

ATTITUDE MARKERS IN DISCUSSION SECTIONS OF QUALITATIVE AND QUANTITATIVE RESEARCH ARTICLES

L. Dobakhti

Tabriz Islamic Art University, Tabriz, Iran

Abstract: *This study investigates the use of attitude markers in qualitative and quantitative research articles by the use of corpus and genre analysis. In the first part of the study, the Discussion sections of 100 qualitative and 100 quantitative research articles published in five high impact journals from 2003-2009 in the field of Applied Linguistics were analysed using WordPilot2002. The analysis showed that attitude markers appeared with similar frequency in both sub-corpora. Categorizing the attitude markers revealed that the two main categories used were adverbs and adjectives. In the second part, in order to identify in which parts of the Discussion section each of these stance features were clustered in, this feature was investigated in various moves of the Discussion sections of 10 qualitative and 10 quantitative research articles. The findings contribute to our understanding of research articles, and also have implications for pedagogy regarding the writing instruction to ESP students who are writing dissertations and research papers.*

Keywords: *Attitude markers, Applied Linguistics, Research articles, Quantitative research, Qualitative research*

Introduction

Over the last decade or so, a great deal of research has challenged the belief that writing in professional academic discourse is presenting informational content objectively and has argued that in order to be persuasive the authors need to adopt certain positions. One of the ways in which writers can indicate their personal involvement in a text is through *attitude markers*. They are words such as *surprisingly, remarkable, agree* which reveal the writers' attitude toward the propositional content and explicitly inform readers of writers' perspective of a particular idea and important information in the text. Attitude markers indicate the writers' "affective attitude" rather than "epistemic attitude" (certainty or doubt) toward a given matter (Hyland, 2008).

Attitude is mostly expressed through attitude verbs (agree, prefer), sentence adverbs (unfortunately, hopefully) and adjectives (appropriate, remarkable) (Hyland, 2005a, 2008). The attitude expressed can be positive or negative and can be of many different types: surprise, importance, obligation, frustration, agreement, and so on. They can be used to show writers' attitude toward, for instance, "the importance of something, ... the interest of something, ... its appropriateness, and ... the personal emotional concomitants of linguistic material" (Ädel, 2006, p. 174). Writers, by intruding their attitude toward the proposition in the text, try to persuade readers and increase the acceptability of the text. Attitude markers help "writers both (to) express a position and pull readers into a conspiracy of agreement so that it can often be difficult to dispute these judgments" (Hyland, 2005c, p. 180). In other words, by expressing their attitudes,

the writers try to connect with their readers interpersonally “asking them to see their affectual responses as justified and valid in some way” (Koutsantoni, 2004, p. 169).

Several studies have revealed the importance of attitude markers in research articles. Koutsantoni (2004), by examining RAs in electronic and electrical engineering, found that attitude markers were used to stress the importance of research area, justify the researchers work, emphasize the originality of the work, evaluate previous studies positively or negatively, and indicate limitations and gaps in knowledge. He (2004, p. 179) concludes that attitude markers are one of the important and powerful means for engineers “to create research space for themselves, assert their learned authority and expertise, solicit readers’ acceptance of claims, and reach consensus”.

By analyzing a corpus of RAs from various disciplines, Hyland (1998c, 1999, 2005a, 2005b, 2008) found that writers in hard field used less attitude markers in their RAs than those in the soft field. He suggests that in hard field “the authority of the individual ... is subordinated to the authority of the text” (Hyland, 1998c, p. 449). On the other hand, the soft fields “are less able to rely on proven quantitative methods to establish their claims and this increases the need for more explicit evaluation” (Hyland, 2005a, p. 151). Hyland (ibid., p. 151) concludes that writers in the soft fields, by using attitude markers, “create a convincing discourse and establish personal credibility, critical insight and disciplinary competence”.

This study investigates the use of attitude markers in qualitative and quantitative research articles by the use of corpus and genre analysis. The purpose is to find out whether these two groups of academic writers use similar forms for expressing their attitudes, how frequently they use attitude markers in their texts, and in which parts of the Discussion section this feature is clustered in.

