THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
Faculty of Arts

WRDS 350 *Knowledge-making in the disciplines*

Instructor: Dr. Kate Power Section #: WRDS 350-003	Term 2
Office hours: MWF: 9.30am-10.30am, or by appt.	Class meeting times and locations: M/W/F 11:00-12:00 Leon and Thea Koerner University Centre (UCLL), Room 107
Office: Buchanan Tower 412	Email: katpower@mail.ubc.ca Website: http://blogs.ubc.ca/iandthou/

WRDS 350 is an advanced scholarly writing course which focuses on how professional research writing simultaneously reflects and constructs the different cultures and types of knowledge conventionally associated with social science and humanities disciplines. It is both an appropriate means by which upper-level students can satisfy the UBC Faculty of Arts Writing requirement and an ideal elective for students wishing to prepare for graduate studies.

In this course, you will deepen your existing knowledge of your own disciplinary major by exploring the discursive practices that characterize knowledge-making activities in your field, and by comparing them with the discursive practices found in other disciplines.

Using methods of discourse analysis, you will design and carry out a study relevant to your interests and discipline. In doing so, you will read about social theories of genre and disciplinarity; you will learn to identify various features of scholarly discourse, using corpus-assisted and other discourse analytic research methods; and you will produce a variety of scholarly research genres, using scholarly discourse.

By the end of this course, you should be able to
1. identify the role of disciplinary cultures in generating research genres;
2. make distinctions between scholarly and non-scholarly discourses;
3. apply discourse analytic methods to various research genres;
4. design and execute a theoretically-informed research project on research writing in your disciplinary major; and
5. write in a variety of academic genres, including the literature review, research proposal, scholarly presentation, and research paper.

DEMOCRATIZED CLASSROOM
It is my goal to create a largely democratized classroom taking into account your personal learning goals and interests. This means there will be opportunities for you – both collectively and individually – to make significant decisions about key aspects of this course.

We will discuss this innovative pedagogical approach in class, but you might like to watch this documentary about democratization in the workplace, which is one of my inspirations: http://topdocumentaryfilms.com/capitalizing-happiness/. More information is also provided below, under the heading "ASSESSMENT."

ACCOMMODATIONS:

Please contact the Centre for Access & Diversity (Tel: 604.822.5844; Email: access.diversity@ubc.ca), if you require special accommodations owing to a disability.

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY:

Academic integrity is about much more than just avoiding plagiarism – although that is part of it. More crucially, it involves understanding and adhering to the *research*, *writing* and *interpersonal* values and expectations of the scholarly community in which you are working. Consequently, it will vary to some degree between academic fields and disciplines.

Please make sure you are familiar with UBC's policies around academic misconduct.

ASSESSMENT:

- I will be asking you to complete and submit to me by midnight, Friday September 22 a "Personal Learning Plan" in which you indicate
  - your chosen grade weighting for each task (see pages 5 – 6 below for details); and
  - whether you will be completing Tasks #3-7 individually or with a partner (and, if so, the name of your partner).

- Most of the graded assessment tasks in this course build on one another, such that
  - Tasks #1– 6 (please see the table on page 4 below) contribute to– and may be revised and resubmitted as part of– your final research paper; and
  - It is strongly advisable to select a research topic– and confirm its suitability with me– as soon as possible, and preferably before completing your LITERATURE REVIEW assignment.

- Detailed grading criteria for all assessment tasks are posted on CANVAS and will be discussed in class.
- Tasks #3 – 7 include a graded peer-review process, modelled on professional scholarly peer review: 10% of your grade for each of these tasks will be earned by (i) peer-reviewing your classmates' work, and (ii) reflecting critically on the feedback you receive,

- Please keep paper and/or other reliable back-up copies of all graded assessment tasks: you may be asked to resubmit them at any time.
- Except in the case of an emergency, late tasks will attract a late penalty of 5% per day, including weekends (i.e., a task due Friday, if submitted Monday, will accrue a 15% late penalty).

ATTENDANCE:

I do not award grades for attendance but I believe you will find that regular attendance and active engagement in class will enhance your success in this course.

If there are serious circumstances that prevent you from attending class– e.g., prolonged illness, accident, family tragedy (or spontaneous combustion!)– please speak to Arts Advising in Buchanan D wing about academic concession.

