[DOI: 10.26655/mjltm.2017.11.1]

Downloaded from mjltm.org at 21:07 +0330 on Wednesday January 2nd 2019

Discursive acts embedded in English RPs' introductions of a non-Anglophone academic discourse [1]

Merve Geçikli[a] , Savaş Yeşilyurt[b]

[a] *Assistant Prof. Dr., Department of Foreign Languages Teaching- English Language Teaching, Faculty of Education, Ataturk University, Erzurum 25240, Turkey*

[b] *Assistant Prof. Dr., Department of Tourist Guiding, Faculty of Tourism, Ataturk University, Erzurum 25240, Turkey*

Abstract

Driven from discourse analysis framework, this paper focuses on the discursive acts in introductory parts of English research papers (RPs) by Turkish authors in the field of English Language Teaching (ELT) to expand the discussion about the scientific rhetoric in non-Anglophone academic discourses. By following qualitative paradigm, the rhetoric in manuscripts was elaborated by drawing on interview-based study of 2 referees and 5 editor/referees' accounts of the issue and contrastive rhetoric analysis of two ELT research paper (RP) corpora by Turkish researchers and Anglophone researchers. In this regard, the accounts of referees and editor/referees and the chi-square values of the differences between two corpora broadly related to raising issues regarding: i) the strength of introductions in accomplishing theoretical research foundation and the reflection and argumentation in terms of evaluative perspectives, ii) the research justification through the discussion of specific reasoning, and iii) the unity and connectedness between/within paragraphs. These matters suggest that the acts noticed in opening sections of English ELT manuscripts by non-Anglophone Turkish authors seem to function just indexing the previous works done, and so the rhetoric involved in these acts is of little depth in succeeding situating the manuscript into the relevant research domain.

Keywords*:* A non-Anglophone Academic Discourse; Discursive Acts; English Language Teaching; RPs' introductions

Introduction

Contextualization of academic texts, particularly research papers, is a critical issue for delaminating knowledge in a scientific manner and intelligible way to the relevant audience for accomplishing welcoming position through academic platforms. In this respect, the manipulation of rhetoric devoted to the status of English linguicism and the norms of this trend has been regarded as a central player in accomplishing recognition just considering English as the international line of academic dialogue. Besides, it seems that many academic discourses warrant this position and recognize the implementation of the rhetorical rules instilled in their products (Buckingham, 2014; Clyne, 2002; Dahl, 2004; Martin, 2003; Mauranen, 1993; Moreno, 2004).

However, the uniqueness of the rhetoric and, especially, the sine qua nons of English conventions have, at the same time, called for more efforts for those from peripheries in "situating the texts in wider context for recognition" (Kanoksilapatham, 2005, p. 283). Here, changing, challenging, or adapting the established academic convictions of the non-Anglophone contexts they come from arguably drive these efforts. Besides, these members of peripheral discourse communities are also required to 'write in

[1] This study is based on part of the doctoral thesis "Rhetorical Construction of English Language Teaching Research Articles in Turkish Context: A Genre-based Discourse Analysis", supervised by Assistant Prof.Dr. Savaş YEŞİLYURT at Ataturk University

[DOI: 10.26655/mjltm.2017.11.1]

Downloaded from mjltm.org at 21:07 +0330 on Wednesday January 2nd 2019

disciplinary approved ways as a means of demonstrating their acculturation into the field' (Hyland, 2013, p. 250). Here, the sort of tasks or rhetorical acts that are expected to accomplish seem to be challenging for many because of the identified functions and communicative codes- compulsory and optional ones- embedded in each part of an academic research paper. In this regard, years of studies since the ground-breaking work of Swales (1990) and the insightful contributions of other scholars (Brett, 1994; Kanoksilapatham, 2003, 2005; Kwan & Chan, 2014; Nwogu, 1997; B. Samraj, 2002, 2005; Yang & Allison, 2003) have provided sample models of text segments with defined "social rhetorical acts" (Miller, 1984)- the ones commonly expected in a straightforward research paper genre- on the basis of discursive dynamics across certain scientific platforms. Over these models and following contrastive rhetoric analysis frame, scholars have issued various corpora of manuscripts produced by non-Anglophone researchers and Anglophone ones produced in English and local languages to argue the sort of specified constructions rooted in accomplishing
"the relationship between rhetoric and context of situation" (Miller, 1984) (Ahmad, 1997; Alotaibi, 2013; Fakhri, 2004; Hirano, 2009; Jogthong, 2001; Loi, 2010; Sheldon, 2011).

For local productions written in native tongues, considering the situated acts of the discourses working to fulfill the needs of their own communities, cultural overlaps and contextual traces are the obvious remarks to make. In this respect, these context-bound acts of peripheral discourses are commonly observed especially in the opening sections of manuscripts. Presumably, researchers are entrusted with drawing such inferences from the data by basing them on evidences from the non-English versions of introductions by non-Anglophone scholars. Actually, introductory parts from texts of non-English products have been extensively studied in the fields of ESP and EAP so now numbers, figures and texts would easily permit easy generalizations of how far the social actions are from the logic and values of Anglophone content manifested. Still, there are also some sample texts, though written in a native tongue, showing rhetorical affinity to the basic tenets of Anglophone generic system. The most prominent example of this sort would be Chinese texts, on which Loi (2010) argues the observed effect of global trend, that is English linguicism, and its norms on Chinese scholars' text editing. As for the other parts of research papers, a huge body of research has addressed English texts published in English-medium journals (Basturkmen, 2012; Kanoksilapatham, 2003, 2005; Kwan & Chan, 2014; Lim, 2006; Nwogu, 1997; Pho, 2008; B. Samraj, 2005). The facts and statistics collected about these sections evidence the running social actions, which are established, or contextualized rhetoric so it would be possible to discuss those texts, more specifically, relevant parts as globalized ones based on rules of thumb of English linguicism. In this regard, those acts turn out to be self-fulfilling prophecies because of the platforms, where the aforementioned texts are displayed, expecting the rhetoric to be as it should be.
Considering that the ideological course of Anglophone academic system now seemingly needs to be adopted by all EAL scholars seeking publication in English context, little attention has been, however, paid to peripheral English participation, or, English texts produced in peripheries. Compared to the work about native tongue publications and English manuscripts of celebrated journals, English texts produced in peripheral contexts have received relatively little attention. Sheldon (2011) studied introductions of 54 research articles (RAs) including 18 RAs in English L1, 18 RAs in English L2, and 18 RAs in Spanish focusing on the discourse practices employed in these three RA sets over Swales' CARS model (2004). It was found that RAs in Spanish showed cultural traces while the discourse practices in English L1 corresponded to the ones displayed in Swales' scheme. As for the RAs in English L2, the