Corpus and Methodology

The corpus of the study consists of 100 qualitative and 100 quantitative RAs’ Discussion sections selected from five high impact journals in the field of Applied Linguistics based on the Journal Citation Reports (Social Sciences Edition) 2008. The list included the journals in Linguistics which covered journals in both pure Linguistics and Applied Linguistics. For the purpose of the study the journals devoted to pure Linguistics were excluded from the list. After examining the remaining journals, the five selected journals were: Applied Linguistics, English for Specific Purposes, Journal of Pragmatics, Language Teaching Research, and TESOL Quarterly.

The articles were selected from the issues published from 2002-2009. The first criterion considered in selecting the articles was that they have a separate Discussion section. These articles were categorized as qualitative and quantitative, and mixed method articles were excluded. In categorizing the articles as qualitative or quantitative, the priority was given to the article writers’ own explicit statement about the design they had used. If they had not mentioned the method explicitly, which mostly had not, the abstracts and the methodology sections were examined in detail. According to Perry (2005), the characteristic of quantitative research is “the use of numbers to represent its data”, and the characteristic of qualitative research is “verbal descriptions as its data” (p. 75). Those articles that were experimental or completely dealt with

statistics were categorized as quantitative and those articles that used qualitative methods and relied mainly on verbal description were classified as qualitative. It should be noted that categorizing the articles as qualitative or quantitative was done based on their methods of data collection and data analysis rather than attempting to identify their underlying philosophy and purpose. Benson, Chik, Gao, Huang, and Wang (2009) differentiate between the studies that *use a specific type of design* (qualitative and quantitative) and those that *represent a specific type of design* (qualitative and quantitative). The focus of this study was to identify the articles that *used* qualitative or quantitative research methods.

After categorizing the articles in two groups of qualitative and quantitative, they were double checked to ensure that each article was set in the right category. Then, 100 qualitative and 100 quantitative RAs were selected randomly and two specialized machine readable sub-corpus were compiled. The qualitative sub-corpus consisted of approximately 132,000 words and the quantitative sub-corpus comprised around 139,000 words. In the next stage, a list of 97 potentially productive attitude markers was selected based on previous lists and researches in literature, especially Biber (2006), Biber et al. (1999), Hyland (1998, 2000, 2005a), Precht (2000), and Varttala (2001).

These items were searched in each sub-corpus separately using WordPilot 2002, a text analysis, and concordance program. The output included frequency lists, concordance lines, summary, and collocations. After each item was searched, a careful analysis of the co-text and context of the cases was carried out for several times to ensure that they were representative of attitude markers. The number of occurrences were written down for each item and aggregated to have the total number of attitude markers in each sub-corpus. The frequency counts were normalized at 1,000 words and compared in the two sub-corpora. After identifying the frequency of each of the attitude marker items in both sub-corpora, the items were categorized in three groups of *verbs*, *adjectives* and *adverbs*.

In the next stage of the study, 10 qualitative and 10 quantitative RAs were selected randomly from among these 200 RAs to be studied in detail for the use of attitude markers in various moves and steps of these RAs (the particulars of the articles can be found in Appendices A and B). To this end, first the selected Discussions were analyzed in terms of moves and steps (Swales, 1990). The generic structures are presented in Appendices C and D. Then, the 97 attitude marker items used in the first part were searched in each move of these two sets of articles using Find function of Microsoft Word. After identifying the cases, all of them were examined and double checked carefully to ensure that they all represented attitude markers. In the next stage, the overall frequency of attitude markers in each move was counted manually and was normalized at 1,000 words.

Results and Discussion

Overall Distribution of Attitude Markers

The analysis showed that attitude markers appeared less than 5 times in every 1,000 words. Table 1 shows the total frequency of attitude markers and their occurrences per 1,000 words. The results indicate that both group of writers use attitude markers with almost the same frequency.

Table1: Overall Distribution of Attitude Markers in 100 Qualitative and 100 Quantitative RAs' Discussion Sections

Sub-corpus	Total No. of Attitude Markers	Attitude Markers Per 1,000 Words
Qualitative (132,271 words)	597	4.51
Quantitative (139,377 words)	628	4.50

The findings are different from Hyland's (1999b, 2005c) results. He identified 8.6 attitude markers per 1,000 which is higher than this study's findings. This difference might be related to the size and type of the corpus and the attitude markers that were investigated. In other words, while Hyland has not specified the number of attitude markers that he used in his study, a total of 97 attitude markers were searched in the corpus of this study. Furthermore, Hyland analyzed 30 RAs but did not specify the number of words; however, the corpus of this study consisted of 200 RAs' discussion sections (271,628 words). The other difference between the two studies is concerned with the rhetorical sections that these two studies analyzed. Hyland investigated the stance features in the whole RAs, while this study focused only on the Discussion section.