COMMUNICATION:

I will……………

- happily answer any questions you may have, either after class, by email or during my office hours.
- regularly send you course information and updates via your official UBC email account, and by posting information on CANVAS.
- do my best to return all graded assessment tasks to you within one week.
- *reply to email messages within 24 hours, except on weekends (emails received after 5pm Friday will be answered on Monday morning).*
- *do my best to accommodate requests for appointments outside my regular office hours, although I cannot usually meet before 9.30am or after 2.30pm on any day.*

Please……………

- ask me about anything that is unclear to you, either during class, by email, or in my office hours.
- let me know if you are facing any challenges that make participation in class and/or completion of assessment tasks particularly difficult.
- let me know your preferred name and/or pronoun.
- regularly check your official UBC email and CANVAS for information about this course.
- *use "WRDS 350" in the subject line of any emails you may send to me.*
- *restrict your use of laptops and other electronic devices to class-related activities* (e.g., taking notes, accessing readings).
  NOTE: A growing body of research indicates that multi-tasking on laptops is negatively correlated with both learning and student satisfaction – not only for the user but also for his/her fellow students. See, for example:
  > Fried, C.B. (2008). In-class lap-top use and its effects on student learning. *Computers & Education*, *50*, 906-914.
  > Sana, F., Weston, T., & Cepeda, N.J., (2013). Laptop multitasking hinders classroom learning for both users and nearby peers. *Computers & Education*, *62*, 24-31.

REQUIRED READING:

1. **Text book:** There is no text book for this class.

2. **Required readings:** Scholarly articles or book chapters (all of which are available through the UBC Library) have been assigned to specific classes (as listed on pages 6-11 below).

   As indicated in the table on page 4 below,
   - You will be responsible (in pairs) for presenting and leading class discussion on <u>one</u> of the required readings (more detail about this task is available on CANVAS).
   - You will also submit a 1-page summary / reading notes of <u>every</u> reading, on the assigned date.
   - Please bring each required reading to the assigned class – preferably downloaded and printed out – along with your one page summary, and come prepared for discussion.

3. **Additional, recommended readings:** I have included several discourse analytic references on pages 12-15 below, which are likely to be relevant to your individual research project. Don't forget to check the reference lists of any articles you read, for additional sources – and feel free to contact me, if you would like help getting started on your library research.

Assessment Tasks (more information and detailed grading criteria are available on CANVAS)	Recommended % of total grade	OR/ Choose a weighting from these ranges
1 Reading notes – individual activity ▪ *complete <u>a one page summary of each required reading</u>, noting (i) its key concepts/arguments and (ii) any questions /comments/critiques you have (including connections with other things you have read)* ▪ *these notes are intended to help you engage with the course material and prepare for the final exam, so you may complete them in any form you wish (including bullet-points)* ▪ *they will be graded for completion only, but I will provide some feedback on them, where applicable*	5	1 – 10
2 Tutorial presentation – pair / small group activity ▪ *together with your partner(s), lead a 30-40 minutes tutorial on <u>one</u> (1) required reading, summarizing and critically evaluating its key argument, and leading the class in discussion /interactive exercise* ▪ *this task will be graded according to both (i) your understanding and evaluation of the reading, and (ii) your success in promoting student engagement with it* ▪ *a sign-up sheet for partners and readings/dates will be available on <u>the first day of class</u>*	5	1 – 10

3 Literature Review (1,000 words) – individual or pair
▪ *this task is the 1st step towards completing your final research paper – please consult with me about your research topic before you start work on it*
▪ *conduct library research on <u>one</u> (1) of the following:*
  (a) theories of <u>genre</u> OR <u>disciplinarity</u> OR <u>writer identity</u>, as they relate to academic writing,
  (b) empirical, discourse analytic research into <u>academic writing in your discipline(s)</u>;
  (c) the cultural <u>context</u> of academic research and writing in your discipline(s).
▪ *focus on peer-reviewed scholarly literature from the field of writing / discourse studies, such as those listed in the Required Reading and Additional Reading lists in this course outline.*
▪ *where appropriate – especially for option (c) above – you may also refer to literature from your discipline*
	10	5 – 15

4 Corpus & Research questions– individual or pair ▪ *this task is the 2nd step towards completing your final research paper* ▪ *compile a theoretically-informed corpus of <u>twenty</u> (20) peer-reviewed articles (or other approved text types) in your discipline(s)* ▪ *generate <u>six</u> (6) potential discourse analytic research questions with which your corpus might be analyzed (you will use <u>one</u> of these questions in your final research paper).*	5	1 – 10

