And **in this sense** the space between words and things once again manifests itself as fatal – **if only to our philosophies**” (Schwenger 102). Even when the boosting effect is implied, as in Barloon’s contention phrased as a paradox, the authors opt for subtle lexicogrammatical exponents: “...**but it does seem remarkable** that in a book **reputedly** about war, **so little** of war or its aftershocks are dramatized **to any great extent**” (6).<sup>52</sup>

Overall, in introductions, an overt positive evaluation is predominantly concentrated in Move 2, where the niche is presented as indispensable for literary studies or even the entire field of the humanities. By implication, the research embedded in such a framework can obviously enrich the discipline. Inclusion of Step 6

---

<sup>52</sup> Cf. Williams’s “the seemingly unexceptionable phrase” (229).

further emphasizes a study's contribution. Thus, promotion is achieved by means of discourse structure as well as lexical and grammatical resources.

## **Discussions**

The discussion section in the literary studies articles differs significantly from the corresponding part-genre in sciences and engineering described by Swales.<sup>53</sup> In all examined papers, the discussion integrates evidence supporting the major thesis with intensive references to previous and ongoing research. Occasionally (e.g., Hodgson; Stahman), the discussion can be preceded by a preface situating the text in question within the pertinent historical, ideological, or theoretical context.

The discussions in the literary studies articles create a tangible link to the introduction by following the order of arguments.<sup>54</sup> A correlation between the statements made in the introduction and chunks of the discussion are typically highlighted linguistically. Dietrich, for example, signals the onset of the development of her first thesis, "Statius' *Silvae* 2.4 is ostensibly written as a consolation poem..." by the paraphrase, "Statius uses the form of, or at least certain elements of, the *consolation* or *epicedion* for many of the *Silvae* (1.4, 2.1, 2.4, 2.5,

---

<sup>53</sup> Cf. the provisional framework outlined by Swales in Genre Analysis and further elaborated in Research Genres.

<sup>54</sup> The only article which does not lay out the questions to be addressed in the discussion is Williams's.

2.6, 2.7, 3.3, 5.1, 5.3, 5.5)...” (95).<sup>55</sup> The transition from the first to the second argument in the introduction is likewise mirrored in her discussion; this time, however, without verbal repetition. Stahman even uses an endophoric marker to advise the reader that the present block of the discussion (pages 29-31) refers back to the proposal made (among others) in the introduction: “**At the beginning of this essay** I describe Kafka’s ‘The Burrow’ as a text that comments on the anxiety and meaninglessness of a life lived for the act of knowledge alone. The creature in its burrow remains fixed in a state of Levinasian ‘ipseity,’ or **egoism**” (30). The noun *egoism* supplies an additional hint as to which suggestion the author has in mind: “Kafka’s story may be read on a literary level as a deconstruction of **egoism**...” (Stahman 20).

While expanding and developing the claims made in introductions, authors reinforce them in discussions by adding certainty and commitment metadiscourse:

**Indeed**, as mentioned by Richard Heinemann (256), **it is quite clear** that the tone of the narrator’s report painstakingly mimics the ‘official’ language and phrasing one would hear in a bureaucratic setting. (Stahman 21)

The mutual sympathy of women and Jesus that Lanyer constructs is also **clearly** designed to color Lanyer

---

<sup>55</sup> The following qualification, “but these poems are concentrated in the second book whose overarching theme is death” (Dietrich 95), resolves the lexical ambiguity of the adverb *ostensibly* (probably intended by the author).

herself as writer. Her self-descriptions in the poem **deliberately** invoke this same figure of the woman who, through her pitying love for Jesus, is rendered both weak and powerful. (Hodgson 107)<sup>56</sup>

This scaffolding technique is used sparingly in the articles offering a (new) perspective on the text(s) (Hodgson and Michie) and studying the text(s) through the prism of a certain theory (Schwenger and Stahman). In the articles that debate alternative analyses (Barloon, Dietrich, Tarantino, Williams) and those concerned with theoretical and methodological questions (Benton and Gottschall), on the other hand, discussions are saturated with intensifiers. In the latter group, the function of metadiscourse is often twofold: to spotlight the author's view and to underline opponents' misconceptions:

I will argue here that Statius both inserts himself into and distinguishes himself from the Latin literary tradition through the use of two catalogues of birds... Statius plays these catalogues off several stories in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* that also feature birds in order to comment on his own work, to locate it within the Latin tradition (particularly the poetry of Ovid), and to

---

<sup>56</sup> Cf. Benton, who reformulates the purpose of his article (stated in the introduction) "to examine literary biography as a form by considering its main generic characteristic – its concern to document facts – in the light of its narrative impulse – its concern to tell its story through the dynamic biographer / biographee relationship unique to every biography" (46) in the discussion using the booster: "**It is evident even from these openings** that the art of biography involves invention as well as interpretation, that the skills of narrative are essential to quicken the life on the page" (48).

comment on the changing role of the poet under the emperors... By including a catalogue, yet at the same time making his catalogue **so** different from Ovid's, Statius **clearly** signals that he is both exploring his role in the poetic tradition and at the same time claiming a voice for himself that is distinct from that of Ovid. (Dietrich 95, 101)

Dietrich's statement, which appears devoid of interactional metadiscourse in the introduction, is augmented with boosters in the discussion. The adverbs *so* and *clearly* emphasize her central thesis that Statius deliberately diverges from Ovid's catalogues of birds and that this alteration has been downplayed or misunderstood by the previous investigators (for instance, Van Dam). She constantly repeats this proposition using the noun *difference* (once even placed in a cleft sentence, "...it is the differences between these birds that give meaning..." (99)), the adjectives *different* (modified by the adverb *very* (100)) and *distinct* as well as the verb *differ* so that her commitment to her arguments appears doubtless.<sup>57</sup> The reiteration of the verb *signal* with the subject Statius and of the adverb *clearly* underscores that the

---

<sup>57</sup> Repetition, often enhanced with adverbial intensifiers, is one of the most characteristic means of reinforcement in this article, e.g., "If we explore these etiologies in detail, we see **clearly** that Statius uses his catalogues in *Silvae* 2.4 to both set himself within and distinguish himself from the earlier tradition" (Dietrich 101); "Through reference to Ovid's *Metamorphoses* ... Statius **clearly** evokes the epic voice of Ovid, as well as his own ... But Statius also goes much further in the *Silvae* and claims a voice for himself that is different from Ovid's and from his own epic voice" (Dietrich 103); "Statius thus signals another way in which his poetry differs from that of Ovid and thus underlines the uniqueness of his voice in the tradition" (Dietrich 105).

author's interpretation of the poem is straightforward, whereas other readings ignore the obvious.<sup>58</sup>

To prove the superiority of his hypothesis, Williams likewise employs boosters not only in presenting his point of view, but also in explicitly critiquing the (over)generalizations of other scholars:

commentators ... **fail** to point out the **highly significant fact** that the image of the hands of Death occurs **once only** in Homer... [and that] explicit reference to the *hands* of Death occurs ... **once only**, in the final couplet of poem 80, Callimachus' famous epigram on the death of Heraclitus... (Williams 229-30)

Adverbial intensifiers and the evaluative verb *fail* underline the weakness of the interpretation and lend salience and boosting effect to the adverb *often* and the prepositional phrase *with particular frequency* used to justify the proposed emendation, "The word *obscenus* is **often** used in close conjunction with *importunus*... It occurs **with particular frequency** in contexts involving the Harpies..." (Williams 232). In this article, the debate becomes personal at times and the confrontation can be amplified by comparative constructions denigrating the dissenting views: "I cannot feel that this [etymology suggested by Francis Cairns] would be **as meaningful as the more obvious and forceful**

---

<sup>58</sup> "*Silvae* 2.4 is thus **carefully** located in the second book to highlight certain themes, **most obviously** death and the control of nature. Another, **more subtle**, theme is **evident** throughout book 2 of the *Silvae*, however, and is represented **prominently** in 2.4: the role of poetry" (Dietrich 98). The cluster of intensifiers in the second sentence is almost anomalous.

etymologies in this poem...” (231).<sup>59</sup> It is worth noting, however, that such intensive and aggressive promotion of the advanced hypothesis at the expense of the alternative explanations is the idiosyncrasy of this particular paper. As Barloon’s article demonstrates, adverbial intensifiers can express disagreement in a less face threatening manner. For instance, in response to the critic Ian Watt, who points out that “...a causal connection operating through time replaces the reliance of earlier narratives on disguises and coincidences, and this tends to give the novel a much more cohesive structure” (qtd. in Barloon 7), Barloon remarks, “**But only the barest devices of novelistic cohesion** can be found in *In Our Time...*” (7). While Barloon’s statement both counters Watt’s interpretation and boosts his own, it is not as audacious as Williams’s.

Gottschall employs boosters primarily to underline the sound basis of the methodology he promulgates: “Viewing texts through the evolutionary lens of survival and reproduction has provided **substantially new perspectives on a broad spectrum of different issues in a wide variety** of literary works and traditions...” (261). The wide applicability and high degree of innovation evolutionary theory offers to literary studies lend support to Gottschall’s belief that “[t]he time is high for a Darwinian literary study” (259). Moreover, Gottschall

---

<sup>59</sup> Contentiousness of this article is signaled from the very beginning: the adjective “inadequate” predicated of “current interpretations” in the abstract and the clause “James McKeown ... tells us that...” in the introduction are markers of conflict in academic discourse. See Hunston, “Conflict and Consensus.”

is convinced that “mutual consistency” (257) and dialogue with natural sciences can rejuvenate literary criticism:

By **integrating** literary knowledge with the **larger** body of **interconnecting** and **mutually supportive** knowledge about human nature, literary scholars **can increase the intellectual rigor** of their **contributions to the human quest for self-understanding** and **exorcise old feelings of irrelevance and lack of utility**. (264)

This conviction is endorsed by repetition of the adjectives *consistent* and *related* and their synonyms throughout the paper. The advantages of the “integrationist literary study” (265) are also buttressed by multiple failures of previous methodologies such as psychoanalysis, feminism, Marxism, queer theory, and many others:

Evolutionary psychology – a sub-category of human behavioral biology – offers **the very thing psychoanalysis promised but ultimately could never deliver**: a science **appropriate** to the demands of literary study.... looking back at literary studies in the postmodern era, **tied into literary theory based in discredited psychology and antiquated notions of extreme cultural constructivism**, it would not be **uncharitable** to say that it has done **as much harm to human self-understanding as good**. (259; 263-4)

Lexical contrast broadens the gap between what criticism based on alternative principles could not accomplish (“ultimately could never deliver” (259); “has done as much harm to human self-understanding as good” (264)) and what the evolutionary grounded study can (“has provided substantially new perspectives on a broad spectrum of different issues in a wide variety of literary works and traditions” (261); “can increase the intellectual rigor... and exorcise old feelings of irrelevance and lack of utility” (264)). Against the impotence of predecessors the advocated approach stands out as more appealing.

In general, the degree of promotion in discussions differ between the articles offering a (new) perspective on the text(s) and studying the text(s) through the prism of a certain theory and the articles disputing alternative analyses and addressing theoretical and methodological questions. The former type is almost devoid of boosters, whereas the latter abounds in promotional language. Two major rhetorical strategies can be discerned in the latter articles: authors can either shed positive light on their own analysis or focus on shortcomings of alternative interpretations. Use of both strategies further amplifies the advantages of the proposed reading or theory. Approving and disapproving evaluation is mostly conveyed by discourse and lexical means.<sup>60</sup> Authors not only use lexemes and phrases with positive connotations (*contribution; appropriate; increase*

---

<sup>60</sup> Grammatical resources include comparative constructions and conjoining clauses with the contrastive coordinator *but*.

*the intellectual rigor*) to refer to their own research, but also juxtapose them with lexemes and phrases associated with negative judgment often reinforced by negative elements (e.g., *not; discredited; fail; lack of utility*). Lexical cohesion, especially repetition synonymy, and antonymy, reinforces both polarities.

### **Conclusions**

The conclusions of the examined papers tend to hark back to introductions. The symmetric structure of the articles is usually foregrounded: Barloon, for example, marks his conclusion by “So, we return to our original question...” (15) and Schwenger signals the summary by “[w]e have come full circle” (113).<sup>61</sup> Only two authors – Benton and Tarantino – discuss the implications of their study: while Tarantino is concerned with the implications of her investigation for the field, Benton identifies the opportunities for further research and exploration of the genre of literary biography in secondary and higher education. Benton’s implications section is not announced in the introduction and therefore needs an endophoric reminder to explain its relevance to the present inquiry: “The motives for studying literary biography, **as was implied at the outset**, spring from more than its mere existence as a historical and cultural phenomenon” (55). The

---

<sup>61</sup> Adams Smith compares this feature to “the theme of a sonata” (30). She notices that stylistically, “this is very satisfying and gives a feeling of completeness” (30).

unity of the paper is achieved by the Cinderella metaphor that opens and closes the study.