Lexical Markers for Expressing Attitude Markers

Categorizing the attitude markers of the 200 RAs revealed that both groups of writers used limited categories of words to reveal their attitudes. Generally, the two main categories used were *adverbs* and *adjectives*.

Table 2: Frequency of Categories of Attitude Markers in 100 Qualitative and 100 Quantitative RAs' Discussion Sections

Category	Qualitative: 132,271 words		Quantitative: 139,377 words	
	Frequency & Percentage	Per 1,000 Words	Frequency & Percentage	Per 1,000 Words
Adjectives	435 (72.86%)	3.29	437 (69.59%)	3.13
Adverbs	160 (26.80%)	1.21	190 (30.25%)	1.36
Verbs	2 (0.34%)	0.01	1 (0.16%)	0.007
Total	597 (100%)	4.50	628 (100%)	4.51

The most frequent category in both sub-corpora was *adjectives* which comprised around 70% of the whole attitude markers in each sub-corpus. Among this category, *important* (n=101 in Quali and n=110 in Quanti) was the most dominant one. The next two most frequent adjectives were *appropriate* (n=58 in Quali and n=43 in Quanti) and *interesting* (n=26 in Quali and n=37 in Quanti). While some other adjectives such as *crucial*, *expected*, *necessary*, and *useful* were frequent in the corpus, some other adjectives such as *thoroughly*, *remarkable*, *curious*, *pleased*, and *ironic* were underused and appeared less than five times in the whole corpus. The following examples show how the adjectives were used to express attitude in the 20 RAs:

- 1) The findings reveal some **important** differences in the nature of the oral interaction experienced by Soon Yi and Ivan in the classroom and real-world contexts. (Quali-LTR1)
- 2) For example, it is **surprising** that the Singaporeans all rejected the use of “researches” or “equipments” as countable nouns ... (Quali-TESOL1)
- 3) However, further analysis with a larger sample size is **necessary** to study this phenomenon in second language discourse in more depth. (Quanti-PRAG1)
- 4) This is an **interesting** finding because earlier suggestions (Ferris, 1999; Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 1994; Reid, 1998, 2005; Roberts, 1999) have tended to identify international visa students as being potentially more attuned ... (Quanti-LTR2)

The other category of words that was used as attitude markers in both sub-corpora was *adverbs* which compared to *adjectives* were less frequent. The only *adverb* that was frequent in both sets of articles was *even* (n=90 in Quali and n=84 in Quanti). Some other adverbs were also found in the corpus which normally were not frequent and some even appeared once or twice in the corpus: *reasonably*, *sufficiently*, *dramatically*, and *curiously*. The following examples illustrate the use of adverbs as attitude markers in the 200 RAs:

- 1) **Interestingly**, all 12 of the fourth year students were deemed successful by the instructor, suggesting that ... (Quali-ESP1)
- 2) Indeed, **ironically**, the interaction between Oakland and Miles during the pre-task planning appears to exhibit a more discussion-like mutual exchange of ideas. (Quali.)
- 3) Of course the reading speeds are slower than for natives, as one would expect, but **even** at this slower speed formulaic sequences show an advantage. (Quanti-APP1)
- 4) Clearly, then, knowledge of grammar serves as a powerful predictor of general proficiency and, **importantly** for the theoretical model this study was based on... (Quanti-APP2)

In the whole corpus, two *verbs* were used to express attitude. One was *hope* which appeared once in each set of the articles and the other was *prefer* which was used only once in one of the qualitative articles:

- 1) Yet the evangelical impulse is surely of a different hue. As atheists, we feel no urge whatsoever to convert others to our views nor even to share our beliefs. In fact, we **prefer** to keep them quiet unless specifically asked about them. (Quali.)
- 2) In closing, I **hope** that the practices observed in this study have broadened our conceptualization of advising in education settings... (Quali.)
- 3) But in fact, there are many other things we take for granted in this manner that have a lot to do with being human; we **hope** that looking at pragmatics has revealed some of those. (Quanti.)