[DOI: 10.26655/mjltm.2017.11.1]

Downloaded from mjltm.org at 21:07 +0330 on Wednesday January 2nd 2019

results indicated that the rhetoric in introductions appeared to run parallel to the generic framework of the model. By using a thematic coding framework developed over the quality criteria set by international journals, Jaroongkhongdach, Todd, Keyuravong, and Hall (2012) conducted content analysis on two corpora of RAs written in English including 100 articles by Thai academics and 100 articles from five international selected journals to assess the quality differences of certain sections (literature review, methodology, discussion) between two corpora. It was found that among three sections, discussion and, particularly, literature review of Thai academics' articles showed clear differences in ratings in terms of justification, awareness, and coherence. By means of these findings, they discussed the poorer quality of the Thai ELT manuscripts compared to the higher ratings of international ELT texts by emphasizing that it would be all but impossible for the articles rated poorly to be welcomed for international publication.

While these studies are important in underlining the sort of acts akin to rhetorical codes of English linguicism and the localized ones featuring the contexts, more studies are needed to highlight the features of English texts produced by other non-English speaking discourses. And, these studies may register the sort of distinguishing patterns formed in the English-texts of non-Anglophones and thus demonstrate how different acts are performed in English products separate from English conventions or discuss how the acts are joined to the so-called conventions. At this point, regarding Turkish academic context, little attention was paid to how the moves in English scientific products are substantiated, especially in the fields covering English studies (e.g. English language teaching, linguistics, literary studies, translation studies). Probably because, given the scope involved with scientific domains, there are levels of textual organization for authors which ineluctably intersect with the mentioned English linguicism and its principles. But, here the questions should be designed to elicit information about whether these pieces of works are really constructed to the favoured frame. Among these pieces, research papers have been the regular analysis tools of researchers seeking to locate the generic structures prompted by either contextual habits or universal rules because research papers could provide more space for writers to elaborate on several rhetorical acts.

Therefore, in the present study attempting to address the gap in the literature regarding English studies in Turkish context, more attention will be paid to research papers by Turkish researchers. Here, the researcher intends to move on discourse analysis framewok with a pragmatic presumption of bending of alternative paradigms through multiperspectival approach (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002). On this basis, this study is driven from two basic impetuses. Theoretically, the rhetorical operation and, thus, discursive formulas embedded in the English texts of Turkish researhers would be described, which may set the grounds for further studies to expand on the non-Anglophone academic discourse of Turkish context to see how the authors organize their papers or the types of mechanisms welcomed and/or performed. Pedagogically, the evaluative discourse of the referees and editors, where they manipulate their critical voice by discourse strategies such as criticisms, recommendations, negative evaluations, requests and complements (Betty Samraj, 2016), might work as useful discourse toolkits for non-Anglophone authors seeking ways to build sophisticated and recognized structures in their texts. Thus, in an attempt to extend the scope of discourse studies on non-Anglophone contributions beyond the bare focus on corpus analysis and certain contexts, this study will look for answers to the following questions through reporting referees and editors' comments about the introductory parts of ELT manuscripts by Turkish authors and deepening the issue of non-Anglophone products over contrastive rhetoric analysis:

1)What sort of rhetoric do referees and editors remark in English RPs' introductions of ELT manuscripts in non-Anglophone Turkish academic context?

[DOI: 10.26655/mjltm.2017.11.1]

Downloaded from mjltm.org at 21:07 +0330 on Wednesday January 2nd 2019

2)What are the prevalent discursive acts in the introductory parts of ELT RPs performed by non-Anglophone Turkish academic discourse?

Methodology

Interview and data collection procedure

Referees and editors to take part in this study were recruited by stratifying the sample (ELT editors and referess in Turkish context) randomly and puposefully on the basis of the parameters defining the demographic and academic background of academics embedded in an online survey, and also by asking infromants "to refer the researcher to other participants" (Merriam, 1998, p. 63) to take part in the study. By contacting the candidate informants at ELT departments of univesities in Turkey through an online survey, eliciting information from the statistics and consulting some informants recruiting probable informants, the cooperation of 7 informants (2 referees and 5 referee/editors)[2] were eventually secured. These informants mainly represent the characteristics of three main strata having statistical majority: (i) editors and referees, the sub-strata of whom are Referees (58.9%), Referee/Editors (16.43%), and Editors (6.8.%); (ii) the sort of journals they work for, the two main sub-strata of which are referees and/or editors of national journals (10%) and those of both national and international ones (40%)[3] ; (iii) the number of articles they edit or review per year, the sub-strata of which covered four types of article editing/reviewing counts ranging from 0-5 research articles to more than 15 research articles[4]. In this third stratum, deviating from the sampling system in the first two strata, editors and/or referees were not sampled by the weight of percentage. Indeed, the main factor used to represent the importance of each stratum was the weight of work-load truly offering a great way to expose editors and/or referees to not only contextual but also individual discourses, and so the manifoldness. Therefore, two sub-strata, reviewing/editing of 10-15 research articles and reviewing/editing of more than 15, were the conclusive evidence of sampling.