Most authors finish their contributions either by reaffirming the initial claims or by emphasizing the novelty and noteworthiness of the reported research. Compare, for example, the major thesis and the conclusion of Hodgson's and Michie's articles:

...the mourning foremother is the central trope for this complex self-fashioning in *Salve Deus*.... But, **certainly**, Lanyer's text **well** illustrates the powerful but ambiguous value of Rachel's tears, the prophetic voice of the woman-mourner, for the Christian poet. (Hodgson 102, 114)

A comparison of Trollope's *The Prime Minister* and James's *The Portrait of a Lady* bears out the idea that, improbably, Trollope's "vulgar" novels inspired some of James's more abstract, refined, and delicate prose.... The vulgar, mindless, financially successful writings of Trollope not only pushed James to crystallize his philosophy of intellectual and aesthetic refinement but also turned out to be **not so absolutely different** from James's novels **as we have, for a long time, been led to expect**. (Michie 10, 20)

Hodgson's conclusion not only reiterates the argument put forward in the introduction, but also strengthens it by using the adverb *certainly*.<sup>62</sup> Whereas Michie's booster is more syntactically complex, it serves the same purpose – it tones up her claims and highlights her contribution to the scholarship.

It is, therefore, surprising that Tarantino restates the impact of her research on the reconstruction of the textual history of the *Confessio Amantis* in the conclusion in a more hedged manner:<sup>63</sup>

These findings offer support for a revision of the chronology of recensions 2 and 3 of the *Confessio Amantis*, and also raise wider questions about the use of source material not only by Gower but also by other medieval and early modern poets... While **it should be stressed** that **these sorts of speculation** on the vicissitudes of a Florentine anecdote gone north **cannot, in any way, constitute hard evidence**, they **would seem** to point in the same direction as some recent developments in the textual criticism and dating of the *Confessio Amantis*. (420; 432)

---

<sup>62</sup> Likewise, by adding the adverb *best* Benton emphasizes the aptitude of the advocated approach: "The principles of the genre, as the article has sought to show, can **best** reflect its hybrid nature by being conceptualized as history crossed with narrative" (56).

<sup>63</sup> Stahman is equally cautious about her reading at the onset and outset of her article: the introduction hedges, "I suggest that "The Burrow" can be read ... may be read ... may also be read..." (20), are balanced with the conclusion hedges, "It seems that ... this is perhaps..." (31), and thus do not undermine the validity of the whole paper.

This paper, in its final sentence, deprecates its own importance boldly put forward at the beginning.<sup>64</sup> Similarly, Dietrich compromises her central argument by interspersing the final remarks with the verbs *seem* and *may*, even though, technically, the paper ends on a positive note: “In the *Silvae* Statius **seems** to have adopted a voice..., he **seems** to distance himself.... Much like the parrot of Persius and Martial, Statius **may** be mimicking a different voice..., but in fact, through reference to Ovid’s epic and his own, he **reaffirms** that his poetry will live” (108-9). The lack of commitment questions the validity of the entire enterprise.

Many authors express their belief that the article has achieved its goal, typically by means of a dependent comment clause. For instance, Schwenger, who promises at the beginning, “This oscillation, **as we shall see**, is not unlike the dynamics of the Freudian death drive” (102), reminds the reader at the end that his mission is accomplished, “This circling by words **we have seen** in carafe, jug, and vase, where richness and emptiness produce each other continuously within the work” (113). A parenthetical or relative clause with or without the inclusive pronoun *we* as the subject not only “bind[s] writer and reader

---

<sup>64</sup> On the whole, this paper stands out as very unstable with regards to the stance metadiscourse: for instance, the discussion opens with a restatement of the central argument formulated just a paragraph earlier less confidently: “My contention, as illustrated below, is that the Dante anecdote in the *Confessio Amantis* represents the earliest known written manifestation of an oral tradition that is in fact the conflation of two different strands of the tale” (Tarantino 420). Compare a hedged version of this proposition in the introduction: “This investigation ... **suggests the likelihood** that Gower had recourse to oral resources based upon a received synthesis of the two main strands of the anecdote” (420).

together” and “sends a clear signal of membership by textually constructing both the writer and the reader as participants with similar understanding and goals (Hyland, “Stance and Engagement” 182), but also urges the reader to recognize that the evidence is (will be or has been) strong enough to convince. Thus, Williams assumes the reader’s agreement when he states, “The agent noun ... is applied to Hades, which, **as we have seen**, Ovid is echoing when he uses the image of the hands of Death...” (233)<sup>65</sup> and Benton implies that his account, albeit concise, warrants his claims: “For, effective literary biography today is developing its own body of theory, **as outlined above**, and it is also a genre that typically includes distinctive elements of critical appreciation and evaluation” (56).

Thus, it appears that the authors’ major concern in conclusions is to persuade the readers that their expectations have been met or even exceeded. This purpose is achieved first of all, by restating the central arguments put forward in the introduction, usually strengthened by boosters; second, by constructing consensus with the reader by means of the inclusive pronoun *we*; third, by reminding the reader that the conclusions are corroborated by the essay, often by means of a dependent comment clause; and, finally, by suggesting a number of possible future lines of inquiry and stating pedagogical implications. Apart from lexical and syntactic boosters and hedges, conclusions draw

---

<sup>65</sup> This allusion to Callimachus is revealed in this article.

on grammatical (e.g., anaphoric dependent comment clauses) and lexical (repetition and synonymy) cohesion.

### **Footnotes / Endnotes**

Since journals from which the articles are culled for this study adhere to either the Chicago Manual of Style (14<sup>th</sup> or 15<sup>th</sup> edition) or MLA Style Manual, a high degree of consistency in the use of footnotes and endnotes is expected. However, as mentioned above, the papers vary as to amount of text in their footnotes / endnotes. Some papers' footnotes / endnotes (Dietrich; Michie; Tarantino; Williams) contain substantial comments. While endnotes in Benton's, Hodgson's, and Gottschall's articles are reserved for bibliographical information, Benton's are limited to works cited, whereas Gottschall's and Hodgson's encompass recommended readings as well. Schwenger's footnotes, apart from occasional brief explanations or quotes, are also restricted to acknowledgement of sources. Benton's endnotes are used for extended quotations. Stahman's essay has only one endnote explaining that the author translated the original text.

Among the papers that relegate extensive remarks to footnotes / endnotes Michie's and Tarantino's have the least number of intensifiers. Whereas sparse boosting is characteristic of the entire Michie's article, Tarantino's footnotes differ drastically from the rest of the essay in this respect. Similarly, Dietrich's footnote comments are

more reserved than her text: apart from occasional criticism of Van Dam, “Van Dam’s reading of *modo ... modo* for *quondam ...nunc* is **insufficiently** supported by a comparison to *Silvae* 2.1.132-33...” (fn.40),<sup>66</sup> she avoids boosting her suggestions. In contrast, Williams’s footnotes, like his discussion, abound in toning up devices which, much like in discussion, are twofold: they can be used either to emphasize the truth of the author’s proposition, as in “Another ingredient in Ovid’s phrase *diuum uocamur* **must of course** be the frequency in legends of the motif of deities intervening in moments of danger to protect their protégés...” (fn.6) or to highlight others’ erroneous assumptions, as in “Editors’ preference for M’s reading *obscenae* over *obsceni* off all other MSS probably rests on the **widespread but mistaken** belief...” (fn.16).<sup>67</sup> Interestingly, the only instance in which Williams seeks support from his predecessors’ opinions occurs in the final footnote:

While this paper was in the press, I discovered that Hall 1994, 27, in an article I had not previously seen, also expresses unease about *obscuras*, though he adduces no arguments, and proposes, again without arguments, *obscenas*, which he had conjectured before discovering that it was first suggested by Nicholas Heinsius. It is

---

<sup>66</sup> See also fn. 39: “Van Dam ... translates this line ... and explains that ... **However**, there is also a **strong** connection with lamentation that **should not be dismissed** in this context” (Dietrich 105).

<sup>67</sup> See also fn.12 beginning: “**If evidence is needed**, see...” corresponding to the in-text statement “Death is **of course** frequently characterized as ‘black’...” (Williams 230).

**gratifying** to find oneself in **such distinguished company**. (233)

This ethos appeal is unique not only as far as this paper is concerned, but also with regard to other literary studies articles in this corpus.

In most essays, footnotes / endnotes do not display promotional discourse. The classicists' articles, which do contain evaluation, employ the same strategies in footnotes as in discussions. The only difference is Williams's last footnote, in which he aligns himself with the scholars whose opinions he (and presumably the whole discourse community) holds in high respect.

### **Summary**

On the whole, close examination of ten literary studies papers shows that research articles in this field typically have an essay form even though their communicative purposes differ, that is, they can focus on theoretical questions, reconsider current interpretations or offer a new perspective on the text(s). Unlike sciences and engineering research articles described by Swales and Hyland, literary studies papers consist of three identifiable parts – introductions, discussions, and conclusions – which are closely knit together by means of linguistic cohesion.<sup>68</sup>

---

<sup>68</sup> For detailed discussion of cohesion, see Halliday and Halliday and Hasan. For lexical cohesion in research articles, see Lewin, Fine, and Young.

All literary studies articles make use of promotional metadiscourse to present their research as valid and contributing to the ongoing discussion in the discourse community. The amount and distribution of boosters, however, vary across the corpus and essay sections. For instance, most authors refrain from overt positive evaluation in introductions; if intensifiers are utilized, they mainly appear in Move 2, where their function is to reaffirm the topic's worthiness in reader's eyes.

The discussions, on the other hand, are more susceptible to promotional metadiscourse. While the discussions in the articles offering a (new) perspective on the text(s) and studying the text(s) through the prism of a certain theory are rarely punctuated with boosters, the discussions in the articles disputing alternative analyses and dealing with theoretical and methodological questions are rife with intensifiers. Two toning up strategies can be identified in these papers: the authors highlight their views or emphasize opponents' misconceptions; sometimes both approaches are combined, which results in widening the gap between the (flawed) previous treatment and the compelling current analysis.

In conclusions, literary scholars usually reaffirm their initial claims and stress their contribution to the field; occasionally, they also outline the implications of their research. Even those authors who employ boosters sparingly throughout the essay feel compelled to

foreground their major findings in conclusions. To reconfirm the validity of their arguments authors not only bolster their claims with intensifiers, but also utilize comment clauses reminding the reader that the goal of the inquiry has been accomplished and use the inclusive *we* presupposing the reader's agreement. Only two researchers in conclusions unexpectedly hedge the assertions they make in the previous sections.

In most articles, footnotes / endnotes contain fewer boosters than discussions and conclusions. Typically, authors reserve footnotes for bibliographical information and parenthetical comments, which do not generally invite toning up. Finally, though literary studies abstracts agree with the move structure characteristic of hard knowledge disciplines, they contrast in use of promotional features, with literary studies opting for boosters-free presentation.

### **Chapter 3: Research Articles in Language Studies**

This chapter examines the language studies research articles to identify the strategies and exponents of promotional (meta)discourse and map them onto the rhetorical structure of the papers. A brief overview of the selected publications is followed by the detailed analysis of distribution of promotional linguistic and rhetorical resources across moves in abstracts, introductions, discussions, conclusions, and endnotes / footnotes. The chapter closes with a summary of generalizations yielded by this inquiry.

#### **An Overview**

Like literary theory and criticism research articles, language studies articles are organized into coherent essays.<sup>69</sup> Six language studies papers explore a linguistic phenomenon either synchronically (Charles Scott; Nancy Stern; Alfred Wedel; Susan Yager) or diachronically (Yoko Iyeiri; Regina Trüb). Three articles are concerned with theoretical issues: two of them (Jack Chambers; Natalie Schilling-Estes) construe a methodological framework for investigation of dialect convergence and dialect variation respectively and one (John Baugh) focuses on linguistic and pedagogical consequences of racial isolation. Finally, one article (N. A. J. Moore) applies discourse analysis to technical writing.

---

<sup>69</sup> One article (Regina Trüb) has a hybrid structure of an essay with elements of IMRD.

Most language studies articles are divided into sections with content headings; only two (Scott and Wedel) offer a non-partitioned text. Six papers (Baugh; Chambers; Iyeiri; Moore; Stern; Trüb) contain an abstract. In line with the tradition of the presentation of data and findings in language studies, five articles (Chambers; Iyeiri; Moore; Scott; Trüb) offer graphs, tables, and figures to provide an additional visual support for their arguments. Apart from Wedel's article, in which footnotes contain predominantly bibliographical information, and Moore's article, which does not have footnotes / endnotes at all, most articles (Baugh; Iyeri; Schilling-Estes; Scott; Stern; Trüb; Yager) use footnotes / endnotes for comments of varying length.<sup>70</sup> Wedel adds an Appendix which supplies more examples of the phenomenon discussed in the article.

### **Abstracts**

Out of ten language studies articles, six contain an abstract ranging from 87 (Moore) to 169 words (Chambers). Most abstracts (Baugh; Iyeiri; Stern; Trüb) begin with a Purpose move containing the noun phrase "the present article" (Iyeiri) / "this paper" (Stern) / "this article" (Baugh; Trüb) in the subject position. Only Chambers's abstract commences with an extensive Introduction, which contextualizes mobility within dialect variation research. While most

---

<sup>70</sup> Most authors express their gratitude to their colleagues, reviewers and funding agencies in an unnumbered footnote / endnote. The only endnote in Chambers's article is the acknowledgement of his colleagues' assistance.

abstracts (Baugh; Chambers; Moore; Trüb) include a Conclusion move, only Moore places it first. Despite overall structural diversity all abstracts contain a Product move.