Presence of Attitude Markers in Various Moves

The analysis of the attitude makers in the 20 RAs showed that they are used in several moves with different frequency. Table 3 shows the distribution of attitude markers in different moves of the qualitative and quantitative sub-corpora.

Table 3: Frequency and Percentage of Attitude Markers in Each Move of the 10 Qualitative and 10 Quantitative RAs' Discussion Section

Moves	Qualitative: 9,290 words				Quantitative: 11,184 words			
	Text Size		Attitude Markers		Text Size		Attitude Markers	
	# of Words	% in the Whole Sub-corpus	Frequency & Percentage	Per 1000 Words	# of Words	% in the Whole Sub-corpus	Frequency & Percentage	Per 1000 Words
Providing Background Information	418	4.50	0 (0.0%)	0.0	589	5.27	0 (0.0%)	0.0
Stating Findings	2071	22.29	5 (26.32%)	2.41	2139	19.12	6 (15.79%)	2.80
Providing Evidence for Findings	1180	12.70	1 (5.26%)	0.85	***			
Commenting on Findings	1803	19.41	5 (26.31%)	2.77	5077	45.40	17 (44.74%)	3.35
Supporting Comments on Findings	712	7.66	2 (10.53%)	2.81	***			
Comparing Findings with Literature	809	8.71	1 (5.26%)	1.24	1115	9.97	5 (13.16%)	4.48
Explaining Inconsistency of Findings with Literature	***				152	1.36	0 (0.0%)	0.0
Making Recommendations	607	6.53	0 (%)	1.65	581	5.19	4 (10.52%)	6.88
Making Deductions	642	6.92	0 (0.0%)	0.0	555	4.96	2 (5.26%)	3.60
Supporting Deductions/ Suggestions	63	0.68	0 (0.0%)	0.0	229	2.05	0 (0.0%)	0.0
Evaluating the Study	725	7.80	4	5.52	576	5.15	4	6.94

			(16.67%)				(10.53%)	
Summarizing the Study	260	2.80	0 (21.05%)	0.0	171	1.53	0 (0.0%)	0.0
Total	9,290	100	19 (100%)	3.23	11,184	100	38 (100%)	3.39

Note: *** indicates that the move was not identified in the sub-corpus

For instance, the writers used the attitude markers in *Stating Their Findings* where they emphasized the importance of their findings:

- 1) The findings reveal some **important** differences in the nature of the oral interaction experienced by Soon Yi and Ivan in the classroom and real-world contexts. (Quali-LTR1)
- 2) On the other hand, it is **interesting** that, in the case of the direct metalinguistic group, the writing test gains were more strongly correlated with the language analysis scores than the error correction test gains. (Quanti-TESOL1)

in *Providing Evidence for their Findings* and *Supporting Comments on Findings* in the qualitative sub-corpus:

- 1) Adam was able to convey his **dramatic** reaction to the site as a generator for his design concept ... Ben also managed his visual presentation to convey temporal sequencing as an **important** part of one of his rhetorical narratives. (Quali-ESP1)
- 2) This implies that it is difficult for learners to apply the Japanese rule, even if they have the necessary knowledge [*Commenting on Findings*]. The following quotation supports this view: ... Maynard (1982:222) makes a further **useful** comment on the difficulty of adopting the target language's rule: ... (Quali-PRAG2)

in *Commenting on their Findings*:

- 1) It is **not unreasonable** to speculate that perhaps significant gains in the English language and skills for handling discipline materials acquired from content-based instruction **Most importantly**, the students from the linked program would know where to turn to for help when they needed it again... (Quali-ESP2)
- 2) The analysis shown in Table 12 suggests that two of the criteria (functional value, and processability) may be especially **important** in determining grammatical complexity as implicit knowledge. (Quanti-App2)

and in *Making Deductions from their Studies*:

- 1) Thus, one often overlooked aspect of the construct of scaffolding is the **essential** role played by the learner ... Without the ability or willingness to engage with the more

knowledgeable other or a readiness to incorporate and **appropriate** what has been revealed in interaction with the more knowledgeable other (Quali-TESOL3)