The qualitative interview was selected as the data collection methodology for this study because it is ideal for "capturing direct quotations about people's personal perspectives and experiences" (Patton, 2002, p. 40) to deepen understanding about real-life situations and emerging cases. However, to avoid any off-topic information but also to accomplish flexibility in probing into the rhetoric in manuscripts, the interview format of this study was semi-structured (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007; Merriam, 1998; Patton, 2002). In this regard, interview questions were systematically developed by constructing well-informed questions generating from the quintesssential works (Bornmann, Herich, Joos, & Daniel, 2012; Bornmann, Nast, & Daniel, 2008; Bornmann, Weymuth, & Daniel, 2009; Bruce, 2008, 2009; Flowerdew, 2001; Mungra

[2] ..among 70 referees and/or editors completing the online survey on the kinds of rhetorical patterns faced in ELT manuscripts by Turkish authors including demographic questions.

[3] To sort out the discursive acts exactly, the sub-stratum of both national and international journals played a decisive part in sampling referees and/or editors because the systems specified for each journal type would likely shape the conception of discourse.

[4] The percentage distribution of editors and/or referees by the frequency of article editing/reviewing per year is 37% editors and/or referess editing/reviewing 0-5 articles per year; %38 editing/reviewing 5-10; %15 editing/reviewing 10-15; %10 editing/reviewing more than 15 articles.

[DOI: 10.26655/mjltm.2017.11.1]

Downloaded from mjltm.org at 21:07 +0330 on Wednesday January 2nd 2019

& Webber, 2010; Pérez-Llantada, Plo, & Ferguson, 2011; B. Samraj, 2005; Sheldon, 2011; Yang & Allison, 2003) with an expert auditing by caring the focus of the study (Merriam, 1998; Patton, 2002); avoiding yes-no questions (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007) and especially leading ones (Merriam, 1998); piloting; modifying, adding and eliminating questions and probes. Throughout the process, the reliability and validity analyses were iteratively conducted to demonstrate that the questions could be intelligible enough for eliciting in-depth knowledge about the contexts (that is, the language and knowledge constructions over experiences, social world understanding, pragmatic concerns, setting) integrated in the rhetoric of manuscripts. In this regard, besides long-period of question construction and piloting the questions with an ELT referee of national and international social science and education journals, the authenticity of the questions was also established by ensuring authentic data regarding the rhetoric in English chemistry education articles by Turkish authors with interviewing with an editor/referee from Chemistry Education Department. Each pilot interview was analyzed by the researcher, transcribed and coded, using the course of qualitative data analysis from Creswell (2005) and (Patton, 2002). The emergent segments and categories of each transcription were cross-checked by seeking the common and deviant codes, with the final coding scheme comprising 9 shared categories[5]. Here, the researcher acknowledges that for reliability checking a systematic coding through inter-rater reliability tests with two or more raters would be more satisfactory and, in a way, this study would seem to fail in achieving a reliability score through the study of multiple coders on the verbatim accounts of editors and referees. However, although such systematic coding is , on the one hand, heavily discussed to enhance the reliability by some certain experts (Creswell, 2007; Merriam, 1998; Patton, 2002), there are arguments against the checking of codes using inter-rater reliability tests emphasizing the probable conflict across different stances each coder would have on the other hand (Armstrong, Gosling, Weinman, & Marteau, 1997; Smagorinsky, 2008).

The entire interview process lasted from 25 to 40 minutes, and all the interviews were digitally recorded with use of two devices simultaneously, a voice recorder and a smart phone, in case of any possible technical problems. The detailed information about the interview schedule can be found in Geçikli (2016, pp. 70-88), where the researcher provided a fuller account of the process including coding and analysis of the results. For the purpose of the present paper, the data provided by the editors and referees for the rhetoric issue of introductory parts in manuscripts of Turkish ELT academics were the main focus. Briefly to mention, the researcher asked editors and referees a number of questions directly related to the sort of discursive acts operated in ELT RPs by Turkish academics within their own academic context. For instance, the researcher asked informants whether they encountered any typical rhetorical patterns in various sections of the manuscripts of non-native English speaking Turkish authors. The researcher also asked informants whether they characterized a culture-specific organization within the generic structure of Turkish authors' research articles.

Corpus and data collection procedure

[5] Discourse-rhetorical features, authorial voice, nativized varieties, parochialism, lexis and grammar, writing/presentation, section content, overall discourse structure (cultural reflection)

[DOI: 10.26655/mjltm.2017.11.1]

Downloaded from mjltm.org at 21:07 +0330 on Wednesday January 2nd 2019

The corpora of the study were compiled from research papers to the parameters such as genre, form, mode factor, channel factor, temporal factor, language code, journal, etc. put by scholars of English for Academic (EAP) and English for Specific Purposes (ESP) with a concern of accomplishing to have two separate but comparable corpora by moving on the principles of contrastive rhetoric framework (Atkinson, 2000; Bruce, 2009; Burgess, Gea-Valor, Moreno, & Rey-Rocha, 2014; Connor, 2002; Moreno, 2003, 2004, 2008; Nwogu, 1997 among others) . In this regard, contrastive rhetoric provides more space to open further discussion on not only cross-cultural variations but also contextual features of local discourses. After a longitudinal study of screening manuscripts within Turkish and Anglo-American contexts, the data to be used were a corpus of one-hundred fifty RPs, seventy-five of which were by Turkish ELT academics and the other seventy-five from the academics of Anglo-American contexts (see Geçikli, 2016, pp. 55-60 for details). To get more stable and valid results with a credible comparison between two corpora, the content analysis framework developed by Jaroongkhongdach, et al. (2012) to assess quality in ELT articles was used [6].