Sentence and move boundaries coincide only in two abstracts (Baugh; Iyeiri) (the symbol // marks move boundaries):

This article compares and contrasts the learning of (Standard?) English as a second dialect in the United States with the learning of Standard English as a second language in South Africa. [Purpose]// It argues that the common denominator of racial segregation has had clear econolinguistic and educational consequences that have been, and might continue to be, detrimental to the welfare of historically subordinated racial populations. [Product]// In order to advance the teaching of Academic English, Standard English, and Workplace English in both contexts, educators should address stereotypes associated with specific varieties, students' goals, the potential benefits of gaining communicative competence in particular varieties, and the potential consequences of not gaining that competence. [Conclusion]// (Baugh 197)<sup>71</sup>

---

<sup>71</sup> Iyeiri's abstract consists of two moves: "The present article discusses why the particular phrase *God forbid* alone preserves subordinate clauses (i.e. *God forbid that...*), even in Present-day English, whereas *forbid* normally takes infinitives with *to*. [Purpose]// Apparently, there was an interesting gap of usage between the *God*

Other abstracts merge various moves within the same sentence. Stern, for example, amalgamates Purpose and Method and Method and Product statements:

...this paper investigates the semantic and pragmatic contributions these forms make in different structural contexts, including not only appositive uses, but also reflexives and a wide variety of so-called exceptional uses, such as logophoric expressions and picture noun phrases. [Purpose / Method] An extensive examination of data from a collection of spoken and written texts reveals that *-self* pronouns in different structural environments nevertheless exhibit the same semantic and pragmatic characteristics. [Method / Product] The structurally diverse assemblage of reflexives, emphatics, and a list of other exceptions are shown to have semantic unity, since the same message effects are seen in all of these environments, including argument and appositive, reflexive and emphatic, as well as what traditionally described as discourse-based uses. [Method / Product]// (270)<sup>72</sup>

---

*forbid* type and the other uses of *forbid* from the beginning.... *God forbid* could have merged into the development of the other uses of *forbid* if the expansion of the use of infinitives after the ordinary type of *forbid* had occurred slightly earlier [Product]//” (149).

<sup>72</sup> So does Moore: “Typical Theme-Rheme patterns are described, and the notion of the ‘point of a text’ is introduced. These concepts are applied to technical writing and

This fusion underlines the aptitude of the procedure and reliability of the analysis. By weaving Method into both Introduction and Product Chambers creates a logical progression from data interpretation to hypothesis formulation:

Third, identification of relatively recently-arrived people from other dialect regions allows comparisons of their linguistic norms with the communal norms, and a measure of their linguistics influence. [Introduction / Method] From the cumulative results, we are in a position to frame hypotheses about linguistic variables in terms of their susceptibility to change and their resistance to it, and the identities of inhibitors and accelerators. [Method / Product]// (117)

Even more intricate interpenetration between Product, Method, and Conclusion moves is displayed by Trüb's abstract:

The data were taken from the Southern Plantation Overseers Corpus (SPOC), a collection of vernacular letters dating from the late eighteenth to mid-nineteenth century. Part one focuses on the effect of two internal linguistic constraints that govern the occurrence of present-tense verbal *-s*. [Method] The first constraint affects the auxiliaries *have* and *be* and predicts higher

---

the reader is then invited to evaluate the improvement in readability in a small sample of texts" (43).

rates of *-s* when compared to lexical verbs. A second, functional constraint, which to the author's knowledge has not been investigated in other studies to date, operates on *be*, depending on its function as copula or other auxiliary verb. [Product] Part two investigates *was/were* variation in the early SAVE past-tense *be* paradigm. [Method] Separate analyses of all idiolects that combine to make up the community grammar of the overseers demonstrate that idiolects need to be considered in a sound interpretations and explanation of the results of group analysis. [Method / Conclusion] (250)

This abstract constitutes a map of the article which is comprised of separate accounts of lexical verbs and auxiliaries, as well as present and past tense paradigms of the verb *be*, each of which contains a "Data and Method" subsection. Hyland observes an analogous structure in his data: "Some longer abstracts, mainly in the sciences, also recycled moves throughout the abstract, often in order to highlight a series of results by presenting them as outcomes of different purposes or methods" (Disciplinary Discourses 69).

Relevance of methodology and multifaceted approach alone seem not to suffice to adequately represent the article in language studies abstracts. Authors are compelled to employ promotional

elements to highlight their research contributions. As noted by Hyland, a Conclusion is “widely used to advance claims for significance” (Disciplinary Discourses 77). Thus, Baugh’s Conclusion delineates the implications of the undertaken study for the field of education:

In order **to advance the teaching of Academic English, Standard English, and Workplace English** in both contexts, **educators should address stereotypes** associated with specific varieties, students’ goals, **the potential benefits** of gaining communicative competence in particular varieties, and **the potential consequences** of not gaining that competence. (197)

The contrast between “the potential benefits” and “the potential consequences” emphasizes the far-reaching impact of the issues raised in the article. Moreover, the appeal to “educators” as opposed to language arts teachers engages a wider audience and entails a broader scope of the discussion.

Trüb’s and Chambers’s Conclusions imply generalizability and therefore importance of the authors’ methodology:

Separate analyses of all idiolects that combine to make up the community grammar of the overseers **demonstrate that idiolects need to be considered in a sound interpretations and explanation of the results of group analysis.** (Trüb 250)

All these threads **should ultimately form integral aspects of the dynamics of dialect convergence.**

(Chambers 117)

A conclusion gains even more prominence if placed initially, as in Moore's abstract:

The readability of technical writing, and technical manuals in particular, especially for second language readers, **can be noticeably improved** by pairing Theme with given and Rheme with New. This allows for **faster processing** of text and **easier access** to the "method of development" of the text. (43)

All authors emphasize applicability of their investigations to wider fields – that of language policies in education, in Baugh's case, linguistic analysis in Trüb's and Chambers's, and technical writing in general, in Moore's.

Baugh insists on the practical significance of his study in a Product move as well: "It [article] argues that the common denominator of **racial segregation** has had **clear econolinguistic and educational consequences** that have been, and might continue to be, **detrimental to the welfare of historically subordinated racial populations**" (197). The preventive value of Baugh's argument is constructed by presenting the solution as bringing "the **potential** benefits" and eliminating "the **potential** consequences" that "**might continue to be ... detrimental**";

the seriousness of the situation is further underlined by the use of the strong modal verb *should*.<sup>73</sup> This pathos appeal to the values shared not only by the academic community, but also by general (anti-racist) public transcends the default research article audience.

Other authors, in a Product move, highlight the noteworthiness of the object of their disquisitions or uniqueness of their inquiries. Iyeiri, for example, uses an “interest” appeal: “Apparently, there was an **interesting** gap of usage between the *God forbid* type and the other uses of *forbid* from the beginning...” (149). Trüb, on the other hand, points to her unprecedented research question: “A second, functional constraint, **which to the author’s knowledge has not been investigated in other studies to date**, operates on *be...*” (250).<sup>74</sup>

Stern draws readers’ attention to the distinctness of her paper in terms of data and approach in a Purpose move, that is, from the very beginning of her abstract:

**In contrast to studies that have focused on the syntactic properties of English –self pronouns (*myself, yourself, etc.*), this paper investigates the semantic and pragmatic contributions these forms make in different structural contexts, including not**

---

<sup>73</sup> Modals and semi-modals are also often utilized to communicate methodological recommendations in language studies abstracts: “All these threads **should** ultimately form integral aspects of the dynamics of dialect convergence” (Chambers 117); “...idiolects **need** to be considered in a sound interpretation and explanation of the results of group analysis” (Trüb 250).

<sup>74</sup> By adding the comment “to the author’s knowledge” and using a dependent relative clause, Trüb downplays her statement both lexically and grammatically.

**only appositive uses, but also reflexives and a wide variety of so-called exceptional uses, such as logophoric expressions and picture noun phrases.**

(270)

In her Method / Product summary, Stern continues in the same vein: “An **extensive examination of data ... reveals** that.... The **structurally diverse assemblage** of reflexives, emphatics, and a list of **other exceptions are shown to have semantic unity...**” (270). Less conspicuous but still visible is Chambers’s claim in an Introduction / Method move that “dialect acquisition by the children of newcomers [a thread in his own research discussed in the article] **provides new perspectives** on critical period effects and influences...” (117). Like physics and biology abstracts examined by Hyland, language studies abstracts emphasize the novelty of their approach (Disciplinary Discourses 77). In addition, linguists exhibit a centuries old ambition to embrace all data available and account for every single exception thus implying a wide applicability of their analysis. As can be seen, boosterism spans across all moves reconfirming the newsworthiness of the study, its originality, and importance.<sup>75</sup>

Apart from the text organization devices delineated above, authors use explicitly evaluative lexicogrammatical elements. Moore,

---

<sup>75</sup> Of all abstracts, only Chambers’s uses the first person pronouns: “The sociolinguistics of mobility unites several disparate threads in **my** own research;” “From the cumulative results, **we** are in a position to frame hypotheses...” (117). Hyland mentions this strategy among the ways to promote “insider credibility” (Disciplinary Discourses 80).

for example, employs comparative forms of the adjectives *fast* and *easy* to underline the “improvements” his suggestion brings about: “This [“pairing Theme with Given and Rheme with New”] allows for **faster** processing and **easier** access to the ‘method of development’ of the text” (43). Chambers opens his abstract with the statement that “[m]obility is **the most effective** leveller of dialect and accent...” (117), where the superlative degree of the adjective *effective* highlights centrality of the chosen topic. This grammatical booster is further strengthened by repeating essentially the same statement in more general terms, “mobility constitutes a **powerful** linguistic force” (Chambers 117).

Evaluation by means of lexis is especially salient in Baugh’s abstract. Baugh foregrounds the importance of his paper by juxtaposing such negatively charged lexemes as *detrimental*, *subordinated*, and *stereotype* describing the current state of affairs and the lexemes with positive connotations such as *advance*, *benefits*, and *competence* outlining the outcome of the actions advocated in the article. The contrast between “benefits” and “consequences” is increased by syntactic parallelism: “the potential benefits of gaining communicative competence in particular varieties, and the potential consequences of not gaining that competence” (Baugh 197).

Another syntactic means encountered in the language studies abstracts is coordination implying the wide scope of the study: “...this

paper investigates the semantic **and** pragmatic contributions these forms make in different structural contexts, including **not only** appositive uses, **but also** reflexives **and** a wide variety of so-called exceptional uses...” (Stern 270). Coordination, like syntactic parallelism exemplified above, can be reinforced by synonymy and antonymy:

An extensive examination of data from a collection of spoken and written texts reveals that *–self* pronouns in **different** structural environments nevertheless exhibit the **same** semantic and pragmatic characteristics. The structurally **diverse** assemblage of reflexives, emphatics, and a list of other exceptions are shown to have semantic **unity**... (Stern 270)

Lexical cohesion also includes repetition: “The **readability** of technical writing ... can be noticeably **improved**... the reader is then invited to evaluate the **improvements in readability**...” (Moore 43). Reiteration of the study’s major accomplishment contributes to the overall promotional tone of this abstract.

Thus, the present corpus reconfirms Hyland’s observation that in abstracts, scholars “legitimate their work by identifying it as significant and worth reading further” (Disciplinary Discourses 84). In promoting their research, linguists underscore its novelty, noteworthiness, interestingness, and wide applicability among other

aspects. This rhetorical goal is attained by discourse structure and various lexicogrammatical means ranging from inflectional morphology to cohesion.

### **Introductions**

Even though moves identified by Swales in his revised CARS [Create a Research Space] model can be mapped onto the introductions of most language studies articles, their order and citations / references distribution are often different. In Move 1 (“Establishing a territory”), for example, Chambers and Schilling-Estes mention only general trends in research without specifying major contributors:

**Research on gender and social dialect variation in American English** has seen enormous changes since the formative years of **quantitative sociolinguistics**, in the early 1960s. These changes have not occurred in isolation, of course, but have influenced and been influenced by the developments in **gender-based language variation** across the globe, as well as developments in the **broader research areas of language and gender** (which encompasses **discourse analysis** as well as **variation study**) and **gender studies**. (Schilling-Estes 122)

Where **dialectologists** once preoccupied themselves with the **linguistics of isolation and immobility**, **contemporary dialectologists (sociolinguists)** find few opportunities for studying isolated dialects and dwindling social relevance in doing so. Instead, **we** are embarking on fecund new ground in **studies of contact and convergence...** (Chambers 117)

While Schilling-Estes incorporates multiple references to previous studies and their overview into Move 3 Step 7 (“Outlining the structure of the paper”), Chambers does not disclose the referents of the noun phrases *dialectologists* and *contemporary dialectologists (sociolinguists)*.