- 2) In summary, this study suggests that motivation and proficiency operate on pragmalinguistic awareness independently rather than jointly, and that motivation plays a more **crucial** role than proficiency in learners' allocation of attention to pragmatic input. (Quanti-APP3)

Attitude markers were found more frequently in the move of *Evaluating the Study* in both sub-corpora. They were used, for instance, to highlight the importance of the study or to state which issues and points are important to be considered when they talked about the limitations of their study:

- 1) This study is limited in its analysis of ownership because it only examines the situated linguistic identities expressed during an experimental task. The participants may orient to English very differently in other contexts ... Furthermore, it is **important** to stress that the potential for ownership... Conversely, it is **important** to acknowledge that the concept of ownership extends to speakers of nonstandard varieties in the inner circle... (Quali-TESOL1)
- 2) The findings of this study are additionally **important** because they have been tested with a larger population than most earlier studies (see Table 1) and because ... (Quanti-LTR2)

While the attitude markers are distributed almost with similar frequency in most of the common moves of the qualitative and quantitative RAs, they appeared with more frequency in *Making Recommendations* and *Commenting on Findings* moves in the quantitative RAs (as shown in Table 3). Upon more detailed examination of the attitude markers in the move of *Making Recommendations*, it was noticed that all of them appeared in *Recommending Further Research* step. While the step was present in 7 RAs (out of 10) in the quantitative sub-corpus, it was identified only in two qualitative RAs and in very short length. That might be a reason for why the attitude markers were found more frequently in this move in the quantitative sub-corpus. The following examples show the use of attitude makers in this move:

- 1) The implication is that teachers need to use **appropriate** and authentic texts and to provide an opportunity for students to examine styles other than the "preferred" structure. (Quali-ESP3)
- 2) However, further analysis with a larger sample size is **necessary** to study this phenomenon in second language discourse in more depth. (Quanti-PRAG1)
- 3) While this movement was not statistically significant, it would be **interesting** to observe in more extensive investigations (where additional post-tests are included) whether any decline is significant. (Quanti-LTR2)
- 4) A more **insightful** line of enquiry might be to look for differences in the patterns of correlations involving oral and written language. (Quanti-APP2)

The other move in which attitude markers appeared more frequently in the quantitative than the qualitative RAs was *Comparing Findings with Literature*. Examination of the instances of attitude markers in this move showed that three out of five attitude markers in the quantitative RAs was used to indicate the inconsistency of findings with literature where the writers expressed that the inconsistency was *interesting*. The following examples demonstrate the use of attitude markers in this move:

- 1) Previous research on spoken academic genres has illustrated that narrative typically functions to create rapport with an audience and to draw them into the speaker's world (Thompson, 2002). In our data, a narrative rhetorical style seemed to be one of the more **important** components of a successful design presentation. (Quali-ESP1)
- 2) It is **interesting** that, in contrast to the study reported in this article, Bitchener et al. did not find any statistically significant effect for direct corrective feedback alone (i.e., without metalinguistic comments). (Quanti-TESOL1)
- 3) It is **interesting** to note that the results from the present study differ from Farley's research (Farley, 2001a; 2001b) and Benati's (Benati, 2001). (Quanti-LTR3)

Conclusion

Overall, with reference to the data, the conclusion to be drawn from the findings is that attitude markers are important elements in both qualitative and quantitative RAs and do appear in both types of articles. Interestingly, while there is an assumption that quantitative research articles are "objective" and impersonal and gain their credibility by employing rigorous methods, the use of attitude markers is also evident in these types of articles. The findings of this study reinforce other studies that research articles are not an objective report of a research process, and that writers take stance in their writing to negotiate and interact with their audience to persuade them and gain acceptability for their findings. Studying the lexical markers of expressing attitude, only two main categories of *adjectives* and *adverbs* were identified; however, the majority of the attitude markers were *adjectives*. Meanwhile, only two verbs were identified as attitude markers which indicate that this category is not a preferred one when expressing attitudes in RAs. No difference was identified in preference of categories in the two sub-corpora. Overall, the three most common lexicons used as attitude markers were *important*, *even*, and *appropriate*.