For the analysis of corpora, one of the non-parametric tests, chi-square analysis, was administered using IBM SPSS 23 package programme. In this respect, the reasoning behind the decision for the use of chi-square analysis was two-fold. Firstly, the coding scheme used in collecting qualitative data was in nominal form constructed with categories in which specific type of aspect could be counted to set frequency (see Jaroongkhongdach, et al., 2012 for the coding scheme). The last but not the least, there was a need to compare the counted frequencies in each rhetorical category between Turkish and foreign articles with expected frequencies (fE) that the frequencies of codes would be expected to be the same (McMillan & Schumacher, 2014) .

Findings and Discussion

Introductions as rhetorically the most problematic sections in Turkish academics' RPs

In this part, the researcher will address the research question aiming to elicit the remarks of editors and referees on rhetorical aspects within the introductory parts of Turkish academics' manuscripts by presenting the major themes they emphasized answering the interview questions. To this end, the following part will be arranged on the basis of the thematic structure of interview data editors and referees provided for the questions examining rhetoric issue in the ELT manuscripts' introductions constructed by Turkish researchers.

3.1.1.Lack of strength regarding theoretical research foundation

Here, editor/referees and referees frequently addressed Turkish authors' weakness of these parts in achieving the ultimate function to meaningfully and rationally ground the study in the relevant literature and establish the specific reasoning for the research on the basis of assessment or the reflection of authors on the studies and the context with consideration of the gap and raising issues:

E/R3: Many Turkish writers also find it difficult to state the importance of their research. They are not always able to indicate gaps in the literature, and they may have difficulty explaining how/why their work is significant. For example, in an introduction, they may state that "This study aims to find out..." but fail to follow up the aim of the study by expressing its importance/expected contribution. Likewise, in a literature review, they are often unsuccessful in drawing attention to areas that have been overlooked

[6] Two raters with ELT background and informed about the content analysis framework coded corpora separately. Then, inter-coder reliability was checked through percentage aggreement, and the overall agreement measured is 83.56%.

[DOI: 10.26655/mjltm.2017.11.1]

Downloaded from mjltm.org at 21:07 +0330 on Wednesday January 2nd 2019

and need further study, or in pointing out flaws in existing research. For instance, Turkish writers may argue that their work is significant simply because no such studies have been carried out at their institutions; they are not able to demonstrate any potential practical or theoretical contribution beyond their particular context or explain its significance to the wider community.

In this regard, it would seem that introduction parts of Turkish academics' research papers seem to share common points with the those of several manuscripts from peripheral researchers, or in other words, from other non-native speakers of English (Ahmad, 1997; Fakhri, 2004; Hirano, 2009; Jogthong, 2001; Sheldon, 2011). Then, when examining introduction samples from Turkish context over the Swales' CARS model (1990; 2004), Turkish authors would apparently have some challenges establishing research niche, or colloquially, performing Move 2 of the CARS. Actually, such move demands a well-established background by clearly stating the previous works and their weaknesses. Therefore, researchers should know the relevant literature basically concerning their research problem and how this literature fails in addressing the research problem. Then, here, regarding Turkish academics' introductions, there appear two issues. The first one is linked to the establishing research territory, or in other words, presenting relevant works before discussing gaps. Accordingly, editor/referees implicitly argued the lack of authorial voice, which they refereed was "the lack of argumentation" or "critical evaluation", indeed. In this regard, the role or argumentation to strengthen the study was clearly put by many with the note that they could not see any in the texts.

3.1.2. Lack of research justification through the discussion of specific reasoning and Lack of reflection and argumentation in terms of evaluative perspectives

Some of previous studies point out that the lack of argumentation or authorial voice is a cultural feature (Fakhri, 2004; Jogthong, 2001). On this basis, considering Turkish culture, it could be argued that a kind of criticism avoidance seems to be relevant for Turkish academics, as well. This is also a kind of pragmatic act and it could be considered as a discoursive strategy, maybe, to keep a positive face for recognition by scholars. But, for Turkish academics, what is commonly observed in those parts is, as Hyland (2002a) puts, a dilemma in terms of "a credible representation of themselves and their work" (p. 1091) rather than a discoursive strategy. However, it is essential to note that this is just an assumption about Turkish academics' case and the researcher believes that corpus linguistics-based studies are essential to see whether the avoidance of argumentation is a cultural issue or a kind of metadiscourse strategy by focusing on the frequency of certain lexico-grammatical elements. Overall, the rhetorical organizations of these parts, editor/ referees and referees expressed, tended to cover just listing the studies actually:

E/R1: And it is not only, you know, summarizing... This is what I can see in most of the research studies conducted by Turkish authors... When they are writing literature review they just summarize, which is wrong… To me, writing a literature review is not just listing the studies conducted in the field that you are working on , you need to have a … you need to make a link and you need to develop an argument… So basically writing effective literature review is not only listing the articles. There should be some more arguments developed. There should be sort of more links, you know, between the research itself and the literature review. That is what I don't see in most of the research papers in Turkish studies. They mostly list the studies… I would like to see more developed arguments there.