Whereas five articles begin with Move 3 (“Presenting the Present Work”), three of them (Iyeri; Moore; Wedel) preface “Announcing present research descriptively” (Move 3 Step 1) with an explanation of the linguistic phenomena – complementation patterns of the verb *forbid*, in Iyeri’s case, the prescriptive rules elaborated on in the article, in Moore’s, and stress patterns in Germanic alliterative verse, in Wedel’s – instrumental to an understanding of the ensuing discussion (compatible with Move 3 Step 3).<sup>76</sup> Move 3 includes only Step 1 in Wedel’s paper, Steps 1 and 4 (“Summarizing methods”) in Iyeri’s, and Steps 1, 7 (“Outlining the structure of the paper”), and 6

---

<sup>76</sup> Even though Wedel cites previous researchers, this information, like Moore’s brief description of the technical manuals guidelines, can be better regarded as preface. On the “fronted-Move 3” introductions, see Swales, *Genre Analysis* 164-6.

(“Stating the value of the present research”) in Moore’s.<sup>77</sup> In these three articles, Move 3 concludes the introduction. In two other articles (Baugh; Scott), in contrast, Move 3 is the opening move. After “Announcing present research descriptively” (Move 3 Step 1), Baugh provides “Definitional clarifications” (Move 3 Step 3) and demarcates the group of population his study targets. Following are extensive “introductory remarks” (Baugh 197) packed with references and indirect quotations (corresponding to Move 1 and Move 2) supplying historical background on linguistic aspects of racial segregation and pointing to the niche the article aims to occupy.

Like Baugh, Scott first announces his research descriptively (Move 3 Step 1) and delimits the number of questions to be addressed. In the following two sentences, however, Scott promises to “[a]dd[...] to what is known” (Move 2 Step 1B) and offers positive justification for his inquiry (Move 2 Step 2):

Several solutions for the issues I will raise have been offered (e.g., Trager 1930, 1940; Cohen 1970; Kiparsky 1989; Labov 1994), though obviously I believe there is still more to be said about the data and how they might be analyzed. Thus, I see this paper as a contribution to a continuing discussion, the resolution of which has still not been achieved. (358)

---

<sup>77</sup> In Step 4, Iyeri provides a detailed account of her corpora; in Step 6, Moore states the implications of his work.

This Move 2 insert not only contextualizes Scott's research, but also lowers readers' expectations for an ultimate solution. In other words, Scott replaces Move 3 Step 5 ("Announcing principal outcomes") with a modest representation of his results as "a contribution to a continuing discussion" (Scott 358).<sup>78</sup> The final sentence of introduction repeats the major research question in more detail and thus reinstates Move 3: "Short a' is the central concern, but its interaction with other low front vowels in monosyllabic and polysyllabic words must be considered as well" (Scott 358).<sup>79</sup>

Some papers employ a cycling, or iteration, option.<sup>80</sup> For instance, Stern begins with Move 1 "Establishing a territory" with references in endnotes and parentheses without citations. After a brief summary of the traditional and current treatment of *-self* pronouns Stern indicates a gap (Move 2 Step 1A) and immediately "announce[s] present research" in terms of "principal outcomes" (Move 3 Step 5):

This study **shows** that it is not only appositive uses that lend themselves to semantic / pragmatic treatment, but that argument uses do too. The data considered here

---

<sup>78</sup> This communicative purpose is reinforced linguistically: "In this paper I **revisit** a **well-attested and much-discussed** phenomenon in the American English vowel system.... Several solutions for the issues I will raise have been offered ... though obviously **I believe there is still more to be said** about the data and how they **might be analyzed**. Thus, I see this paper as **a contribution** to a continuing discussion, the resolution of which **has still not been achieved**" (Scott 358).

<sup>79</sup> On interdependence of placement and move function, see Swales, Research Genres 229. Swales remarks that a non-sequential order of moves is attested in "shorter communications such as various kinds of published Notes or those that appear in conference proceedings, especially in the sciences and engineering" (Research Genres 234).

<sup>80</sup> On cycling, see Swales, Genre Analysis and Research Genres. Ozturk finds a high frequency of cycling in Applied Linguistics research articles introductions.

**reveal** a semantic unity among all types of environments  
in which *-self* forms appear. (270-71)

She then exemplifies and briefly explains the treatment of “exceptions to the rule” by different linguists with references but without citations (Move 1). “Definitional clarifications” (Move 3 Step 3) are incorporated in this overview. This subsection is concluded with the directive, “**It should be noted** that labeling these uses does not change their status: they are exceptions to the structural reflexive / emphatic account, and all **require** that the account be modified or expanded” (Stern 271), which can be interpreted as “Indicating a[nother] gap” (Move 2 Step 1A).<sup>81</sup> The following section “A Semantic View of *-self* Pronouns” opens with “Announcing present research descriptively” (Move 3 Step 1)<sup>82</sup> and closes with “Announcing principal outcomes” (Move 3 Step 5) worded almost identically with a Method / Product move in the abstract and not very differently from Move 3 Step 5 earlier in the introduction. Thus, recycling allows Stern to clearly identify two questions her research addresses: a methodological one (introducing semantic / pragmatic approach as opposed to previous syntactic treatments) and a classificatory one (offering a unified account for *-self* pronouns in different structural environments); furthermore, it gives her an opportunity to state the results twice.

---

<sup>81</sup> “Exceptions to the Rule” subsection is set out typographically.

<sup>82</sup> This paragraph is a paraphrase of Purpose move in abstract.

Iyeiri, on the other hand, employs recycling of Move 3 Step 1 at the beginning of the first discussion section “*God forbid* in Bible Translations,” after a brief summary of the previous (her own) findings about the construction in question (Move 1) to recapitulate her objective, “The main concern of this article is to investigate why this particular phrase still dominates a subordinate clause today, when the use of *that*-clauses after *forbid* has undergone an almost complete obliteration” (150), in less binding manner: “I would argue in this article that the *God forbid* construction is different in nature from the other cases of *forbid* followed by *that*-clauses, although both are observed commonly in the early history of the English language” (151).

Many authors take an opportunity to indicate the centrality, interestingness or novelty of their research in introductions:

Where **dialectologists once preoccupied themselves** with the linguistics of isolation and immobility, **contemporary dialectologists (sociolinguists) find few opportunities** for studying isolated dialects and dwindling social relevance in doing so. **Instead, we are embarking on fecund new ground** in studies of contact and convergence... (Chambers 117)

**Popular and scientific fascination** with the language of the American South has produced an **immense number of amateur observations and reports of linguistic**

**studies, dating as far back as the early eighteenth century. Interest** in the dialect is **manifold**, triggered by the **general attractiveness of traditional Southern culture and speech**, as well as its **numerous subdialects** and its **historical distinctiveness** from and relationship to other American dialects... (Trüb 250)

Representing their work as part of ongoing scholarly debate continuing a long established tradition (Trüb) or breaking new ground (Chambers), authors situate themselves within their discourse communities and claim “insider credibility” (Hyland, Disciplinary Discourses).<sup>83</sup> This situatedness can be reinforced by self-citations, both integral and non-integral: “As **I** discuss in **Iyeiri (2000) and also above**, it was normal for the English verb *forbid* to dominate *that*-clauses until the middle part of the Middle English period...” (Iyeiri 150); “Readers who are familiar with the Ebonics controversy in the United States will know well that the vast majority of school districts ... have retreated from any controversial effort to advance Standard English proficiency among their Black students (see **Baugh 1999, 2000**; Rickford and Rickford 2000; Smitherman 2000; Williams 1975)” (Baugh 198). References to their own previous contributions reconfirm authors’ ethos.

At the same time, the same authors can choose to downplay their accomplishments:

---

<sup>83</sup> Chambers underscores his membership of the “contemporary dialectologists (sociolinguists)” community by the first person pronoun *we* (117). Interestingly, this use of *we* can be interpreted as either reader inclusive or exclusive.

This article **hopes to contribute to the ongoing research** into an antebellum stage of the vernacular that was decisive for its development (see Bailey 1997) [Move 3 Step 1]// and that **might exhibit linguistic similarities with other earlier varieties of English**, such as African American speech or source dialects from the British Isles (see Schneider and Montgomery 2001). [Move 3 Step 5]// (Trüb 250)

**I would like to press this distinction** [between *folk* and *peple*] **a bit further**, at least where Chaucer's usage is concerned; [Move 3 Step 1]// as Chaucer uses them, *peple* and *folk* **tend to have different semantic emphases**, with *folk* unmarked or, occasionally, positively connoted and *peple* **generally** negatively marked. When the terms appear in proximity in Chaucer ... they **often** indicate intellectual and behavioral differences between groups. [Move 3 Step 5]// (Yager 211-12)

Syntactic merger of Move 3 Steps 1 and 5, coupled with numerous hedges, tones down findings of the investigation and construes Step 5 as an explication of Step 1 rather than a separate proposition. With the exception of Stern's article, promotional elements are not utilized in

outcomes preview (Move 3 Step 5). If found in introductions at all, they are employed in “Establishing a niche” move (Move 2).

### **Discussions**

Discussions in most language studies articles (Baugh; Chambers; Iyeiri; Moore; Schilling-Estes; Stern; Trüb; Yager) are divided into subsections. Each subsection deals with an aspect of the phenomenon addressed in the paper; subsections can end with a brief summary (e.g., “We see, then, that a focus on localized groups has led researchers away...” (Schilling-Estes 127)) or begin with the announcement of the research question to be tackled in the forthcoming subsection (e.g., “This section tests the auxiliary constraint...” (Trüb 254)); continuity is often endophorically signaled (e.g., “As demonstrated in the previous section” (Iyeiri 155)). Trüb, who treats different verbal paradigms separately and applies distinct linguistic tools to analyze them, incorporates information on “Data and Method” into each discussion subsection. Non-partitioned essays, on the other hand, facilitate unity and progression of reasoning: Scott construes his discussion as hypothesis testing involving gradual revision of initial assumption by adducing data; Wedel tests applicability of Lloyd’s aspectual theory to Cynewulf’s *Elene*. With an exception of Chambers’s paper, implications and calls for further inquiry are reserved for conclusions.

Three papers (Moore; Trüb; Wedel) offer an extended explanation of the theoretical framework prior to delving into analysis; others embed references to previous and current research, which constitute an essential component of the discussion, into the arguments. In articles focusing on a linguistic phenomenon and application of a theory to the text (Iyeiri; Moore; Scott; Stern; Trüb; Wedel; Yager),

it is the present results that have the primary rhetorical focus and are foregrounded. The work of others [as well as the author's previous work] (or supporting or recalcitrant elements in the world) are introduced for the purposes for confirmation, comparison, or contradistinction. They are therefore backgrounded and take a secondary position. (Swales, Research Genres 235)

In articles devoted to theoretical questions (Baugh; Chambers; Schilling-Estes), review and evaluation of alternative frameworks are given prominence, “confirmation, comparison, or contradistinction” being of paramount importance (Swales, Research Genres 235).

A number of strategies are used to promote the author's standpoint and shed a positive light on research outcomes in the discussion. Schilling-Estes, for example, analyzes previous research in terms of its contribution to understanding of the factor of gender in social dialect variation. She proceeds from identifying drawbacks of

various early theories and improvements introduced by more recent social network-based studies to advocating social constructionist approaches. The progress made by sociolinguists is emphasized by characterizing the early survey research as reductive and overgeneralizing; social network-based studies as moving in the right direction; and communities of practice framework as the most insightful:

Researchers were **intent on capturing this uniformity**, often **abstracting away** inter- and intracommunity differences in the operation of gender, social class, and other social categories in order **to uncover the “general principles”** governing the intersection of language and society. Hence, for example, Labov (1990) articulates three **supposedly general** observations about the relationship between gender and language variation and change... Along with the search for **general patterns** came a search for **general explanations**... In particular, researchers invoked women’s supposed greater status consciousness as the underlying force behind their **seemingly uniform** linguistic behavior... a focus on localized social groups **has led** researchers **away from prestige based explanations** for gender-based language differences **toward explanations based on differential**

**access to power and differentiated societal roles.** Such studies **have also led away from** the consensus-based model for social division ... **toward a greater focus on contrasts and conflicts between and within groups and individuals...** Just as research in the CofP [Communities of Practice] framework **has uncovered important** intragender **differences** in women's speech, **so too has it revealed much** intragender **differentiation** in men's speech... (Schilling-Estes 123-4; 127; 129)

Superseding qualities of the approach embraced by the author become evident not only due to the numerous boosters such as the verbs *uncover* and *reveal*, but more so due to constant advantageous comparison with previous methodologies, as in “the CofP [Communities of Practice] is defined in terms of speakers' subjective experiences **rather than the external criteria that are often used in delimiting the speech community...**” (Schilling-Estes 128). Repetitive use of the lexemes *difference*, *differentiation*, *differential*, and *differentiated* in collocation with the adjective *important* and the verb *reveal* endows them with positive connotations in this paper, whereas *general* and *uniform* modified by *seemingly* and *supposedly* acquire negative value.