One of the strengths of this study is that it combines both corpus and genre analysis. While corpus analysis gave general information about the overall frequency of attitude markers in the qualitative and quantitative sub-corpora, it was unable to provide information about where these features were clustered in. Conducting genre analysis and studying attitude markers in each Move provided extra insights about the use of attitude markers in these two types of RAs and helped to explain the results obtained from the corpus analysis. It is hoped that the findings of this study contribute to better understanding of the genre of RA in Applied Linguistics.

REFERENCES

- Ädel, A. (2006). *Metadiscourse in L1 and L2 English*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Benson, P., Chik, A., Gao, X., Huang, J., & Wang, W. (2009). Qualitative research in language teaching and learning journals, 1997-2006. *The Modern Language Journal*, 93(i), 79-90.
- Biber, D. (2006). Stance in spoken and written university registers. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 5, 97-116.
- Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., & Finegan, E. (1999). *The Longman grammar of spoken and written English*. London: Longman.
- Hyland, K. (1998). Persuasion and context: The pragmatics of academic metadiscourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 30, 437-455.
- Hyland, K. (1999). Disciplinary discourses: writer stance in research articles. In C. N. Candlin & K. Hyland (Eds.), *Writing: Texts, processes and practices* (pp. 99-121). London: Longman.
- Hyland, K. (2000). *Disciplinary discourses: Social interactions in academic writing*. London: Longman.
- Hyland, K. (2005a). *Metadiscourse*. London, New York: Continuum.
- Hyland, K. (2005b). Stance and engagement: a model of interaction in academic discourse. *Discourse Studies*, 7(2), 173-192.
- Hyland, K. (2008). Persuasion, interaction and the construction of knowledge: representing self and others in research writing. *International Journal of English Studies*, 8(2), 1-23.
- Koutsantoni, D. (2004). Attitude, certainty and allusions to common knowledge in scientific research articles. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 3(2), 163-182.
- Perry, Jr. F. L. (2005). *Research in applied linguistics: Becoming a discerning consumer*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Precht, K. (2000). *Patterns of stance in English*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis. Northern Arizona University.
- Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Varttala, T. (2001). *Hedging in scientifically oriented discourse: Exploring variation according to discipline and intended audience*. Unpublished Ph.D thesis, University of Tampereen Yliopisto, Finland.

Appendix A

List of the Qualitative Research Articles Analyzed in Terms of Generic Structure

Applied Linguistics (APP):

1) (Quali-APP1)

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

2) (Quali-APP2)

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

3) (Quali-APP3)

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

English for Specific purposes (ESP):

4) (Quali-ESP1)

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

5) (Quali-ESP2)

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

6) (Quali-ESP3)

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

Journal of Pragmatics (PRAG):

7) (Quali-PRAG1)

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

8) (Quali-PRAG2)

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

9) (Quali-PRAG3)

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

Language Teaching Research (LTR):

10) (Quali-LTR1)

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

11) (Quali-LTR2)

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

12) (Quali-LTR3)

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

TESOL Quarterly (TESOL):

13) (Quali-TESOL1)

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

14) (Quali-TESOL2)

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

15) (Quali-TESOL3)

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

APPENDIX B

List of the Quantitative Research Articles Analyzed in Terms of Generic Structure

Applied Linguistics (APP):

1) (Quanti-APP1)

Conklin, K. & Schmitt, N. (2008). Formulaic sequences: Are they processed more quickly than nonformulaic language by native and nonnative speakers? *Applied linguistics*, 29(1), 72-89.

2) (Quanti-APP2)

Ellis, R. (2006). Modelling learning difficulty and second language proficiency: The differential contributions of implicit and explicit knowledge. *Applied linguistics*, 27(3), 431-463.

3) (Quanti-APP3)

Takahashi, S. (2005). Pragmalinguistic awareness: Is it related to motivation and proficiency? *Applied linguistics*, 26(1), 90-120.

English for Specific purposes (ESP):

4) (Quanti-ESP1)

Atay, D. & Ozbulgan, C. (2007). Memory strategy instruction, contextual learning and ESP vocabulary recall. *English for Specific Purposes*, 26, 39-51.

5) (Quanti-ESP2)

Song, B. (2006). Content-based ESL instruction: Long-term effects and outcomes. *English for Specific Purposes*, 25, 406-437.