The other emerging issue related to introductions is mostly concerned with authors' awareness of the literature and awareness of the link expected to be established between research questions of the study and the relevant aspects of that literature. In this sense, it is possible to question whether the

[DOI: 10.26655/mjltm.2017.11.1]

Downloaded from mjltm.org at 21:07 +0330 on Wednesday January 2nd 2019

academic background of researchers is put into practice because both academic writing and research methods courses seemingly enlighten novice researchers and, the experienced ones. Moreover, editors and reviewers' reports have similar functions. At this point, the previous literature clearly shows that the knowledge acquired through instruction is transferred to the scientific products (Dovey, 2006; James, 2006, 2010), and so it seems that this is not the case for Turkish researchers. Nevertheless, it would be too risky to surely claim this; therefore, further investigations, especially, experimental ones are needed to instantiate that Turkish academics do not transfer knowledge to their texts.

3.1.3.Lack of unity and connectedness between/within paragraphs

Regarding introduction section, also, one editor/referee specifically pointed out the problems about the unity of the whole text by discussing the "choppy series of paragraphs" that are not well-connected or coherent:

E/R3: ...In the literature review section of a paper, Turkish authors often have difficulty in creating smooth transitions between topics/sub-topics. This can result in a choppy series of paragraphs that are not well related and do not create a logical flow of thought.

In this sense, it would appear that Turkish academics do not effectively use the linguistic tools to form a jointed body in introductions. In terms of connectors preference, Carrio-Pastor (2013) discusses the effect of target audience, styles of writers, and the linguistic background of authors (p. 200). Among these, considering the question of coherence and cohesion regarding introductions in the papers of Turkish researchers, the effect of writers' styles could be supposed to be one reason. In this regard, Basturkmen and von Randow (2014) point out that the means of language are employed due to the pragmatic concerns of the writers in terms of guiding their readers. In addition, discussing writers' efforts to make texts coherent, Basturkmen and von Randow (2014) specifically emphasize the reader issue as the key factor of making texts coherent through meaningful interpretation and understanding of texts. Then, back to Turkish researchers and their introductions, it could be argued that writers' styles or the ways to use connectors seem not to function as they are expected by their readers, or in other words, editors and referees. So, the texts of Turkish academics have seemingly a chaotic organization.

Additionally, the disjointed structure of introductions may very well be linked to the linguistic background of writers. Indeed, the sensible use of connectors would be probable if their functions could be accomplished according to the normative standards of English language. Thus, it is possible to doubt about Turkish researchers' competency in the intelligible use of those connectors to develop logical and consistent texts. To add, despite being competent enough about the functions of those connectors, still Turkish researchers could not achieve logical flow because this also demands the mapping of cognitive components into the texts, and if these components are not systematically linked in the cognitive schemata, then it is difficult to get a meaningful whole. Therefore, the researcher also believes that for coherence writers should also cohere the elements of texts cognitively before transferring these elements into texts, which seems the main problem of Turkish researchers.

Discursive acts in ELT RPs' introductions of non-Anglophone Turkish academic discourse

The differences in the rhetoric of introduction parts between the corpus of Turkish academic discourse and that of Anglo-American one are presented in Table 3.2.1. This table shows the frequency of articles of each corpus for which a relevant category was rated low, medium or high, and the chi-square value of the differences between two corpora for those ratings. Here, as the main concern of this study is to put the discursive acts in ELT RPs' introductions of manuscripts by non-Anglophone Turkish academics, Anglo-American corpus is associated with the probable criterion for Turkish one which is, then, to be expected

[DOI: 10.26655/mjltm.2017.11.1]

Downloaded from mjltm.org at 21:07 +0330 on Wednesday January 2nd 2019

to have similar rhetorical content of its international counterpart. In this regard, to be at a significant level of 0.000 and the frequency count in the ratings of any level (low, medium or high) for one specific category of a certain corpus are the two main parameters that would be descriptive about rhetoric variation between the two corpora for the related category.

Each category pertaining to the introduction seems to ensure the expected parameters set for fixing the difference for the rhetoric of those sections between the two corpora. Mainly, for the two categories of literature, which concern the issues of coherence and informativenees, more than half of the articles in Turkish corpus were rated medium in the logical flow of ideas within-across paragraphs/sections and in careful composition and balance of aspects on the point being studied over relevant literature while the majority in the international one were rated highly coherent and informative in those aspects, suggesting the difference which is noticeable in the chi-square value. But, interestingly, though it would be considered fundamentally related to those first two categories, the frequency count regarding reflection seems high to some extent. However, it does not reach the expected occurrence of international corpus as the total number of those articles rated medium and low is still high, which may suggest the inefficiency of Turkish authors in generating judgments on the aspects of previous works.

Table 3.2.1.Differences in Rhetoric of Introduction

Category	Frequency Count						Total	Chi-square	df	*p* value
	Low		Medium		High					
	Turkish	International	Turkish	International	Turkish	International				
Coherence	6	1	35	3	24	61	130	19.78	2	.000
Informativeness	5	3	32	3	28	59	130	19.60	2	.000
Reflection	8	3	23	2	34	60	130	15.72	2	.000
Strength of introduction as research foundation	39	4	24	3	2	58	130	31.96	2	.000
Strength of research justification	4	5	16	1	36	59	121[a]	28.00	2	.000

[a] The total frequencies do not add up to 130 because 1) some research articles did not cover related

[DOI: 10.26655/mjltm.2017.11.1]

Downloaded from mjltm.org at 21:07 +0330 on Wednesday January 2nd 2019

category, or 2) the rater could not identify relevant content.