Moore also exploits this strategy, though his criticism of predecessors is less harsh: “The examples here are intended to illustrate

**how easy it is to make assumptions about the readers' technical knowledge.** Inclusion of materials is intended **to show how some of the very best training materials exhibit this kind of error**" (51). The false assumptions of the technical manuals writers are repeatedly emphasized and contrasted with the improvements suggested by the author:

In each case, the underlined items **are assumed by the writer** as Given information and placed in the Theme of the clause. None of these items have appeared in the text before, and there are no graphics to support these instructions. **Consequently, there is no reason to presume that the reader knows** what these words refer to. Apart from "Optionally," all five items are emphasized as Given by being assigned **presuming reference** in the form of the definite article... This kind of **"assuming" language** is likely to contribute to many people feeling that learning to use a computer is quite complicated, as it **assumes** a certain amount of knowledge... The written instructions ... have changed little except word order, **but readability and usability are significantly improved**... (Moore 53)

This juxtaposition of others' neglect of readers' needs (their presuming and assuming) and the author's concern about the audience

(significantly improved readability and usability) is constantly repeated throughout Moore's discussion.

Most linguists, however, convey their beliefs in the validity of their claims by highlighting their own analysis and positively evaluating the studies on which they draw:

**Obviously**, the *ge*-compounded verbal forms had a specific function other than providing a needed unstressed syllable in a given rhythmic unit as example (5) might suggest. And, **indeed**, the prefix *ge*- served as a means to achieve aspectual distinction **as will be seen**.  
(Wedel 202)

**Certainly**, repeated mention by an appositive suggests greater importance... (Stern 274)

Montgomery (1994) has **successfully shown** how Scots present- and past-tense subject-verb concord patterns manifested themselves not only in Ulster but also in North American speech. (Trüb 259)

The only explanation which seems plausible to me is of the kind **brilliantly elucidated** by Steven Pinker in *Words and Rules* (1999). (Scott 362)

For this purpose, such devices as adverbial intensifiers like *successfully* and *brilliantly*, boosters like *indeed*, *obviously*, and *certainly*, which express the commitment of the author to the statement, and comment

clauses of the type *as will be seen, as shown above, we have seen / will see*, which endorse the abovementioned / forthcoming argument, are frequently employed.

Often authors underscore that their analysis accounts for a pattern, not an isolated example:

The term **consistently** describes those who ‘deme’....  
*Folk* is used **consistently** to describe the *boni* until the  
last line of the passage... (Yager 215)

**As Figures 1 and 2 demonstrate**, there was a **clear-cut division** in the use of expletive negation between *God forbid that...* and the other uses of *forbid* followed by *that*-clauses until Text 8. (Iyeiri 153)

**What is especially curious** about the forms in which [æ] occurs, however, is **the categories** to which they belong... That these words, which are exceptions to the distributional restrictions of (3), **can be categorized at all is itself interesting**: they are **not simply random forms**. Moreover, **the categories themselves are perhaps noteworthy**... (Scott 362)

This emphasis on wide applicability is especially salient in the studies proposing new research venues:

The fact that this holds **equally for countless other children** suggests that it is **principled behaviour that**

**needs to be accounted for in a theory of language convergence. Its generality, perhaps universality, shows that it is not merely idiolectal but sociolectal, and presumably part of sociolinguistic competence. Evidently, Ethan and the others** come equipped with an innate filter... (Chambers 121)

This “generality, perhaps universality” legitimizes recognition and further exploration of the phenomenon. Sometimes, for the same reason, the number of counterexamples is emphatically downplayed: “**By contrast**, the case in which the indirect object occurs after *God forbid* is **very limited** and **may be illustrated** by the following **possible example...**” (Iyeiri 153).

In many papers, the pronoun *we* is used not only to engage the reader and proclaim the membership in disciplinary community, but also to present one’s point of view as already accepted:

The next example is an unusual one, but it is not anomalous from **our** semantic perspective... Because **our** semantic analysis provides an understanding of this use, it need not be considered a simple slip of the tongue, or performance error. (Stern 275)

Around the same time, **we** start observing some mixed examples. (Iyeiri 156)

As opposed to *I*, which attributes opinion solely to the author, *we*, often referring to the same person, represents the view as endorsed by other scholars. *We*, of course, deemphasizes originality of the analysis, but also limits responsibility. Shifts between *I* and *we* are also encountered in the present corpus:

**We** speak as if it is both possible and desirable to provide high-quality education to students from diverse backgrounds ... hence **our** reference to workplace language. Being mindful of the diverse linguistic demands of various occupations, the educational instruction that **I** advocate or envision strives to advance language arts fluency... In this respect, **we** follow Alexander (1989)... Professional linguists have all been trained, as **I** have, to recognize that... (Baugh 205)

This switch singles out the author's perspective in the chorus of consensual voices and allows the author to foreground his / her contribution to the common cause.

A promotional effect can also be achieved by combining self-reference, self-citation, and "distinguished company" claims:

Along with Levinson (1991), Givón (1993) and Kemmer (1995), I have proposed that reflexive uses occur for unexpected coreference within a clause (Stern 2001, 2003)... This generalization, which I call the Role

Conflict Hypothesis, accounts for the appearance of *-self* forms in reflexive environments, as well as in some environments that are not covered by the structural reflexive account. (Stern 276)

The corresponding endnote 6 reads: “The Role Conflict Hypothesis can also explain the occurrence of simple pronouns in grammatically reflexive environments (Levinson 1991; Stern 2001)” (Stern 279). Self-mentions and integral and non-integral self-citations draw attention to the article author’s contribution to the field. The accepted competence and authority of the linguists Stern associates herself with lend credibility to her Hypothesis. Regardless of the compatibility of Stern’s and the mentioned scholars’ analyses, the Role Conflict Hypothesis is accorded validity because it is aligned with other trustworthy accounts.

Overall, level of promotionalism in discussions is high in all types of language studies papers. In the articles exploring a linguistic phenomenon (Iyeiri; Scott; Stern; Trüb; Wedel; Yager) the prevalent rhetorical strategy is to highlight the contribution of the proposed analysis and the works in which it is grounded (including the previous research of the current author). While employing essentially the same strategy, two (Baugh; Chambers) of the three theoretically oriented essays lend more weight to their own research. Only two authors (Moore; Schilling-Estes) choose to give prominence to their views by concomitantly boosting their accomplishments and criticizing

alternative approaches. These strategies are realized through ethos appeals (including self-citations and “distinguished company” claims) along with explicitly evaluative lexis (including adverbial intensifiers and verbal, adjectival, and nominal boosters), first person pronouns, comment clauses, and lexical cohesion (repetition, antonymy, and synonymy). As noted by Swales, “it would seem that successfully published researchers in most fields are wary of allowing their results ‘to speak for themselves,’ but rather seize opportunities to validate and defend their findings” in Results sections (Research Genres 226).

## Conclusions

Apart from Baugh’s paper, all articles have an identifiable conclusion.<sup>84</sup> Most conclusions open with a one-sentence overview of the essay:

This paper has looked not at the syntactic conditions of the use of *–self* pronouns but rather at the communications to which these forms contribute. (Stern 278)

The main concern of this article was to discuss why the particular phrase *God forbid* alone preserves subordinate

---

<sup>84</sup> The final section of Baugh’s article, “Teaching Standard, Academic, or Workplace English as a Second Dialect,” might be viewed as implications (and call for action) move, which is characteristic of conclusions, but since the author refers to it as the “remainder of this discussion” and raises educational issues not dealt with above, this section is regarded as part of the discussion. The last section in Trüb’s paper, “Summary and Discussion,” is akin to conclusions in the rest of the corpus and therefore will be treated as such.

clauses ..., even in Present-day English, whereas *forbid* normally takes infinitives with *to* and less frequently gerunds, with or without the preposition *from*. (Iyeiri 158)

Wedel incorporates outcomes into this summary: “The present investigation shows how Lloyd’s aspectual theory of the Gothic verbal system can also be applied to Old English” (209-10); Moore includes approach as well: “This article has used the linguistic functions of Theme-Rheme and Given-New to explain why it is always best to ‘begin with what you know is familiar to readers’” (54). Whereas methods are found only in Stern’s and Moore’s conclusions, accomplishments (often further detailed, as in Chambers’s, Iyeiri’s, Scott’s, and Wedel’s articles) occur in all examined papers:

The above analysis reveals that there was perhaps an interesting gap of usage between the *God forbid* type and the other uses of *forbid* from the beginning. (Iyeiri 158)

A distinction between the terms *peple* and *folk* is structurally and thematically embedded in several of Chaucer’s works, and the association of “peple” with ignorance and commonness is sometimes stronger in Chaucer than in his sources. (Yager 223)

Implications and calls for further research, often formulated by means of directives (e.g., Moore; Scott; Schilling-Estes; Stern), are found in many examined papers:

The study of these and other areas of dialect convergence extend sociolinguistics along lines that we have been pursuing for several years. (Chambers 129)

Although it is not clear exactly where reified and institutionalized ideologies ... fit within the CofP approach, with its emphasis on the active, ongoing production of gender..., it does seem clear that we must allow room for such structures and ideologies in our analyses. (Schilling-Estes 133)

Of course, I also wonder if the details I have offered here are shared by other speakers and if the analysis offered here is amenable to a simpler, and better, solution. (Scott 368)

Self-mention is a salient trait of conclusions; its function in this part-genre, however, is not to spotlight an individual researcher, as in the discussion, but to stress the author's membership and humble service to the disciplinary community.<sup>85</sup>

In conclusions, as in introductions and abstracts, linguists usually advance the originality of their inquiries, significance of their findings, and soundness of their methodology. However, such positive

---

<sup>85</sup> See Hyland, *Disciplinary Discourses*.

evaluations are generally expressed indirectly as one of the implications of the undertaken study and recommendations for future research:

...a functional constraint, **which has not been tested in other studies**, is observed in the *be* paradigm. It **should be considered in future studies** of SAVE as well as contact varieties such as AAVE.... this article **points out the importance of fine linguistic and extra-linguistic differentiation and consistent methodologies** if comparisons of grammatical patterns on which statements about language evolution are based **are to succeed**. (Trüb 262)

This finding suggests that if we want to understand the distribution of *-self* and simple pronouns, the semantic route is a **promising path for further exploration**. The structural exceptions in **the analysis described here provide evidence** that these so-called exceptions **should not be marginalized** in footnotes to analyses of these forms; instead, these uses **should be examined closely as revealing indicators** of semantic contribution made by *-self* pronouns in all of the contexts in which they appear. (Stern 278)

Explicit promotional statements are rare and typically qualified by modals: “This distinction, though it is by no means Chaucer’s universal

practice, **can provide interesting clues** for interpretation of his works, especially when the terms are in proximity” (Yager 223). Lewin, Fine, and Young likewise observe “structure[s] of uncertainty” in conclusions of social studies articles (148). “This failure to ‘conclude’ decisively’,” they suggest, “may be a function of the need to dilute new claims so that impositions are not made upon the reader” (148).

On the whole, linguists seem to be more concerned with the impact of their studies on research in their field or social action than with advertisement of their accomplishments. This characteristic feature of conclusions is consistent with the distribution of promotional elements in introductions.

### **Footnotes / Endnotes**

As mentioned above, Baugh, Iyeri, Schilling-Estes, Scott, Stern, Trüb, and Yager utilize footnotes / endnotes to supplement the presentation in the main body of the paper. Generally, the same aspects are given prominence in footnotes / endnotes as in the main text of the article. For example, Trüb, who underscores the novelty of her method throughout the paper, continues to argue in favor of her approach in endnotes:

At first sight, **this procedure opposes** the rejection of the individual as an object of linguistic analysis in traditional variational analyses and shall thus briefly be

justified... While it is certainly true that individual variation needs to be kept distinct from variation in the speech community, **it has to be remembered that Labov's statement** relates to the quest for the principles of language change. **In the present context, however,** the focus is on the synchronic description of the past-tense *be* paradigm in early SAVE and the attempt to visualize the weight of single contributions to the total make-up of the group count, which can be achieved **only by an analysis of individual grammars.** (endn.10)

**If nonstandard *were* is investigated,** i.e., its occurrence in singular environments, **tokens of nonconcord *were* are not separated from tokens of nonconcord *was* in plural environments** (see, e.g., Wolfram and Christian 1976). Hazen (2000) is **a notable exception** to this tendency. (endn.11)

As in the main body of the article, in the endnotes, Trüb combines appeals to originality of her inquiry, on the one hand, and groundedness in the previous research, on the other.<sup>86</sup>

Likewise, Iyeiri provides additional quantitative evidence in endnotes to support her treatment of *God forbid* and to stress insignificance of counterexamples: "The text search of the *OED* on

---

<sup>86</sup> Baugh, likewise, foregrounds his conceptions as representing understanding of various phenomena by an undefined scholarly group ("our") in endnotes as well as in the main text.