#	Task		
5	**Research proposal (250 words + reference list) – individual or pair** ▪ *this task asks you concisely to outline the research you would like to do for your final research paper* ▪ *citing relevant discourse analytic literature, identify the "gap" in knowledge your project will address* ▪ *identify your research question(s) and the discourse analytic method you will use to answer it (them)* ▪ *you must have an approved research proposal before completing the remaining assignments*	15	5 – 15
6	**Research presentation – individual or pair** ▪ *present your discourse analytic research findings to the class, using <u>one</u> (1) of the following formats:* *(a) a short but <u>traditional research presentation</u>, designed for a scholarly audience (4 minutes + 1 minute for questions),* *(b) a "<u>3 Minute Thesis</u>," using <u>one</u> (1) PPT slide and addressing a non-specialist audience (3 minute presentation + 2 minutes for questions)* *(c) a <u>creative 2-3 minute video /podcast</u> designed for a popular audience (in this option, you may choose to focus on <u>one</u> (1) of the following: (i) your research findings, OR (ii) a theoretical introduction (supported by your research) to: the genre of "the research article" OR the concept of "disciplinarity" OR the context of scholarly knowledge-making.*	10	1 – 20
7	**Research paper (3,000 words + reference list) – individual or pair** ▪ *this task involves reporting on your analysis of scholarly research writing in your discipline(s), using the IMRD research article genre (typical of scholarship in the sciences and social sciences)* ▪ *your paper should be based on your own corps-based discourse analysis of writing in your discipline(s), but may also include "textographic" elements* ▪ *you might like to <u>consider preparing this paper for publication</u> in an undergraduate discourse analytic journal.*	30	20 – 40
8	**Peer review – individual** ▪ *active participation in peer-review is an essential part of scholarship* ▪ *give and receive peer review feedback with your assigned partner(s) for Tasks #3-7 above* ▪ *respond in writing to the peer review feedback you received for each of these tasks*	10% of your grade for Tasks 3-7 will be earned through the peer review process.	
9	**Final exam – individual** ▪ *the final exam for this course is 3-hours long and has two essay-style questions:* *(a) <u>discourse analysis</u>: identifying the genre of two sample passages, and comparing their rhetorical structure and discursive features; AND* *(b) <u>critical writing</u>: write an extended definition for two (2) key concepts covered in class (from a possible four), OR a literature review about the link between scholarly situation and writing style*	20	20 – 40
	TOTAL	100	

WEEKLY SCHEDULE:

(PLEASE NOTE: class topics and dates for required readings may change, with notice)

Week 1: Scholarly identity

Wednesday, September 6

Focus: A NEW APPROACH TO "GENRE"; ASSIGNING TUTORIAL PARTNERSHIPS
Reading: n/a
Assignment: n/a

Friday, September 8

Focus: CONSTRUCTING YOUR SCHOLARLY IDENTITY
Reading: Flowerdew, J., & Wang, S. H. (2015). Identity in academic discourse. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 35*, 81-99. doi:10.1017/S026719051400021X
Assignments: Write a "personal ad" for this course (this will be discussed in class on Wednesday)
                1st student-led tutorial
                1-page summary / reading notes

Week 2: Discourse & Genre

Monday, September 11

Focus: DISCOURSE ANALYSIS AS A RESEARCH METHOD
Reading: Gill, R. (2000). Discourse analysis. In M. W. Bauer & G. Gaskell (Eds.), *Qualitative Researching with Text, Image and Sound: A Practical Handbook* (pp. 172-190). London: Sage.
                NOTE: Feel free to skip the case study, which starts: "Case study: Death of the dad." If you do, please start reading again at the section titled "Evaluating discourse analysis..." and continue to the end of the chapter.
Assignments: 2nd student-led tutorial
                1-page summary / reading notes

Wednesday, September 13

Focus: GENRE THEORY
Reading: Bawarshi, A. (2003). *Genre and the invention of the writer* (pp. 16-48). Logan, UT: Utah State UP.
                NOTE: Please read only **Chapter 2: The genre function.** Also, please note that Bawarshi wrote an article for *College English* in 2000 with the same title: read the book chapter, NOT the article. Feel free to skip the section titled "Genre as site of literary action," except for the final paragraph, which starts: "We can go a long way toward understanding genres as sites within which individuals acquire, negotiate, and enact everyday language practices..." (bottom page 31). If you do skip that section, please start reading again from the bottom of page 31 and continue to the end of the chapter.
Assignments: 3rd student-led tutorial
                1-page summary / reading notes

Friday, September 15

Focus: GENRE SYSTEMS
Reading: Tardy, C. (2003). A genre system view of the funding of academic research. *Written Communication, 20*(1), 7-36. doi:10.1177/0741088303253569
Assignments: 4th student-led tutorial
                1-page summary / reading notes

Week 3: Disciplinarity

Monday, September 18

<u>Focus</u>:   PUTTING ACADEMIC DISCOURSE IN CONTEXT

<u>Reading</u>:   Paltridge, B. (2008). Textographies and the researching and teaching of writing. *Ibérica, 15*, 9-24.

<u>Assignment</u>:   5th student-led tutorial

               1-page summary / reading notes

<u>NOTE</u>: Sept 19 is the last day to withdraw from this course without W standing.

Wednesday, September 20

<u>Focus</u>:   KNOWING IN THE DISCIPLINES

<u>Reading</u>:   Becher, T. (1994). The significance of disciplinary differences. *Studies in Higher Education, 19*(2), 151-161. doi:10.1080/03075079412331382007

<u>Assignment</u>:   6th student-led tutorial

               1-page summary / reading notes

Friday, September 22

<u>Focus</u>:   WRITING IN THE DISCIPLINES

<u>Reading</u>:   Hyland, K. (2009). Writing in the disciplines: Research evidence for specificity. *Taiwan International ESP Journal, 1*(1), 5-22.