6) (Quanti-ESP3)

Taillefer, G. F. (2007). The professional language needs of Economics graduates: Assessment and perspectives in the French context. *English for Specific Purposes*, 26, 135-155.

Journal of Pragmatics (PRAG):

7) (Quanti-PRAG1)

Kang, J. Y. (2004). Telling a coherent story in a foreign language: Analysis of Korean EFL learners' referential strategies in oral narrative discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 36, 1975-1990.

8) (Quanti-PRAG2)

Laval, V. (2003). Idiom comprehension and metapragmatic knowledge in French children. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 35, 723-739.

9) (Quanti-PRAG3)

Adenzato, M. & Bucciarelli, M. (2008). Recognition of mistakes and deceits in communicative interactions. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40, 608-629.

Language Teaching Research (LTR):

10) (Quanti-LTR1)

Takimoto, M. (2006). The effects of explicit feedback on the development of pragmatic proficiency. *Language Teaching Research*, 10(4), 393-417.

11) (Quanti-LTR2)

Bitchener, J. & Knoch, U. (2008). The value of written corrective feedback for migrant and international students. *Language Teaching Research*, 12(3), 409-431.

12) (Quanti-LTR3)

Benati, A. (2005). The effects of processing instruction, traditional instruction and meaning-output instruction on the acquisition of the English past simple tense. *Language Teaching Research*, 9(1), 67-93.

TESOL Quarterly (TESOL):

13) (Quanti-TESOL1)

Sheen, Y. (2007). The effect of focused written corrective feedback and language aptitude on ESL learners' acquisition of articles. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41(2), 255-283.

14) (Quanti-TESOL2)

Barcroft, J. (2009). Effects of synonym generation on incidental and intentional L2 vocabulary learning during reading. *TESOL Quarterly*, 43(1), 79-103.

15) (Quanti-TESOL3)

Smith, B. (2005). The relationship between negotiated interaction, learner uptake, and lexical acquisition in task-based computer-mediated communication. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39(1), 33-58.

Appendix C

The Generic Structure of Discussion Section of Qualitative Research Articles

Moves	Steps
1- Providing Background Information	-
2- Stating Findings	1- Reporting Findings
3- Providing Evidence for Findings	1- Referring to Data
4- Commenting on Findings	1- Explaining 1A- Providing an Explanation 1B- Providing Alternative Explanations 2- Interpreting 2A- Providing an Interpretation 2B- Providing an Interpretation by Referring to Literature

	3- Evaluating 3A- Providing an Evaluation 3B- Providing an Evaluation by Referring to Literature
5- Supporting Comments on Findings	1- Referring to Data 2- Referring to Literature
6- Comparing Findings with Literature	1- Indicating Consistency of Findings with Literature 2- Indicating Inconsistency of Findings with Literature
7- Making Recommendations	1- Making Suggestions for Practice 2- Recommending Further Research
8- Making Deductions	-
9- Supporting Deductions/Suggestions	1- Referring to Data 2- Referring to Literature
10- Evaluating the Study	1- Stating Significance of the Study 2- Stating Limitations of the Study
11- Summarizing the Study	-

Appendix D

The Generic Structure of Discussion Section of Quantitative Research Articles

Moves	Steps
1- Providing Background Information	-
2- Stating Findings	1- Reporting Findings 2- Summarizing Findings
3- Commenting on Findings	1- Explaining 1A- Providing an Explanation 1B- Providing Alternative Explanations 1C- Providing an Explanation by Referring to Literature 2- Interpreting 2A- Providing an Interpretation 3- Evaluating 3A- Indicating Consistency of Findings with Expected Findings/Hypotheses 3B- Indicating Inconsistency of Findings with Expected Findings/Hypotheses
4- Comparing Findings with Literature	1- Indicating Consistency of Findings with Literature

	2- Indicating Inconsistency of Findings with Literature
5- Explaining Inconsistency of Findings with Literature	1- Referring to Methodology
6- Making Deductions	-
7- Supporting Deductions	1- Referring to Findings 2- Referring to Methodology 3- Referring to Literature
8- Evaluating the Study	1- Stating Significance of the Study 2- Stating Limitations of the Study
9- Making Recommendations	1- Making Suggestions for Practice 2- Recommending Further Research
10- Summarizing the Study	-