CD-ROM gives three examples from the nineteenth century of *that*-clauses after *forbid* (and not *God forbid*), which, **I would suggest, are highly exceptional**” (endn.5); “Although this classification may be controversial, **examples of this type are in any case not abundant** in the corpora of the present study” (endn.20). Yager also uses footnotes to point out additional examples (e.g., fns.6, 21, and 23) and possible counterexamples (e.g., fn.16) to bolster her consistency claim and underscore the accuracy of her treatment. Interestingly, unlike other authors, she hedges her interpretations in text, but reinforces them in footnotes. Compare, for instance, her statement, “This section of the endlink is related from the Knight’s perspective, and it **may be** that he sees ‘peple’ – social inferiors enjoying the spectacle of the angry men – when others, such as the Miller and Friar, **might see** ‘folk’”(219), with the corresponding footnote, “A similar instance of the term *peple* appears in Gen[eral] Pro[logue], l. 706... The Pardoner would **certainly** look down upon his simple audience” (fn.23). The distinction between framing of propositions in text and footnotes can be seen in Schilling-Estes’s and Stern’s articles as well. Much like the main text, Schilling-Estes’s endnotes evaluate the work of different sociolinguists, but, in contrast to the rest of the paper, summarize the investigators’ findings without emphasizing their disadvantages. Stern’s endnotes are similarly devoid of boosters and other promotional devices compared to the main body of the paper.

The only article in which endnotes are employed to diminish the opponent's view is Scott's. Scott's endnote 2 forms part of his polemics with the anonymous reviewer, "whose thoughtful, interesting, and informative comments" the author "very much appreciate[s]" (endn.1): "If correct, it [the suggested phonological rule] certainly underscores a remarkable difference in the complexity of distribution of these two phones" (endn.2). This understatement is more implicit than Scott's warding off the same reviewer's counterclaim with regard to the author's framework in text:

It has been suggested [by the anonymous reviewer, see endn.1] that recalcitrant data such as those in (1) might be better explained in a phonetic/lexical framework rather than in the traditional rule-based format I use here... The issue, it seems to me, has less to do with formats of statement ... and everything to do with how exceptions to systematic regularities should be described and explained... Thus, I do not see that the format of rewrite rules is the culprit in handling the data of (10) or in the inelegance of rules (8) and (9). (Scott 365)

However, disagreement is evident in both instances and Scott's rejoinder is sharp in both text and endnote.<sup>87</sup>

Thus, language studies papers differ with regard to usage of footnotes / endnotes. Some articles (e.g., Trüb) maintain the same level

---

<sup>87</sup> Scott's endnotes might even be read as sarcastic.

of promotionalism in the main text and footnotes / endnotes, while others (e.g., Yager) in footnotes / endnotes add boosters to the propositions qualified by the markers of uncertainty in the main text. Some papers (e.g., Iyeiri; Yager) place (possible) counterexamples in the footnotes / endnotes downplaying their importance and insinuating completeness of the account. Finally, some papers (e.g., Scott) can use footnotes / endnotes to rebut contention, while others (e.g., Schilling-Estes) can, in contrast to the main text, avoid judgmental statements.

### **Summary**

On the whole, close examination of ten language studies research articles demonstrates that in spite of the paramount importance of methods and quantitative data in this field, linguists prefer to present the outcomes of their disquisitions in essay form. Most papers treat various aspects of the phenomenon in question separately; therefore, move cycling is frequent. Continuity between (discussion) subsections is not prioritized; rather, their interconnectedness comes to the fore in introductions and conclusions.

Abstracts appear in six articles. Despite their structural diversity and varying length, all of them contain a Product move. Most abstracts exhibit Purpose and / or Conclusion moves, while the Introduction is found only in Chambers's abstract. Many language studies abstracts merge different moves within a syntactic unit. Hyland ascribes this

feature to “a rational response to the space constraints of the abstract” and, in the case of Purpose and Method fusion, an attempt to “insinuate the appropriacy of the technique by strategically linking the approach in a[n] unproblematic and reasonable way to accomplishing the research objective” (Disciplinary Discourses 74-5). In the present corpus, the significance of the contribution is highlighted not only by means of discourse structure, but also grammatically, lexically, and rhetorically. Most abstracts emphasize wide applicability, novelty, and interestingness of the investigation.

Whereas the same values – wide applicability, novelty, and interestingness – are emphasized in introductions, promotional devices are restricted to the “Establishing a niche” move (Move 2). Though the sequence of moves and steps as well as distribution of references and citations in language studies articles introductions often diverge from the Swalesian revised CARS model, all papers contain the obligatory Move 3 Step 1. Interestingly, preview of outcomes (Move 3 Step 5) is absent from many introductions, and when included is conspicuously hedged; Stern’s paper is an exception in this respect.

Most discussions in language studies articles explore different layers of the major research question(s). An explanation of the theoretical framework or historical background can be prefaced to the treatment of the phenomenon under investigation. Toning up in discussions acquires various forms. Authors sometimes choose to

contrast the advantages of the advocated approach with the shortcomings of alternative methodologies. More frequently, however, linguists accentuate the validity of their claims and soundness and applicability of the theories in which their studies are grounded. They buttress their analysis by underscoring the consistency and generalizability of their hypotheses as well as by meticulously accounting for every piece of data and emphatically downsizing the number of “possible” counterexamples. At times, authors present their views as already accepted or as unique, but stemming from the scholarly consensus. For these purposes, ethos appeals on a par with boosters, adverbial intensifiers, comment clauses, various uses of first person pronouns, and lexical cohesion are utilized.

Conclusions often offer a brief summary of the issues raised in the article; methods, implications, and calls for further research or action are also typically included. Accomplishments appear to be an obligatory component. Prominence can be given to the outcomes and methodology, but their significance is usually suggested in the implications of the study and recommendations for future research or practice. As in introductions, linguists refrain from self-aggrandizing and pose as humble contributors to the scholarly debate.

Since footnotes / endnotes primarily augment the main text with more data or bibliographical information, they are expected to agree in tone with the rest of the paper. At times, however, footnotes / endnotes

construe arguments differently than the main body of the text: in articles filled with promotional elements, endnotes / footnotes can be neutral; in other instances, where the analysis is systematically hedged in the main text, endnotes / footnotes can contain boosters. Sometimes authors can utilize footnotes / endnotes to ward off counterclaims and buttress the analysis offered in the main text.

## **Chapter 4: Conclusion**

This chapter summarizes the findings of the current research. It compares and contrasts the strategies and exponents of promotional (meta)discourse in language and literary studies described in detail in Chapters 2 and 3. Finally, it suggests a direction for further investigation.

### **Rhetorical Strategies of Promotion**

“Practically all commentators,” Swales reports, “have concluded that ... RA [research article] texts are richly persuasive rather than flatly expository...” (Research Genres 218). Current study of language and literary studies research articles amply reconfirms this observation. In the present corpus, very few authors shun presenting their work in favorable light. Research articles in both disciplines respond to the need to emphasize importance, novelty, uniqueness, interestingness, and many other aspects of their work by employing primarily two rhetorical strategies: first, positive evaluation of one’s own study and of those investigations in which the current study is grounded and second, negative evaluation of dissenting views. Some language and literary studies papers combine both strategies to widen the gap between their contribution and (erroneous) alternative treatments.

Logos appeals are the most frequent means to these ends. In both disciplines, scholars foreground soundness of methodology and argumentation, plausibility of interpretation, as well as research and pedagogical implications. These principles form the backbone of academic communication and therefore govern the structure and language of research articles. In addition, many papers contain ethos appeals related to the author's already established reputation and / or alignment of the proposed analysis with the theories accepted and esteemed in the field.<sup>88</sup> Predominantly, personal credibility is conveyed by self-citations. When placed in footnotes / endnotes, without a mention in the body of the text, bibliographic details of the author's related previous or forthcoming work serve as subtle advertisement (e.g., Gottschall, endnotes 16 and 17; Wedel, footnotes 26 and 27; Williams, footnote 16). In introduction Moves 1 and 2 ("Establishing a territory" and "Establishing a niche"), either preceded by self-mentions (e.g., Iyeiri) or inserted non-integrally (e.g., Baugh), self-citations become more salient. Yet it is in discussions, where they can be reinforced by extended self-references (both in the text and footnotes / endnotes) (e.g., Chambers) and "distinguished company" claims (e.g., Stern), that self-citations gain the most overt promotional value.<sup>89</sup>

---

<sup>88</sup> For ethos, pathos, and logos appeals in academic and business writing, see Hyland, *Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing*. For a discussion on insider credibility construction, see Hyland, *Disciplinary Discourses*.

<sup>89</sup> Williams's final footnote, containing the "distinguished company" appeal, is an addendum to the article and therefore cannot be related to any of the article constitutive parts, i.e., introduction, discussion or conclusion.

Interestingly, pathos appeals, which concern the characteristics of the audience rather than the author (Hyland, Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing 65), are encountered in the corpus as well.<sup>90</sup> Literary studies are especially susceptible to transcending borders with literary genres. Haggan observes that titles of literary papers, unlike linguistics and science titles, “have aesthetic merit” (300). Much like the titles, the introductory statements of the literary research articles, “tend to be aimed at the aesthetic sensibilities of the reader” (Haggan 301). Barloon’s, Benton’s, Gottschall’s, and Schwenger’s essays, for instance, open with metaphors and literary allusions, and Hodgson’s, Michie’s, and Stahman’s papers contain an epigraph. What is more, Stahman’s whole essay is modeled after the literary work it analyzes. Stahman attempts to replicate the fractured narration in Kafka’s “The Burrow”: just as “Kafka’s text literally breaks off in mid-sentence,” Stahman leaves off her “discussion of the Western philosophical model of subject who posits the world through understanding at the moment of struggle or impasse between self and other” (24); later on, she disrupts her essay’s flow again: “...the creature’s report is interrupted. What is the reader to draw from this interruption? Kafka’s forty-sixth aphorism calls attentions to the fact that the word *sein* carries two meanings in German...” (29). Schwenger’s article likewise blurs the boundaries between the research

---

<sup>90</sup> This possibility to invest the research article with the means of persuasion not essential to “scientific” inquiry can be accounted for by plasticity of genre (Bakhtin).

and literary worlds when in between the sophisticated elaboration on Lacan, Freud, Shklovsky, and Heidegger, among other philosophers and critics, he states, “Adam’s act of naming had about it a strangeness lost to us now, when the word is our instinctive refuge from the thing’s strangeness” and quotes John Hollander’s poem “Adam’s Task” in the corresponding footnote (102). Affective appeals are much less characteristic of language studies: in fact, of all linguistics papers, only Baugh’s pushes the boundaries of the research article genre by crossing into the public discourse. His direct address to the audience,

Linguistic perceptions come into play when viewing language policy, and it might be helpful if **you** first reflect upon **your own** linguistic background. How many languages do **you** speak? What circumstances did **you** learn those languages? How would **you** describe **your own** dialect or accent in your first, second, or third language, and so on? Depending on how **you** answer these questions, **you** are likely to view the education of (S)ENN [Standard English Not Native] students in very different ways... (Baugh 203)

along with multiple references to social stereotypes, political and educational aspects of racial isolation without any in-depth linguistic analysis demonstrate that the communicative purpose of this paper is raising awareness, traditionally associated with journalistic rather than

academic writing.<sup>91</sup> It is worth noting, however, that in the entire corpus, this is the only article that attaches much weight to pathos and ethos; in the rest of the papers, emotion and credibility appeals are complementary to logos.

### **Linguistic Exponents of Promotion**

“In a genre such as the experimental research article,” Hunston remarks, “the phenomenon of evaluation is relatively simple, because only certain things (e.g. the experimental method, the authors’ results and conclusions, other researchers’ results and conclusions) are evaluated and only in certain ways (e.g. as free from bias, fitting a range of data, applicable to a range of situations)” (“Evaluation and the Planes of Discourse” 177). Language resources, in which evaluation is encoded, are, in contrast, multifarious and complex. In the present corpus, inherently evaluative lexis is frequently utilized to express approval or disapproval. Positive and negative polarities are strengthened by derivational and inflectional morphology. Coordination, comment clauses, and personal pronouns are only a few syntactic resources employed in language and literary studies articles to underscore wide applicability of the proposed analysis, point out that

---

<sup>91</sup> Statements like “Here I argue, as forcefully, as I can, that...” (Baugh 202) and “Being mindful of the diverse linguistic demands of various occupations, the educational instruction that I advocate or envision strives to advance language arts fluency in the languages that one deems most beneficial to students’ personal life” (Baugh 205) are not found in the rest of the corpus. Cf. Chambers’s and Schilling-Estes’s articles which also discuss various dimensions of dialect variation.

the paper has attained its objectives, and stress the contribution of the study to the ongoing scholarly debate. The merger of different moves within one syntactic unit underlines aptness of the chosen methodology or a logical progression from data interpretation to hypothesis formulation. These different lexicogrammatical resources are often used in combination.