               <u>NOTE</u>: This article is available for free download from Ken Hyland's RESEARCH GATE site: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/267817913_Writing_in_the_disciplines_Research_evidence_for_specificity

<u>Assignments</u>: 7th student-led tutorial

               1-page summary / reading notes

               <u>PLEASE NOTE</u>: YOUR PERSONAL LEARNING PLAN IS DUE BY MIDNIGHT.

Week 4: Designing a research project

Monday, September 25

<u>Focus</u>:   PEER REVIEW – AN EXPRESSION OF COLLEGIALITY

<u>Reading</u>:   Graff, N. (2009). Approaching authentic peer review. *The English Journal, 98*(5), 81-87.

<u>Assignments</u>: In-class peer review for LITERATURE REVIEW assignment, using the approach outlined by Graff.

Wednesday, September 27

<u>Focus</u>:   COURSE REVIEW & FEEDBACK OPPORTUNITY

<u>Reading</u>:   n/a

<u>Assignments</u>: Revised LITERATURE REVIEW due

Friday, September 29

<u>Focus</u>:   CORPUS CONSTRUCTION – DESIGNING A RESEARCH PROJECT

<u>Reading</u>:   Bauer, M. W., & Aarts, B. (2000). Corpus construction: A principle for qualitative data collection. In M. W. Bauer & G. Gaskell (Eds.), *Qualitative Researching with Text, Image and Sound: A Practical Handbook* (pp. 19-37). London: Sage.

<u>Assignments</u>: 8th student-led tutorial

               1-page summary / reading notes

Week 5:

Monday, October 2

Focus: RHETORICAL MOVES & STEPS #1: INTRODUCTIONS

Reading: Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*.
               Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
               NOTE: This whole book is very helpful, but I only require you to read (and we will only discuss in class)
               Section 7.4 *Introductions*.

Assignments: 9th student-led tutorial
               1-page summary / reading notes

Wednesday, October 4

Focus: RHETORICAL MOVES & STEPS #2: DISCUSSIONS

Reading: Cotos, E., Link, S., & Huffman, S. (2016). Studying disciplinary corpora to teach
               the craft of discussion. *Writing and Pedagogy, 8*(1), 33-64.
               doi:10.1558/wap.v8i1.27661

Assignments: 10th student-led tutorial
               1-page summary / reading notes

Friday, October 6

Focus: DISCURSIVE FEATURE #1: PERSONAL PRONOUNS

Reading: Harwood, N. (2006). (In)appropriate personal pronoun use in political science: A
               qualitative study and a proposed heuristic for future research. *Written
               Communication, 23*(4), 424-450. doi:10.1177/0741088306293921

Assignments: 11th student-led tutorial
               1-page summary / reading notes

Week 6:

Monday, October 9

Focus: NO CLASS – THANKSGIVING

Reading: n/a

Assignments: n/a

Wednesday, October 11

Focus: DISCURSIVE FEATURE #2: CITATION

Reading: Hyland, K. (1999). Academic attribution: Citation and the construction of
               disciplinary knowledge. *Applied Linguistics, 20*(3), 341-367.

Assignments: 12th student-led tutorial
               1-page summary / reading notes

Friday, October 13

Focus: DISCURSIVE FEATURE #3: LEXICAL BUNDLES

Reading: Cortes, V. (2004). Lexical bundles in published and student disciplinary writing:
               Examples from history and biology. *English for Specific Purposes, 23*, 397-423.
               doi:10.1016/j.esp.2003.12.001

Assignments: 13th student-led tutorial
               1-page summary / reading notes

Week 7:

Monday, October 16

Focus: DISCURSIVE FEATURE #4: EPISTEMIC MODALITY

Reading: Hyland, K. (1996). Talking to the academy: Forms of hedging in scientific research articles. *Written Communication, 13*, 251-281.

Assignments: 14th student-led tutorial
                1-page summary / reading notes

Wednesday, October 18

Focus: DISCURSIVE FEATURE #5: DEONTIC MODALITY

Reading: Giltrow, J. (2005). Modern conscience: Modalities of obligation in research genres. *Text, 25*(2), 171-199.