On an ongoing basis, strength of literature review as a research foundation is the lowest rated category that the ratings and chi-square value manifest the remarkable difference between Turkish and international articles in building the study on relevant literature. Indeed, on this matter, one can easily comment that this lower rating would be the presumed one when considering the incidence of the first categories below the expected levels for Turkish research papers. As of the final category, the strength of research justification, the coding showed that some research articles of Turkish corpus did not have the content for this category or it could not be identified, as seen in Table 3.2.1. Moreover, though a considerable part of texts (36) were rated highly, it is still controversial to claim that specific reasoning for conducting the study is properly explained or convincing mainly because of the difference between two corpora. Then, it would be more convenient, as so in the reflection category, to express that the strength of research justification in literature review parts of Turkish articles is on average.

As expected, and also pointed out by the referees and editors of this study, the introduction parts of ELT texts in Turkish context seem to manifest the elements in the relevant literature but this manifestation does not actually go beyond, with the very terms of editors and referees, listing studies considering the medium of informativeness. At that point, it would appear that, the findings of many studies confirm the weighted distribution of previous works done in those parts, either written in English or in any other language, as the straightforward feature of the sections (Ahmad, 1997; Alotaibi, 2013; Jogthong, 2001; Kanoksilapatham, 2003, 2005; Lim, 2012; Loi, 2010; Ozturk, 2007; Sheldon, 2011). Then, researchers from both peripheral contexts, including Turkish one, and Anglophone regions, would rather establish the territory by mainly reviewing previous works and thus may accomplish suggesting academic expertise or considerable knowledge of the field, or at least, relevant tasks in literature. But, for Turkish corpus, it is still questionable whether this medium of informativeness, or review of literature, is really genuine because, if an introduction covers rounded aspects of relevant literature or, in other words, presents supporting elements and all sorts of paradoxes for the issue, then the theoretical foundation would be considered well-established, but this is obviously not so for the introductions of Turkish academics. This would suggest that the items or elements presented in introductions are synthesized just to outline the previous works briefly but not to precisely discuss the central issues or raising questions. In this regard, relatedly, the evaluative skills of academics would be immediately questioned. Actually, in Turkish academics' opening sections of research papers, making evaluative judgments of the previous works seems some sort of superficial consideration for the critical points of literature. In this respect, as mentioned before, researchers widely discuss that lack of argumentation in these parts are generally linked to cultural values of the contexts (Fakhri, 2004; Jogthong, 2001). On the basis of culture factor and considering discussion of Swales and Feak (2004) referring to introductions as mini-critiques in terms of pointing gap or raising questions, we could suggest that Turkish academics might avoid evaluative perspectives due to the conventional moralities so the cultural reflections are also possible in Turkish corpus' introductory parts. Again, moving from Politeness Theory put by Brown and Levinson (1987; as cited in Woods, 2006), we could interpret this tendency as a kind of strategy seeking approval from leading figures and dominant discourses. Here, one may question that research justification seems one of the observed cases looking at the frequency from the table despite the occurrences regarding theoretical

[DOI: 10.26655/mjltm.2017.11.1]

Downloaded from mjltm.org at 21:07 +0330 on Wednesday January 2nd 2019

foundation and evaluative perspectives. In this respect, not directly emphasized, the reasoning would be embedded in the overall manuscript. Finally regarding unity, the poorness of logical relationship between parts of introductions, or weakness in coherence, would also be the predicted one because only a coherent body would ensure a meaningful flow across sentences and paragraphs through achieving cognitive links (problem-solution, cause and effect, argumentation, compare and contrast) among ideas and truly listing studies without any connection would naturally result in independent items in texts.

Overall, the introduction parts of Turkish academics seem to be caught in a vicious circle – any of rhetorical categories are interwoven with the other so any issues concerning a relevant section of introduction appear to affect the other ones. In this regard, this observation in the introduction sections of Turkish academics' texts is closely corroborated with that of Thai articles Jaroongkhongdach, et al. (2012) focused on in terms of remarkable difference with the features of native speakers' manuscripts. Similarly, the in-turn effect of one rhetorical category on another in those parts is clearly put by Jaroongkhongdach, et al. (2012). In short, drawing on the similarities between these two discourses, the cases noticed in introduction parts could be attributed to the peripheral or contextual factors as well as the issue of non-nativeness especially concerning the adoption of Anglophone discourses' academic norms.

Conclusion

This study was concerned with rhetorical constructions in introductions of ELT research articles in Turkish context by drawing on the situated social and rhetorical acts performed in the texts. In this respect, the rhetoric issues in manuscripts were questioned on the data handled through verbatim accounts from editors and referees, and the numeric data from chi-square analysis of the differences between two ELT RP corpora by Turkish researchers and Anglophone researchers. Accordingly, the study queried whether there were peripheral evidences in the texts by benefitting from the arguments contrastive rhetoric study and the remarks of referees and editor/referees centered. Thus, the types of discursive acts embedded in introductory parts were defined and discussed over the peripheral samples. Now, following those facts collected and discussed, the concluding remarks about the research problem will be put.

The introduction units of ELT RPs by Turkish academics are of little depth with indexing of previous works rather than a review or evaluation of their scope. Precisely, the issue of theoretical foundation in introductions is the questionable matter for ELT research papers of non-Anglophone Turkish academic discourse. In this regard, the findings clearly put the weak rhetoric in creating research space in those parts with the lack of emphasizing the gap and establishing the clear reasoning behind the research study through identifying the potential links between previous works and the raising issues, and then announcing their research's position in addressing the questions. Here, the lack of argumentation emerges as the prevailing case for Turkish academic discourse, and so especially over the emphasis of editors and referees, it would seem that Turkish academics mostly prefer an impersonal way of thinking in their written products. From Swalesian perspective, the lack of theoretical basis and niche establishment could be regarded as the lack of not only Move 2, or establishing niche, but also the absence of the first move, that is, establishing research territory to certain extent, simply because, the smooth transition between of which would only promote the logical grounds for the study being conducted. Moreover, although the introductions of ELT RP's produced within Turkish academic discourse show some similar features with those of texts produced in different peripheries by the other non-Anglophone researchers in terms of problems regarding establishing niche and the absence of

[DOI: 10.26655/mjltm.2017.11.1]
Downloaded from mjltm.org at 21:07 +0330 on Wednesday January 2nd 2019

criticism or argumentative styles (Ahmad, 1997; Fakhri, 2004; Hirano, 2009; Jogthong, 2001), as to establishing research territory, the rhetoric in introductions seems mostly based on descriptive paragraphs about previous studies without further reflections on the works done.