On a text organization level, lexical cohesion and discourse chunks sequencing figure most prominently.<sup>92</sup> For instance, many articles in the present corpus place an introduction Move 3 initially and thus spotlight the reported research. Some of these papers outline their “territory” and “niche” later, while others do not include Moves 1 and 2 at all. As Lewin, Fine, and Young underline, realization of all prototypical moves is not compulsory, but the ties between sections are:

a text is not shaped by genre structure alone, although it may be the system that drives the other systems. While the moves create the horizontal structuring in a text, with each move accounting for a segment of the text, the vertical discourse elements of lexical cohesion and reference weave the generic structures into a unified text. In other words, a text may realize the generic structures and still be disjointed. Lexical cohesion and

---

<sup>92</sup> Shifts of tense and aspect, another textual cohesion device, are characteristic only of Schilling-Estes’s article.

the reference to participants that traverse the text create textual unity. (148)

In the present corpus, lexical chains are based on synonymy, antonymy, and repetition, which not only constantly remind the reader of the major concern of the paper (e.g., “mutual consistency” in Gottschall’s essay), but also reinforce the interrelationship between different arguments.

Significantly, the distribution of promotional elements varies across article sections and moves. Discourse structure, for instance, is most frequently employed for publicization in abstracts (e.g., inclusion and fronting of Conclusion move) and introductions (e.g., recycling of “Announcing principal outcomes” step of Move 3 “Presenting the present work”). Adverbial boosters such as *clearly* and *evidently*, on the other hand, prevail in discussions and conclusions. Even though, as Swales points out, “[t]here are certainly opportunities ... for the writers of research papers to expatiate upon the news value or interestingness of their work toward the end of their introductions,” that is, in Move 3, in the present corpus, promotional elements, if included at all in introductions, are concentrated in Move 2 (“Establishing a niche”) (Research Genres 232).

## Same Floors – What about Voices?

It is not surprising that as instantiations of the same genre in closely related fields, research articles in language and literary studies are structurally similar. In both disciplines, research articles are organized in a coherent essay, which can be divided into sections (with or without content headings). All examined papers are comprised of three identifiable parts – introduction, discussion, and conclusion. Furthermore, both disciplines make use of the two rhetorical strategies outlined above as well as of a combination thereof to promote their contributions. A thorough inquiry into realizations of these strategies, however, reveals that on a par with shared practices, language and literary studies publications exhibit a number of distinctive features.

Thus, even though the fact that there are only two abstracts in literary subcorpus (as opposed to six in linguistics) does not allow for effective comparison, it is remarkable that in both fields abstracts include Product move.<sup>93</sup> It is also noteworthy that scholars in both disciplines indicate novelty and uniqueness of their disquisitions in terms of approach (e.g., Stahman; Trüb) and proposed solution (e.g., Williams; Stern).<sup>94</sup> However, in language studies abstracts, these aspects are foregrounded by a variety of lexicogrammatical devices, lexical cohesion, and discourse structure (e.g., inclusion and fronting of

---

<sup>93</sup> Hyland ascribes presence of Product move to promotionalism (Disciplinary Discourses 68).

<sup>94</sup> Stahman's toning down of her Product statement might be probably explained by her PhD candidate status. For hedging as power asymmetry related phenomenon, see, for instance, Koutsantoni. Cf. Harwood, "Nowhere Has Anyone Attempted...".

Conclusion move); in literary theory and criticism abstracts, on the other hand, no promotional elements are found. Distinctness of the literary essays is brought to the reader's attention either by criticizing alternative interpretations (Williams) or by avoiding any reference to previous work (Stahman).<sup>95</sup> What is more, in contrast with linguists, literary scholars formulate their accomplishments in a hedged manner.

This caution in stating research outcomes is characteristic of most introductions in both language and literary studies. In both disciplines, promotional elements (predominantly evaluative lexis) are concentrated in "Establishing a niche" move, where centrality, wide applicability, interestingness or novelty of the domain to which the study contributes are brought to the fore. In Move 3, authors utilize discourse structure – cycling of Step 5, "Announcing principal outcomes," (Stern) or inclusion of Step 6, "Stating the value of the present research" (Tarantino) – to heighten the reader's interest. Self-citations, another publicization technique, are encountered only in linguistics papers. On the whole, situatedness of the inquiry within the scholarly debate is allotted different weight in language and literary studies. While most linguistics essays summarize previous and ongoing research in introduction Moves 1 and 2 (with varying number of citations and detail), only three literary articles offer an overview of the "territory" and "niche." Instead, literary papers briefly describe the

---

<sup>95</sup> Unlike Williams, Stern, who also presents her study as contrasting with previous accounts, spotlights her unprecedented approach rather than predecessors' shortcomings.

text(s) under scrutiny and devote the major part of the introductions to “Presenting the present work.”

In discussions, on the other hand, citations play a pivotal role in both disciplines. References underlie ethos and logos appeals: existing research in the field is invoked for justification (e.g., Benton; Trüb), support (e.g., Gottschall; Stern) or in contradistinction to the reported investigation (Williams; Schilling-Estes).<sup>96</sup> Evaluation of other views forms an integral part of both promotional strategies. Besides intertextuality, literary and language studies articles stress their own contributions. For this purpose, linguists employ self-citations reinforced by self-mentions and “distinguished company” claims in conjunction with explicitly evaluative lexis, first person pronouns, comment clauses, and lexical cohesion (repetition, antonymy, and synonymy). Within the literary studies subcorpus, there is an interesting divide between the articles offering a (new) perspective on the text(s) and studying the text(s) through the prism of a certain theory, on the one hand, and the articles disputing alternative analyses and addressing theoretical and methodological questions, on the other. The former type avoids boosterism, while the latter exploits multiple discourse and lexical devices to spotlight the proposed interpretation.

In conclusions, however, almost all literary scholars buttress their claims with intensifiers. With the exception of two papers

---

<sup>96</sup> For discussion of citation practices across disciplines, see Hyland, Disciplinary Discourses.

(Dietrich and Tarantino), literary essays emphasize the validity of the arguments put forward at the beginning and fulfillment of the readers' expectations.<sup>97</sup> Some literary studies papers state implications of their inquiries, which further underscore their contribution to the field. Implications are included in many language studies articles as well, but in contrast with literary papers, they are formulated in terms of recommendations for further research or application. While serving the same rhetorical purpose – reconfirmation of the research and pedagogical significance of the essay – conclusions differ linguistically in the two disciplines. Unlike literary studies articles, which employ overt promotional elements, linguistics papers are markedly free from boosters.

Finally, in both language and literary studies articles footnotes / endnotes are used for a number of purposes: to provide bibliographical information of works cited and recommended; to adduce parenthetical comments; and to supply additional examples (and counterexamples) or (extended) quotations. In most footnotes / endnotes comments in both disciplines, usage of boosters and hedges agree with the main text (e.g., Michie; Trüb); some authors (e.g., Tarantino; Yager), however, reverse their tactics so that the footnotes / endnotes of papers densely populated

---

<sup>97</sup> Disagreement between introduction and conclusion displayed by Dietrich's and Tarantino's articles is also found in Lewin, Fine, and Young's corpus: "There are examples in which the second reference to a claim undergoes a change of state from certain to uncertain or from a weaker to a stronger generalization" (Lewin, Fine, Young 150). They do not offer any explanation, but they propose that this issue "could be relevant to the question of the social construction of scientific knowledge" (150).

with intensifiers do not contain toning up devices, whereas papers exhibiting caution in their in-text statements express certainty in footnotes / endnotes. While evaluation of research methodology and outcomes (including one's own) is found in both literary and linguistics essays footnotes / endnotes, linguists, unlike literary scholars, use footnotes / endnotes to ward off counterclaims.

On the whole, this thesis endorses Hyland's argument in favor of specificity in teaching academic literacies ("Specificity Revisited"). As Lewin, Fine, and Young indicate, "a description of a genre should be as specific as possible. A description that would include disciplines from astronomy to zoology would be so general it would be useless" (154). This disciplinary and genre variability constitutes a serious problem in a heterogeneous EAP class, where such "pedagogical luxuries" as single-major groupings are unavailable. Nicholas Groom therefore recommends "present[ing] generalisations about the linguistic and rhetorical features of ... genres [students are likely to encounter] not as models to be applied, but as hypotheses for students to test by investigating authentic texts and practices in their own disciplines" (273). As demonstrated by the current investigation, this methodology can reveal not only convergences and divergences between disciplines and their subfields, but also the examples that can be followed.<sup>98</sup>

---

<sup>98</sup> Charles notices that "the process of investigation is itself of great value in raising students' awareness of the patterned nature of academic discourse. With this understanding, students are better equipped to examine the ways in which grammatical patterns and lexical choices combine to perform rhetorical functions

## Further Research

It has long been established that discipline and power asymmetry play a key role in shaping academic communication.<sup>99</sup> The impact of gender, on the other hand, has yet to be systematically examined.<sup>100</sup> As indicated by Tse and Hyland, while the factor of gender has proved influential in various sociolinguistic contexts, very little is known about the “gender preferential features in academic writing and nothing about how such preferences interact with disciplinary preferences and conventions” (177). Tse and Hyland make their contribution to this mostly unexplored field “by examining male and female academics’ use of interactive resources in a corpus of 84 academic book reviews in the three contrasting disciplines of philosophy, biology and sociology” (178). They find out that:

while gender does not seem to be a major variable in writers’ overall rhetorical practices, disciplinary considerations colour the ways male and female writers choose to construct their evaluations in book reviews, thus making gender an important source of disciplinary variation. Moreover, our interviews reveal that many

---

within their own disciplines and hence to apply this knowledge to their own academic writing” (“Argument or Evidence?” 216).

<sup>99</sup> For the impact of disciplinary norms, see, for example, Becher, Hyland, and Swales. For power asymmetries, see, for instance, Bazerman, Hyland, Koutsantoni, and Swales.

<sup>100</sup> On feminine and masculine writing styles, see, for instance, Brody, Campbell, Kirsch, and Sefcovic and Bifano. See also Matsuda and Tardy.

female academic informants see a clear distinction between a more rhetorically elaborated, interactive metadiscursive rhetoric of female writers and a more assertive, personally evaluative and challenging style, characterized by heavy use of interactional metadiscourse, employed by their male colleagues. (200)<sup>101</sup>

The availability of corpora of spoken and written registers facilitates further investigation of the variable of gender across disciplines and genres.<sup>102</sup> The application of the methodologies drawn from sociolinguistics, corpus linguistics, gendered rhetorical theory, discourse analysis, and other approaches can result in the comprehensive studies that might prove valuable in teaching academic reading and writing.

---

<sup>101</sup> For female linguistic and rhetorical strategies which evolve as “a direct consequence of the frequent challenges women encounter to their authority” (Kirsch 64), see Kirsch.

<sup>102</sup> For a sample of publications resulted from the MICASE (Michigan Corpus of Academic Spoken English) and T2K-SWAL (TOEFL 2000 Spoken and Written Academic Language) projects, see Biber, University Language. For corpus-driven investigation of linguistic book reviews written by male and female authors, see Römer.

## Appendix

### Language Studies

Baugh, John. "Standard English and Academic English (Dialect) Learners in the African Diaspora." Journal of English Linguistics 32.3 (2004): 197-209.

Chambers, J. K. (Jack) "Dynamics of Dialect Convergence." Journal of Sociolinguistics 6.1 (2002): 117-30.

Iyeiri, Yoko. "'God Forbid!': A Historical Study of the Verb *forbid* in Different Versions of the English Bible." Journal of English Linguistics 31.2 (2003): 149-62.

Moore, N. A. J. "Aligning Theme and Information Structure to Improve the Readability of Technical Writing." Journal of Technical Writing and Communication 36.1 (2006): 43-55.

Scott, Charles T. "American English 'Short A' Revisited: A Phonological Puzzle." American Speech 77.4 (2004): 358-69.

Schilling-Estes, Natalie. "American English Social Dialect Variation and Gender." Journal of English Linguistics 30.2 (2002): 122-37.

Stern, Nancy. "The Semantic Unity of Reflexive, Emphatic, and Other *-self* Pronouns." American Speech 79:3 (2004): 270-80.

Trüb, Regina. "Nonstandard Verbal Paradigms in Earlier White Southern American English." American Speech 81.3 (2006): 250-65.

Wedel, Alfred R. "Alliteration and the Prefix *Ge-* in Cynewulf's *Elene*." Journal of English and Germanic Philology 100.2 (2001): 200-10.

Yager, Susan. "Chaucer's *Peple* and *Folk*." Journal of English and Germanic Philology 100.2 (2001): 211-23.

#### Literary Studies

Barloon, Jim. "Very Short Stories: The Minituarization of War in Hemingway's *In Our Time*." The Hemingway Review 24.2 (2005): 5-17.

Benton, Michael. "Literary Biography: The Cinderella of Literary Studies." Journal of Aesthetic Education 39.3 (2005): 44-57.

Dietrich, Jessica S. "Dead Parrots Society." American Journal of Philology 123 (2002): 95-110.

Gottschall, Jonathan. "The Tree of Knowledge and Darwinian Literary Study." Philosophy and Literature 27 (2003): 255-68.

Hodgson, Elizabeth M. A. "Prophecy and Gendered Mourning in Lanyer's *Salve Deus Rex Judaeorum*." Studies in English Literature 43.1 (2003): 101-16.

Michie, Elsie. "The Odd Couple: Anthony Trollope and Henry James." The Henry James Review 27 (2006): 10-23.

Schwenger, Peter. "Words and the Murder of the Thing." Critical Inquiry 28 (2001): 99-113.