Assignments: 15th student-led tutorial
                1-page summary / reading notes

Friday, October 20

Focus: DISCURSIVE FEATURE #6: ENGAGEMENT

Reading: Mei, W. S. (2007). The use of engagement resources in high- and low-rated undergraduate geography essays. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 6*(3), 254-271. doi:10.1016/j.jeap.2007.09.006

Assignments: 16th student-led tutorial
                1-page summary / reading notes

Week 8:

Monday, October 23

Focus: PEER REVIEW – CORPUS & RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Reading: n/a

Assignments: **In-class peer review for CORPUS & RESEARCH QUESTIONS assignment**

Wednesday, October 25

Focus: DISCOURSE ANALYSIS WORKSHOP #1 – mapping the scholarly situation

Reading: n/a

Assignments: **Revised CORPUS & RESEARCH QUESTIONS due**

Friday, October 27

Focus: DISCOURSE ANALYSIS WORKSHOP #2 – mapping rhetorical moves (in light of scholarly situation)

Reading: n/a

Assignments: n/a

Week 9:

Monday, October 30

Focus: DISCOURSE ANALYSIS WORKSHOP #3 – mapping discursive features (in light of scholarly situation)

Reading: n/a

Assignments: n/a

Wednesday, November 1
Focus: RESEARCH PROPOSALS (LECTURE)
Reading: n/a
Assignments: n/a

Friday, November 3
Focus: RESEARCH PROPOSALS (WORKSHOP)
Reading: n/a
Assignments: n/a

Week 10:

Monday, November 6
Focus: PEER REVIEW – RESEARCH PROPOSALS
Reading: n/a
Assignments: **In-class peer review for RESEARCH PROPOSAL assignment**

Wednesday, November 8
Focus: MULTIMODAL ACADEMIC GENRES – RESEARCH PRESENTATIONS & POSTERS
Reading: n/a
Assignments: **Revised RESEARCH PROPOSAL due**

Friday, November 10
Focus: COURSE REVIEW & FEEDBACK OPPORTUNITY #2
Reading: n/a
Assignments: n/a

Week 11:

Monday, November 13
Focus: NO CLASS – REMEMBRANCE DAY
Reading: n/a
Assignments: n/a

Wednesday, November 15
Focus: DATA ANALYSIS WORKSHOP #1
Reading: n/a
Assignments: n/a

Friday, November 17
Focus: DATA ANALYSIS WORKSHOP #2
Reading: n/a
Assignments: n/a

Sunday, November 19

Assignments: **8pm deadline to submit RESEARCH PRESENTATION: Standard PPT, 3MT, or CREATIVE VIDEO/PODCAST**

Week 12:

Monday, November 20
Focus: RESEARCH PRESENTATIONS (as assigned)
Reading: n/a
Assignments: **Provide peer-review feedback to your assigned classmate**

Wednesday, November 22
Focus: RESEARCH PRESENTATIONS (as assigned)
Reading: n/a
Assignments: **Provide peer-review feedback to your assigned classmate**

Friday, November 24
Focus: RESEARCH PRESENTATIONS (as assigned)
Reading: n/a
Assignments: **Provide peer-review feedback to your assigned classmate**

Week 13:

Monday, November 27
Focus: EMERGING SCHOLARLY GENRES
Reading: n/a
Assignments: n/a

NOTE: Nov 28 is the last day to book an exam accommodation for Fall semester exams.

Wednesday, November 29
Focus: PEER REVIEW – RESEARCH PAPERS
Reading: n/a
Assignments: **In-class peer review for RESEARCH PAPER assignment**

Friday, December 1
Focus: COURSE REVIEW & EXAM PREPARATION
Reading: n/a
Assignments: **Revised RESEARCH PAPER due**

Final exam period

I do not hold regular office hours after the final class.
However, you are most welcome to contact me by email, if you have any questions.

Recommended additional reading:

Adami, E. (2009). "To each reader his, their or her pronoun": Prescribed, pro-scribed and disregarded uses of generic pronouns in English. *Language & Computers, 69*(1), 281-308.

Banks, D. (1998). Vague quantification in the scientific journal article. *ASp [Online]*, 19-22. doi:10.4000/asp.2666

Becher, T. (1989). *Academic tribes and territories: Intellectual enquiry and the culture of disciplines*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Bhatia, V. K. (2002). Applied genre analysis: Analytical advances and pedagogical procedures. In A. M. Johns (Ed.), *Genre in the classroom: Multiple perspectives* (pp. 279-284). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Biber, D., & Gray, B. E. (2010). Challenging stereotypes about academic writing: Complexity, elaboration, explicitness. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 9*, 2-20.

Biber, D., & Barbieri, F. (2007). Lexical bundles in university spoken and written registers. *English for Specific Purposes, 26*, 263-286.

Biber, D., Connor, U., & Upton, T. A. (2007). *Discourse on the move: using corpus analysis to describe discourse structure*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Billig, M. (2013). *Learning to write badly: How to succeed in the social sciences*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Busch-Lauer, I. (2000). Titles in English and German research papers in medicine and linguistics. In A. Trosborg (Ed.), *Analysing professional genres* (pp. 77-97). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Caffarella, R., & Barnett, B. (2000). Teaching doctoral students to become scholarly writers: The importance of giving and receiving critiques. *Studies in Higher Education, 25*(1), 39-52.