This paper deepens the understanding of the discursive acts operated in non-Anglophone Turkish academic context over the discussion on introductory sections of typical and authentic materials, research papers. The particular aspects emphasized about the emerging cases regarding ELT research papers contribute to demystifying the discoursive acts and critically evaluating the deviation observed in Turkish academic discourse from the Anglo-American academic writing norms and contextualization issue. In this aspect, the study also informs the needs for designing appropriate materials, well-planned courses, and well-established EAP curriculums. In addition, this study has made an intriguing contribution by monitoring editors and referees' points about the rhetorical issues in the research papers, whose evaluative judgements on the content of RPs can be used as educational instruments in accomplishing situated discursive acts in not only introductory parts but also other relevant sections of manuscripts.

Despite some similar evidences from peripheral countries shared with the ones observed in some other EFL contexts, there are also some other intrinsic features noticed in Turkish academic discourse that clearly deviate from the established courses in other discourses. Some of those features could be dealt with opening the discussion through alternative explanations; however, it is still questionable whether the context-specific and culture-specific nature of research articles may be linked to conceptualizations of research or conflicts between cultural codes and scientific facts. It may therefore be useful to apply an ethnographic method or the field study to obtain rich data about relationally constructed behaviors in texts. In this respect, this study was restricted to the focus on some social genres (basically context and content schemata, and author stance employed to some extent) in the texts, as well. A further study focusing on the cognitive genres performed in research papers might provide significant insights into the ethnographic sides of rhetorical organization in texts. Again, any data linked to personal experiences of authors may become also a meaningful summary of rhetoric engaged in scientific written communication through discourse-based interviews to display writers' own accounts of reasons to complement the acts observed in the current study.

References

Ahmad, U. K. (1997). *Scientific research articles in Malay: a situated discourse analysis*. Doctor of Philosophy, The University of Michigan, USA.

Alotaibi, H. (2013). *Research article abstracts and introductions: a comparative genre-based study of Arabic and English in the fields of educational psychology and sociology*. Doctor of Philosophy, Texas A&M University-Commerce, USA.

Armstrong, D., Gosling, A., Weinman, J., & Marteau, T. (1997). The place of inter-rater reliability in qualitative research: An empirical study. *Sociology, 31*(3), 597-606.

Atkinson, D. (2000). On Robert B. Kaplan's Response to Terry Santos et al.'s " On the Future of Second Language Writing". *Journal of Second Language Writing, 9*(3), 317-320.

Basturkmen, H. (2012). A genre-based investigation of discussion sections of research articles in Dentistry and disciplinary variation. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 11*(2), 134-144.

Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (2007). *Qualitative research for education: An Introduction to theory and methods* (5th ed.). Boston: Pearson.

[DOI: 10.26655/mjltm.2017.11.1]
Downloaded from mjltm.org at 21:07 +0330 on Wednesday January 2nd 2019

Bornmann, L., Herich, H., Joos, H., & Daniel, H.-D. (2012). In public peer review of submitted manuscripts, how do reviewer comments differ from comments written by interested members of the scientific community? A content analysis of comments written for Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics. *Scientometrics, 93*(3), 915-929. doi: 10.1007/s11192-012-0731-8

Bornmann, L., Nast, I., & Daniel, H.-D. (2008). Do editors and referees look for signs of scientific misconduct when reviewing manuscripts? A quantitative content analysis of studies that examined review criteria and reasons for accepting and rejecting manuscripts for publication. *Scientometrics, 77*(3), 415-432. doi: 10.1007/s11192-007-1950-2

Bornmann, L., Weymuth, C., & Daniel, H.-D. (2009). A content analysis of referees' comments: how do comments on manuscripts rejected by a high-impact journal and later published in either a low- or high-impact journal differ? *Scientometrics, 83*(2), 493-506. doi: 10.1007/s11192-009-0011-4

Brett, P. (1994). A genre analysis of the results section of sociology articles. *English for Specific Purposes, 13*, 47-59.

Bruce, I. (2008). Cognitive genre structures in Methods sections of research articles: A corpus study. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 7*(1), 38-54. doi: 10.1016/j.jeap.2007.12.001

Bruce, I. (2009). Results sections in sociology and organic chemistry articles: A genre analysis. *English for Specific Purposes, 28*(2), 105-124.

Buckingham, L. (2014). Building a career in English: Users of English as an additional language in academia in the Arabian Gulf. *TESOL Quarterly, 48*(1), 6-33.

Burgess, S., Gea-Valor, M. L., Moreno, A. I., & Rey-Rocha, J. (2014). Affordances and constraints on research publication: A comparative study of the language choices of Spanish historians and psychologists. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 14*, 72-83.

Clyne, M. (2002). Contrastive discourse studies. *Cahiers de praxématique, 38*, 58-84. doi: 10.4000/

Connor, U. (2002). New directions in contrastive rhetoric. *TESOL Quarterly, 36*(4), 493-510.

Creswell, J. W. (2005). *Educational Research:Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River: Merrill.