- Stahman, Laura. "Franz Kafka's 'The Burrow' as Model of Ipseity in Levinasian Theory." Mosaic: A Journal for the Interdisciplinary Study of Literature 37.3 (2004): 19-32.
- Tarantino, Elisabetta. "The Dante Anecdote in Gower's *Confessio Amantis*, Book VII." The Chaucer Review 39.4 (2005): 420-35.
- Williams, Frederick. "The Hands of Death: Ovid *Amores* 3.9.20." American Journal of Philology 124 (2003): 225-34.

## Works Cited

- Adams Smith, Diana E. "Medical Discourse: Aspects of Author's Comment." The ESP Journal 3 (1984): 25-36.
- Ädel, Annelie. "On the Boundaries between Evaluation and Metadiscourse." Tognini-Bonelli and Del Lungo Camiciotti 153-62.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail M. Speech Genres and Other Late Essays. Trans. Vern W. McGee. Ed. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1986.
- Bamford, Julia. "Subjective or Objective Evaluation? Prediction in Academic Lectures." Tognini-Bonelli and Del Lungo Camiciotti 17-29.
- Bawarshi, Anis S. Genre & the Invention of the Writer: Reconsidering the Place of Invention in Composition. Logan, Utah: Utah State University Press, 2003.
- Bazerman, Charles. Shaping Written Knowledge: The Genre and Activity of the Experimental Article in Science. Madison, Wisconsin: The university of Wisconsin Press, 1988.
- Becher, Tony. "The Significance of Disciplinary Differences." Studies in Higher Education 19.2 (1994): 151-61.
- Berkenkotter, Carol, and Thomas N. Huckin. Genre Knowledge in Disciplinary Communication: Cognition/Culture/Power. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., 1995.

- Bernhardt, Stephen A. "The Writer, the Reader, and the Scientific Text." Journal of Technical Writing and Communication 15.2 (1985): 163-74.
- Biber, Douglas. University Language: A Corpus-based Study of Spoken and Written Registers. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2006.
- Bondi, Marina. "'A case in point': Signals of Narrative Development in Business and Economics." Hyland and Bondi 49-74.
- Brody, Miriam. Manly Writing: Gender, Rhetoric, and the Rise of Composition. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, 1993.
- Campbell, Karlyn Kohrs. "Rhetorical Feminism." Rhetoric Review 20.1&2 (2001): 9-12.
- Casanave, Christine Pearson. Writing Games: Multicultural Case Studies of Academic Literacy Practices in Higher Education. Mahwah, N.J.; London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2002.
- Channell, Joanna. "Corpus-Based Analysis of Evaluative Lexis." Hunston and Thompson 38-55.
- Charles, Maggie. "Argument or Evidence? Disciplinary Variation in the Use of the Noun *that* Pattern in Stance Construction." English for Specific Purposes 26 (2007): 203-18.

- . "The Construction of Stance in Reporting Clauses: A Cross-disciplinary Study of Theses." Applied Linguistics 27.3 (2006): 492-518.
- Crismore, Avon, Raija Markkanen, and Margaret S. Steffensen. "Metadiscourse in Persuasive Writing: A Study of Texts Written by American and Finnish University Students." Written Communication 10.1 (1993): 39-71.
- Devitt, Amy J. "Integrating Rhetorical and Literary Theories of Genre." College English 62.6 (2000): 696-718.
- Fahnestock, Jeanne. "Rhetoric of Science: Enriching the Discipline." Technical Communication Quarterly 14.3 (2005): 277-86.
- Fløttum, Kjersti Torodd Kinn, and Trine Dahl. "'We now report on...': Versus 'Let us now see how...': Author Roles and Interaction with Readers in Research Articles." Hyland and Bondi 203-24.
- Freddi, Maria. "Arguing Linguistics: Corpus Investigation of One Functional Variety of Academic Discourse." Journal of English for Academic Purposes 4 (2005): 5-26.
- Gilbert, G. Nigel, and Michael Mulkay. Opening Pandora's Box: A Sociological Analysis of Scientists' Discourse. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.
- Groom, Nicholas. "Pattern and Meaning across Genres and Disciplines: An Exploratory Study." Journal of English for Academic Purposes 4 (2005): 257-77.

- Haggan, Madeline. "Research Paper Titles in Literature, Linguistics and Science: Dimensions of Attraction." Journal of Pragmatics 36 (2004): 293-317.
- Halliday, M. A. K. An Introduction to Functional Grammar. London: Edward Arnold, 1985.
- . Linguistic Studies of Text and Discourse. Ed. Jonathan J. Webster. London: Continuum, 2002.
- , and Ruqaiya Hasan. Cohesion in English. London: Longman, 1976.
- Harwood, Nigel. "'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 26.3 (2005): 343-75.
- . "'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 (2005): 1207-31.
- , and Gregory Hadley. "Demystifying Institutional Practices: Critical Pragmatism and the Teaching of Academic Writing." English for Specific Purposes 23 (2004): 355-77.
- Hoey, Michael. "Persuasive Rhetoric in Linguistics: A Stylistic Study of Some Features of the Language of Noam Chomsky." Hunston and Thompson 28-37.

- Holcomb, Chris. "Performative Stylistics and the Question of Academic Prose." Rhetoric Review 24.2 (2005): 188-206.
- Hunston, Susan. "Conflict and Consensus: Construing Opposition in Applied Linguistics." Tognini-Bonelli and Del Lungo Camiciotti 1-15.
- . "Evaluation and the Planes of Discourse: Status and Value in Persuasive Texts." Hunston and Thompson 176-207.
- , and Geoff Thompson, eds. Evaluation in Text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Hyland, Ken. Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing. London; New York: Continuum, 2005.
- . "Stance and Engagement: A Model of Interaction in Academic Discourse." Discourse Studies 7.2 (2005): 173-92.
- . "Disciplinary Interactions: Metadiscourse in L2 Postgraduate Writing." Journal of Second Language Writing 13 (2004): 133-51.
- . "Directives: Argument and Engagement in Academic Writing." Applied Linguistics 23.2 (2002): 215-39.
- . "Specificity Revisited: How Far Should We Go Now?" English for Specific Purposes 21 (2002): 385-95.
- . "Authority and Invisibility: Authorial Identity in Academic Writing." Journal of Pragmatics 34 (2002): 1091-112.

- . "Bringing in the Reader: Addressee Features in Academic Articles." Written Communication 18.4 (2001): 549-74.
- . Disciplinary Discourses: Social Interactions in Academic Writing. Harlow: Longman, 2000.
- . Hedging in Scientific Research Articles. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1998.
- . "Hedging in Academic Writing and EAP Textbooks." English for Specific Purposes 13.3 (1994): 239-56.
- . "Academic Attribution: Citation and the Construction of Disciplinary Knowledge." Applied Linguistics 20.3 (1999): 341-67.
- , and Marina Bondi, eds. Academic Discourse Across Disciplines. Germany: Peter Lang, 2006.
- , and Polly Tse. "Hooking the Reader: A Corpus Study of Evaluative *That* in Abstracts." English for Specific Purposes 24 (2005): 123-39.
- Jacoby, Sally. "References to Other Researchers in Literary Research Articles." English Language Research Journal 1 (1987): 33-78.
- Kirsch, Gesa E. Women Writing the Academy: Audience, Authority, and Transformation. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, 1993.
- Koutsantoni, Dimitra. "Rhetorical Strategies in Engineering Research Articles and Research Theses: Advanced Academic Literacy

- and Relations of Power.” Journal of English for Academic Purposes 5 (2006): 19-36.
- Lewin, Beverly A. “Hedging: An Exploratory Study of Authors’ and Readers’ Identification of ‘toning down’ in Scientific Texts.” Journal of English for Academic Purposes 4.2 (2005): 163-78.
- . “From Hedging to Heightening: Toning Down and Up in Scientific Texts.” Melbourne Papers in Linguistics and Applied Linguistics 1 (2001): 17-28.
- , Jonathan Fine, and Lynne Young. Expository Discourse: A Genre-based Approach to Social Science Research Texts. London / New York: Continuum, 2001.
- MacDonald, Susan Peck. “A Method for Analyzing Sentence-Level Differences in Disciplinary Knowledge Making.” Written Communication 9.4 (1992): 533-69.
- Mao, Luming R. “I Conclude Not: Toward a Pragmatic Account of Metadiscourse.” Rhetoric Review 11.2 (1993): 265-89.
- Martin, J. R. Introduction. Text 23.2 (2003): 171-81.
- Matsuda, Paul K., and Christine M. Tardy. “Voice in Academic Writing: The Rhetorical Construction of Author Identity in Blind Manuscript Review.” English for Specific Purposes 26 (2007): 235-49.

- Mauranen, Anna, and Marina Bondi. "Evaluative Language Use in Academic Discourse." Editorial. Journal of English for Academic Purposes 2 (2003): 269-71.
- Myers, Greg. "The Pragmatics of Politeness in Scientific Articles." Applied Linguistics 10 (1989): 1-35.
- Ozturk, Ismet. "The Textual Organisation of Research Article Introductions in Applied Linguistics: Variability within a Single Discipline." English for Specific Purposes 26 (2007): 25-38.
- Quirk, Randolph, et al. A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language. Harlow, Great Britain: Longman, 1985.
- Raimes, Ann. Keys for Writers. 4th ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 2005.
- Römer, Ute. "'This seems somewhat counterintuitive, though...': Negative Evaluation in Linguistic Book Reviews by Male and Female Authors." Tognini-Bonelli and Del Lungo Camiciotti 97-115.
- Salager-Meyer, Françoise. "Hedges and Textual Communicative Function in Medical English Written Discourse." English for Specific Purposes 13.2 (1994): 149-70.
- Schryer, Catherine F., and Philippa Spoel. "Genre Theory, Health-care Discourse, and Professional Identity Formation." Journal of Business and Technical Communication 19.3 (2005): 249-78.

- Sefcovic, Enid M. I., and Diane Theresa Bifano. "Creating a Rhetorical Home for Feminists in the 'Master's House' of the Academy: Toward a Gendered Taxonomy of Form and Content." Women and Language 27.1 (2004): 53-62.
- Shaw, Philip. "Evaluation and Promotion across Languages." Journal of English for Academic Purposes 2 (2003): 343-57.
- Silver, Marc. "The Stance of Stance: A Critical Look at Ways Stance is Expressed and Modeled in Academic Discourse." Journal of English for Academic Purposes 2 (2003): 359-74.
- . "Introducing Abstract Reasoning: World of Reference and Writer Argument across Disciplines." Hyland and Bondi 75-101.
- Sinclair, John. "Language as a String of Beads: discourse and the M-word." Tognini-Bonelli and Del Lungo Camiciotti 163-8.
- Stotesbury, Hikka. "Evaluation in Research Article Abstracts in the Narrative and Hard Sciences." Journal of English for Academic Purposes 2 (2003): 327-41.
- . "Gaps and False Conclusions: Criticism in Research Article Abstracts across the Disciplines." Hyland and Bondi 123-48.
- Suárez-Tejerina, Lorena. "Is Evaluation Structure-bound? An English-Spanish Contrastive Study of Book Reviews." Tognini-Bonelli and Del Lungo Camiciotti 117-32.
- Swales, John M. Research Genres: Explorations and Applications. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

- . Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings.  
Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Thetela, Puleng. "Evaluated Entities and Parameters of Value in  
Academic Research Articles." English for Specific Purposes  
16.2 (1997): 101-18.
- Thompson, Geoff. "Interaction in Academic Writing: Learning to  
Argue with the Reader." Applied Linguistics 22.1 (2001): 58-  
78.
- , and Susan Hunston. "Evaluation: An Introduction." Hunston and  
Thompson 1-27.
- , and Puleng Thetela. "The Sound of One Hand Clapping: The  
Management of Interaction in Written Discourse." Text 15.1  
(1995): 103-27.
- Thompson, Paul. "Aspects of Identification and Position in Intertextual  
Reference in PhD Theses." Tognini-Bonelli and Del Lungo  
Camiciotti 31-50.
- Tognini-Bonelli, Elena, and Gabriella Del Lungo Camiciotti, eds.  
Strategies in Academic Discourse. Amsterdam/Philadelphia:  
John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2005.
- Tse, Polly, and Ken Hyland. "Gender and Discipline: Exploring  
Metadiscourse Variation in Academic Book Reviews." Hyland  
and Bondi 177-202.

- Tucker, Paul. "Evaluation in the Art-historical Research Article." Journal of English for Academic Purposes 2 (2003): 291-312.
- Vande Kopple, William J. "Some Exploratory Discourse on Metadiscourse." College Composition and Communication 36.1 (1985): 82-93.
- Vold, Eva Thue. "Epistemic Modality Markers in Research Articles: A Cross-linguistic and Cross-disciplinary Study." International Journal of Applied Linguistics 16.1 (2006): 61-87.
- . "The Choice and Use of Epistemic Modality Markers in Linguistics and Medical Research Articles." Hyland and Bondi 225-49.
- Yang, Ruiying, and Desmond Allison. "Research Articles in Applied Linguistics: Structures from a Functional Perspective." English for Specific Purposes 23 (2004): 264-79.