Carter, M., Ferzli, M., & Wiebe, E. (2004). Teaching genre to English first-language adults: A study of the laboratory report. *Research in the Teaching of English, 38*(4), 395-419.

Charles, M. (2003). 'This mystery. . .': a corpus-based study of the use of nouns to construct stance in theses from two contrasting disciplines. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 2*(4), 313-326.

Charles, M. (2006). The construction of stance in reporting clauses: A cross-disciplinary study of theses. *Applied Linguistics, 27*(3), 492-518.

Charles, M. (2007). Argument or evidence? Disciplinary variation in the use of the Noun that pattern in stance construction. *English for Specific Purposes, 26*(2), 203-218.

Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (1993). *The powers of literacy: A genre approach to teaching writing*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Dahl, T. (2008). Contributing to the academic conversation: A study of new knowledge claims in economics and linguistics. *Journal of Pragmatics, 40*, 1184-1201.

Dahl, T. (2009). The linguistic representation of rhetorical function: A study of how economists present their knowledge claims. *Written Communication, 26*(4), 370-391.

Devitt, A. J. (1993). Generalizing about Genre: New Conceptions of an Old Concept. *College Composition and Communication, 44*(4), 573-586.

Devitt, A. J. (2009). Teaching critical genre awareness. In C. Bazerman (Ed.), *Genre in a changing world* (pp. 337-351). West Lafayette, IN: Parlor Press.

Diani, G. (2008). Emphasizers in spoken and written academic discourse: The case of *really*. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics, 13*(3), 296-321.

Fløttum, K. (Ed.) (2007). *Language and discipline: Perspectives on academic discourse*. Newcastle, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Flowerdew, J., & Forest, R. (2009). Schematic structure and lexico-grammatical realization in corpus-based genre analysis: The case of research in the PhD Literature Review. *Academic writing: At the interface of corpus and discourse*. Eds. Charles, et al. London, GBR: Continuum International Publishing, pp. 15-32. UBC Library E-Books.

Freadman, A. (2012). The traps and trappings of genre theory. *Applied Linguistics, 33*(4), 1-21.

Geertz, C. (2007). "Thick description: toward an interpretive theory of culture" in L.F. Monaghan & J.E. Goodman (eds.), *A Cultural Approach to Interpersonal Communication: Essential Readings*, 27-28. Oxford: Blackwell.

Gesuato, S. (2009). Encoding information in titles: Practices across four genres in linguistics. In C. Taylor (Ed.), *Ecolingua: The role of e-corpora in translation and language learning* (pp. 125-157). Trieste: EUT.

Giannoni, D. S. (2012). Value marking in an academic genre: When authors signal 'goodness'. In V. K. Bhatia & M. Gotti (Eds.), *Insights into academic genres*. Bern: Peter Lang.

Gillaerts, P., & Van de Velde, F. (2010). Interactional metadiscourse in research article abstracts. *Journal for English for Academic Purposes, 9*, 128-139.

Giovanni, P. (2014). Genre organization in specialized discourse: Disciplinary variation across university textbooks. *Discourse Studies, 16*(1), 65-87.

Goldschmidt, M. (2014). Teaching writing in the disciplines: Student perspectives on learning genre. *Teaching & Learning Inquiry: The ISSOTL Journal, 2*(2), 25-40.

Gray, B.E. (2011) Exploring academic writing through corpus linguistics: When discipline tells only part of the story. PhD Thesis. 2011, ISBN 1267114193

Gray, B. E. (2010). On the use of demonstrative pronouns and determiners as cohesive devices: A focus on sentence-initial *this/these* in academic prose. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 9*(3), 167-183.

Groom, N. (2005). Pattern and meaning across genres and disciplines: An exploratory study. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 4*(3), 257-277.

Harwood, N. (2005a). 'I hoped to counteract the memory problem, but I made no impact whatsoever': Discussing methods in computing science using *I. English for Specific Purposes, 24*(243-267).

Harwood, N. (2005b). '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), 343-375.

Harwood, N. (2005c). *'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*, 1207-1231.

Harwood, N. (2007). Political scientists on the functions of personal pronouns in their writing: An interview-based study of 'I' and 'we'. *Text and Talk, 27*(1), 27-54.

Harwood, N. (2009). An interview-based study of the functions of citations in academic writing across two disciplines. *Journal of Pragmatics, 41*(3), 497-518.

Henkel, M. (1997). Academic values and the university as a corporate enterprise. *Higher Education Quarterly, 51*(2), 134-143.

Hewings, A., Lillis, T., & Vladimirou, D. (2010). Who's citing whose writings? A corpus based study of citations as interpersonal resource in English medium national and English medium international journals. *Journal for English for Academic Purposes, 9*, 102-115.

Holmes, R. (1997). Genre analysis and the social sciences: An investigation of the structure of the research article discussion sections in three disciplines. *English for Specific Purposes, 16*(4), 321-337.