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks,London, New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Dahl, T. (2004). Textual metadiscourse in research articles: a marker of national culture or of academic discipline? *Journal of Pragmatics, 36*(10), 1807-1825.

Fakhri, A. (2004). Rhetorical properties of Arabic research article introductions. *Journal of Pragmatics, 36*(6), 1119-1138.

Flowerdew, J. (2001). Attitudes of journal editors to nonnative speaker contributions. *TESOL Quarterly, 35*(1), 121-150.

Geçikli, M. (2016). *Rhetorical Construction of English Language Teaching Research Articles in Turkish Context: A Genre-Based Discourse Analysis.* Unpublished PhD Thesis, Atatürk University, Erzurum.

Hirano, E. (2009). Research article introductions in English for specific purposes: A comparison between Brazilian Portuguese and English. *English for Specific Purposes, 28*(4), 240-250.

Hyland, K. (2013). Faculty feedback: Perceptions and practices in L2 disciplinary writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 22*(3), 240-253.

Jaroongkhongdach, W., Todd, R. W., Keyuravong, S., & Hall, D. (2012). Differences in quality between Thai and international research articles in ELT. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 11*(3), 194-209.

[DOI: 10.26655/mjltm.2017.11.1]

Downloaded from mjltm.org at 21:07 +0330 on Wednesday January 2nd 2019

Jogthong, C. (2001). *Research article introductions in Thai: Genre analysis of academic writing.* Doctor of Philosophy, West Virginia University, Morgantown, West Virginia.

Jorgensen, M., & Phillips, L. J. (2002). *Discourse Analysis as theory and method*. London: SAGE Publications.

Kanoksilapatham, B. (2003). *A corpus-based investigation of scientific research articles: Linking move analysis with multidimensional analysis.* Doctor of Philosophy, The University of Georgetown University, Washington, DC.

Kanoksilapatham, B. (2005). Rhetorical structure of biochemistry research articles. *English for Specific Purposes, 24*(3), 269-292.

Kwan, B. S. C., & Chan, H. (2014). An investigation of source use in the results and the closing sections of empirical articles in Information Systems: In search of a functional-semantic citation typology for pedagogical purposes. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 14*, 29-47.

Lim, J. M. H. (2006). Method sections of management research articles: A pedagogically motivated qualitative study. *English for Specific Purposes, 25*(3), 282-309.

Loi, C. K. (2010). Research article introductions in Chinese and English: A comparative genre-based study. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 9*(4), 267-279.

Martin, P. M. (2003). A genre analysis of English and Spanish research paper abstracts in experimental social sciences. *English for Specific Purposes, 22*(1), 25-43.

Mauranen, A. (1993). Contrastive ESP rhetoric: Metatext in Finnish-English economics texts. *English for Specific Purposes, 12*(1), 3-22. doi: 10.1016/0889-4906(93)90024-i

McMillan, J., & Schumacher, S. (2014). *Research in Education Evidence-Based Inquiry* (7th ed.). the United State of America: Pearson.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Miller, C. R. (1984). Genre as social action. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 70*, 151-167.

Moreno, A. I. (2003). Matching theoretical descriptions of discourse and practical applications to teaching: the case of causal metatext. *English for Specific Purposes, 22*(3), 265-295.

Moreno, A. I. (2004). Retrospective labelling in premise-conclusion metatext: An English-Spanish contrastive study of research articles on business and economics. *Journal of English for Specific Purposes, 3*, 321-339.

Moreno, A. I. (2008). The importance of comporable corpora. In U. Connor, E. Nagelhout & W. Rozycki (Eds.), *Contrastive Rhetoric: Reaching to intercultural rhetoric*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Mungra, P., & Webber, P. (2010). Peer review process in medical research publications: Language and content comments. *English for Specific Purposes, 29*(1), 43-53.

Nwogu, K. N. (1997). Medical research paper: Structure and functions. *English for Specific Purposes, 16*(2), 119-138.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research & Evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thosand Oaks, London, New Delhi: Sage.

Pérez-Llantada, C., Plo, R., & Ferguson, G. R. (2011). "You don't say what you know, only what you can": The perceptions and practices of senior Spanish academics regarding research dissemination in English. *English for Specific Purposes, 30*(1), 18-30. doi: 10.1016/j.esp.2010.05.001

Pho, P. D. (2008). Research article abstracts in applied linguistics and educational technology: a study of linguistic realizations of rhetorical structure and authorial stance. *Discourse Studies, 10*(2), 231-250.

[DOI: 10.26655/mjltm.2017.11.1]

Downloaded from mjltm.org at 21:07 +0330 on Wednesday January 2nd 2019

Samraj, B. (2002). Introductions in research articles: variations across disciplines. *English for Specific Purposes, 21*(1), 1-17.

Samraj, B. (2005). An exploration of a genre set: Research article abstracts and introductions in two disciplines. *English for Specific Purposes, 24*(2), 141-156.

Samraj, B. (2016). Discourse structure and variation in manuscript reviews: Implications for genre categorization. *English for Specific Purposes, 42*, 76-88. doi: 10.1016/j.esp.2015.12.003

Sheldon, E. (2011). Rhetorical differences in RA introductions written by English L1 and L2 and Castilian Spanish L1 writers. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 10*(4), 238-251.

Smagorinsky, P. (2008). The method section as conceptual epicenter in constructing social science research reports. *Written Communication, 25*(3), 389-411.

Swales, J. (1990). Genre in rhetoric *Genre Analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Swales, J. (2004). *Research genres: explorations and applications.* . Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Yang, R. Y., & Allison, D. (2003). Research articles in applied linguistics: moving from results to conclusions. *English for Specific Purposes, 22*(4), 365-385. doi: 10.1016/s0889-4906(02)00026-1