Hood, S. (2011). Writing discipline: Comparing inscriptions of knowledge and knowers in academic writing. In F. Christie & K. Maton (Eds.), *Disciplinarity: Functional Linguistics and Sociological Perspectives* (pp. 106-128). London: Continuum.

Hunston, S. (1994). Evaluation and organization in a sample of written academic discourse. In M. Coulthard (Ed.), *Advances in Written Text Analysis* (pp. 191–218). London: Routledge.Hyland, K. (1996). Talking to the academy: forms of hedging in scientific research articles. *Written Communication, 13*, 251-281.

Hyland, K. (1998). Boosters, hedges and the negotiation of academic knowledge. *Text, 18*(3), 349-382.

Hyland, K. (2000). *Disciplinary Discourses: Social Interactions in Academic Writing*. London: Longman.

Hyland, K. (2001a). Bringing in the reader: Addressee features in academic writing. *Written Communication, 18*(4), 549-574.

Hyland, K. (2001b). Humble servants of the discipline? Self mention in research articles. *English for Specific Purposes, 20*, 207-226.

Hyland, K. (2002). Authority and invisibility: authorial identity in academic writing. *Journal of Pragmatics, 34*(1091-1112).

Hyland, K. (2003a). Genre-based pedagogies: A social response to process. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 12*, 17-29.

Hyland, K. (2003b). Self-citation and self-reference: Credibility and promotion in academic publication. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology, 54*(3), 251-259.

Hyland, K. (2005). Stance and engagement: A model of interaction in academic discourse. *Discourse Studies, 7*(2), 173-192.

Hyland, K. (2007). Applying a gloss: Exemplifying and reformulating in academic discourse. *Applied Linguistics, 28*(2), 266-285.

Hyland, K. (2008a). Academic clusters: Text patterning in published and postgraduate writing. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 18*(1), 41-62.

Hyland, K. (2008b). Persuasion, interaction and the construction of knowledge: Representing self and others in research writing. *International Journal of English Studies, 8*(2), 1-23.

Hyland, K. (2010). Community and individuality: Performing identity in applied linguistics. *Written Communication, 27*(2), 159-188.

Hyland, K. (2011). Projecting an academic identity in some reflective genres. *Ibérica, 21*, 9-30.

Hyland, K. (2012). Undergraduate understandings: Stance and voice in Final Year Reports. In K. Hyland & C. Sancho Guinda (Eds.), *Stance and voice in written academic genres* (pp. 134-150). London: Palgrave-MacMillan.

Hyland, K., & Tse, P. (2004). Metadiscourse in academic writing: A reappraisal. *Applied Linguistics, 25*(2), 156-177.

Hyon, S. (1996). Genre in three traditions: Implications for ESL. *TESOL Quarterly, 30*(4), 693-722.

Ivanič, R. (1998). *Writing and identity: The discoursal construction of identity in academic writing*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Johns, A. M. (2008). Genre awareness for the novice academic student: An ongoing quest. *Language Teaching, 41*(2), 237-252.

Julián, M. Q. (2011). More than personal narratives in English academic lectures. *Revista Española de Lingüística Aplicada, 24*, 131-151.

Kedhri, M., Heng, C. S., & Ebrahimi, S. F. (2013). An exploration of interactive metadiscourse markers in academic research article abstracts in two disciplines. *Discourse Studies, 15*(3), 319-331.

Koutsantoni, D. (2004). Attitude, certainty and allusions to common knowledge in scientific research articles. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 3*, 163-182.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation.* Princeton, NS: Princeton University Press.

MacDonald, S. P. (1989). Data-driven and conceptually driven academic discourse. *Written Communication, 6*(4), 411-435.

MacDonald, S. P. (1992). A method for analyzing sentence level differences in disciplinary knowledge making. *Written Communication, 9*, 533-569.

Madigan, R., Johnson, S., & Linton, P. (1995). The language of psychology: APA style as epistemology. *American Psychologist, 50*(6), 428-436.

Marco, M. J. L. (2000). Collocational frameworks in medical research papers: A genre-based study. *English for Specific Purposes, 19*, 63-86.

Martin, J. R. (1997). Analyzing genre: Functional parameters. In F. Christie & J. R. Martin (Eds.), *Genres and institutions* (pp. 3-39). London: Cassell.

McKinley, J. (2015). Critical argument and writer identity: Social constructivism as a theoretical framework for EFL academic writing. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies, 12*(3), 184-207. doi:10.1080/15427587.2015.1060558

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

Myers, G. (1989). The pragmatics of politeness in scientific texts. *Applied Linguistics, 10*(1), 1-35.

Myers, G. (1990). The rhetoric of irony in academic writing. *Written Communication, 7*(4), 419-455.

Myers, G. (2003). Discourse studies of scientific popularization: Questioning the boundaries *Discourse and Society 5*(2), 265-279.

North, S. (2005). Different values, different skills? A comparison of essay-writing by students from arts and science backgrounds. *Studies in Higher Education, 30*(5), 517-533.

Nystrand, M. (1982) *What Writers Know: The Language, Process, and Structure of Written Discourse.* New York: Academic

Odell, L., Goswami, D., & Herrington, A. (1983). The discourse-based interview: A procedure for exploring the tacit knowledge of writers in nonacademic settings. In P. Mosenthal, L. Tamor, & S. A. Walmsley (Eds.), *Research on Writing: Principles and Methods* (pp. 221-236). New York: Longman.

Paltridge, B. (2014). Genre and second-language academic writing. *Language Teaching, 47*(3), 303-318.

Peacock, M. (2011). A comparative study of introductory *it* in research articles across eight disciplines. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics, 16*(1), 72-100.

Pérez-Llantada, C. (2010). The discourse functions of metadiscourse in published academic writing: Issues of culture and language. *Nordic Journal of English Studies, 9*(2), 41-68.

Petrić, B. (2007) Rhetorical functions of citations in high- and low-rated master's theses. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes 6*, 238-253.

Pique-Angordans, J., Posteguillo, S. & Andreu-Beso, J.-V. (2002) Epistemic and deontic modality: A linguistic indicator of disciplinary variation in academic English. LSP & Professional Communication 2(2) 49-65.

Porter, J. (1992). Audience and rhetoric: An archaeological composition of the discourse community. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Reeshemius, G. (2012). Research cultures and the pragmatic functions of humor in academic research presentations: A corpus-assisted analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics, 44*(6/7), 863-875.

Rounsaville, A., Goldberg, R., & Bawarshi, A. (2008). From incomes to outcomes: FYW students' prior genre knowledge, meta-cognition, and the question of transfer. *WPA: Writing Program Administration, 32*(1), 97-112.

Scollon, R. (2004). Intertextuality across communities of practice: Academics, journalism and advertising In C. L. Moder & A. Martinovic-Zic (Eds.), *Discourse Across Languages and Cultures* (pp. 149-176). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Swales, J. M. (1998). Textography: Toward a contextualization of written academic discourse. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 31*(1), 109-121.

Swales, J. M. (2005). Attended and unattended "this" in academic writing: A long and unfinished story. *ESP Malaysia, 11*, 1-15.

Swales, J., Ahmad, U. K., Chang, Y.-Y., Chavez, D., Dressen, D. F., & Seymour, R. (1998). Consider this: The role of imperatives in scholarly writing. *Applied Linguistics, 19*(1), 97-121.

Tadros, A. (1993). The pragmatics of text averral and attribution in academic texts. In M. Hoey (Ed.), *Data, Description, Discourse: Papers on the English Language in Honour of John McH. Sinclair* (pp. 98-114). London: HarperCollins.

Tang, R., & John, S. (1999). The "I" in identity: Exploring writer identity in student academic writing through the first person pronoun. *English for Specific Purposes, 18*, S23-S39.

Taş, E. E. I. (2010). "In this paper I will discuss...": Current trends in academic writing. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences, 2*, 121-126.

Teich, E., & Holtz, M. (2009). Scientific registers in contact: An exploration of the lexico-grammatical properties of interdisciplinary discourses. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics, 14*(4), 524-548.

Thaiss, C., & Zawacki, T. M. (2006). Faculty talk about their writing, disciplines, and alternatives. In C. Thaiss & T. M. Zawacki (Eds.), *Engaged Writers and Dynamic Disciplines: Research on the Academic Writing Life* (pp. 32-57). Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Thompson, G. (2001). Interaction in academic writing: Learning to argue with the reader. *Applied Linguistics, 22*(1), 58-78.

Thompson, G., & Ye, Y. Y. (1991). Evaluation in the reporting verbs used in academic papers. *Applied Linguistics, 12*(4), 365-382.

Thompson, P., & Tribble, C. (2001). Looking at citations: Using corpora in English for Academic Purposes. *Language Learning & Technology, 5*(3), 91-105.

Tucker, P. (2003). Evaluation in the art-historical research article. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 2*(291-312).

Vande Kopple, W. J. (1994). Some characteristics and functions of grammatical subjects in scientific discourse. *Written Communication, 11*(4), 534-564.

Warchal, K. (2010). Moulding interpersonal relations through conditional clauses: Consesus-building strategies in written academic discourse. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 9*, 140-150.

Wardle, E. (2009). "Mutt genres" and the goal of FYC: Can we help students write the genres of the university? *College Composition and Communication, 60*(4), 765-789.

Webber, P. (1994). The function of questions in different medical journal genres. *English for Specific Purposes, 13*(3), 257-268.

Wynne, M. (2010). Interdisciplinary relationships. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics, 15*(3), 425-427.