國立交通大學

英語教學研究所碩士論文

A Master Thesis
Presented to
Institute of TESOL,
National Chiao Tung University
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of
Master of Arts

撰寫期刊論文的序論:寫作困難及寫作策略

Writing RA Introduction: Difficulties and Strategies

研究生：徐昱愷

Graduate: Yu-Kai Hsu

指導教授：郭志華

Advisor: Chih-Hua Kuo

中華民國九十八年七月

July, 2009

論文名稱: 撰寫期刊論文的序論:寫作困難及寫作策略

校所組別: 國立交通大學英語教學研究所

畢業時間: 九十七學年度第二學期

指導教授: 郭志華教授

研究生: 徐昱愷

中文摘要

對許多英語為非母語人士而言，英文期刊論文中的序論是最難撰寫的一章。Swales 認為撰寫的難處在於滿足兩種需求：吸引讀者以及獲得認可並被接受。Swales 認為這些需求必須展現在所謂的創造研究空間(Create a Research Space or CARS)的修辭結構中，這個結構蘊含複雜的文步(moves)與次要文步(steps)。然而，期刊序論的文體分析大部分僅限於修辭結構上的分析。鮮少有研究探討英語為非母語的人士撰寫這一個章節所經歷的寫作過程，例如探討他們在寫作上的困難及寫作策略的運用。

本研究採用個案研究(case study)之研究方法，以質化的角度來看兩位來自不同領域(應用語言學、資訊工程)的台灣博士班學生如何撰寫國際期刊論文，特別著重在他們寫序論的過程中所遭遇到的各種困難與使用的寫作策略。本研究的資料蒐集來自多重來源(multiple sources)，以便能呈現更完整的寫作面向以及整體的寫作歷程。資料的蒐集來源包含博士班學生所撰寫的投稿稿件，指導教授的評論，及與期刊審查者的審查意見。此外，研究者亦與這些博士班學生以及他們的指導教授進行深度訪談，以澄清、明瞭這些新進學者在撰寫序論時的寫作困難及策略。

研究的結果顯示這些新手寫作上的困難和序論的修辭結構十分相關。例如，這兩位研究參與者都覺得要在文獻探討後批評前人研究的缺點是件困難及令他們不安的事情。另外，我們也發現寫作序論的困難與策略在不同領域之間有所不

同，這似乎顯示了理工與社會人文領域之間的差異。像是資訊工程的知識建構是比較偏重在「方法」上（method-oriented），而應用語言學則是比較偏向「言談」（discursive）及「論說」性質（argument-oriented）。事實上，這樣的領域差異性展現在序論寫作的許多層面上，從寫作的歷程、寫作上所遇到的問題、及寫作時所運用的策略都在在顯示了領域的相異性。舉例來說，在寫作之前的規劃上，資訊工程的研究參與者試圖將其知識宣稱（knowledge claims）建構在他所使用的「研究方法」的價值上;相對而言，應用語言學的研究參與者則是從「研究目的」來決定該探討哪些文獻及提出何種知識宣稱。甚者，就寫作困難而言，前者遭遇較多的困難包含如何清楚描述採用的研究方法、簡潔正確地總結前人研究的方法、及顯示本身研究方法的價值，這些困難幾乎都跟「方法」有關；相對地，後者的主要困難在於：提供讀者適切的主題背景概論（topic generalization）、使用合乎邏輯的論述、文章具有連貫性與轉折銜接、及提出有力的論點，這些問題的本質都跟文章整體的「論證」極為相關。除此之外，寫作策略的不同更進一步顯現領域之間的差異性：前者偏向採用跟方法有關的寫作策略（像是在做文獻探討時，為了要正確、精簡地總結前人的方法，他所發展出來的策略是模仿所要引用文章中結論的第一句話）；後者的策略則是跟她的論證與推理有關，比方說，寫作前的規劃，她會詳盡地列出要點(outlining)，安排順序，以便協助她撰寫出具有邏輯的序論。最後，根據這些質化的主要研究結果，本論文討論了期刊論文寫作教學上的應用與省思，期待能協助英文為非母語的新進學者成功地撰寫這個艱難的文體。

ABSTRACT

Introduction in research articles (RAs) is perceived by many L2 writers as the most difficult section to write (Flowerdew, 1999; Shaw, 1991; Swales, 1990). As Swales (2004) has indicated, there may be two main reasons for this: the need to attract an audience and the need to compete for acceptance and recognition. In Swales' words, these needs should be met in the rhetorical organization of "creating a research space" in Introduction, which involves complicated moves and steps. Most genre studies on Introduction, however, have focused on its rhetorical move structure. Little research is concerned with how RA writers, particularly L2 writers, learn to cope with this section, such as their writing difficulties and strategies.

Adopting the method of case studies, the present study presents an in-depth qualitative study of two Taiwanese doctoral students from two disciplines (Applied Linguistics and Computer Science) writing for international publication, focusing on their difficulties and strategies during their process of writing Introduction. Multiple sources of data were collected and analyzed, including major drafts of the student participants' papers, their advisors' comments, and, if any, correspondences with journal editors. Moreover, interviews with the student participants and their advisors were also conducted to further clarify and understand these novice writers' specific difficulties and strategies in writing Introduction.

Results show that L2 novice researcher writers' distinctive difficulties in writing Introduction are closely related to the rhetorical organization of Introduction. For example, both participants seem to have difficulties and unease in making negative evaluations after doing literature review, as in Swales' (1990, 2004) "creating a niche." Furthermore, disciplinary variations in difficulties and strategy use are found, an indication of disparities between soft science and hard science. Specifically, it is

found that knowledge construction in the discipline of Computer Science is more method-oriented whereas the discipline of Applied Linguistics is more discursive and argument-oriented. Such disciplinary contrasts are manifest in a number of ways in terms of process, difficulties, and strategies of writing Introduction. At the planning stage, the participant from Computer Science tried to ascertain his knowledge claims on the basis of the values of his "method" whereas the participant from Applied Linguistics used her "purpose statements" of the study to decide what to review and what kind of knowledge claims she should form. Additionally, with regard to difficulties of writing Introduction, the former encountered more difficulties in delineating his own method, summarizing methods of related previous studies, and proclaiming the values of his method, which are mostly method-related. The latter encountered more difficulties in making appropriate topic generalization, making logical sequencing and transitions, forming forceful arguments, all of which are closely related to the overall argumentation. The types of strategies identified in the study further attest the disciplinary differences: the former seems to deploy more method-related strategies (such as copying the first sentence of the Conclusion from the published paper to help him succinctly and correctly summarizing the cited study); the latter was concerned more about her reasoning and argumentation; for instance, she used detailed outlining to assist her writing of Introduction. Finally, pedagogical implications regarding how to assist L2 novice researchers to grapple with such a sophisticated genre are also discussed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis study encapsulates my numerous bittersweet memories of the three years spent in the master's program. Throughout this brain-racking research process as well as long-festering text formation, I feel fortunate and extremely grateful to a number of important people that have guided, enlightened, and supported me. First, without doubt, I would like to express my utmost appreciation to my advisor, Professor Chih-Hua Kuo. She embodies all the good traits that I could ever expect from an advisor and hope to become – a knowledgeable researcher, superb academic writer, righteous teacher, and caring mentor. Without her continuous guidance and unwavering support, this thesis study would have been immeasurably more difficult.

Besides, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my two sagacious and benevolent committee members, Professor Stephanie W. Cheng and Professor Tsai-Yu Chen, for their insightful and detailed comments on my thesis, enabling me to rethink many issues that were originally left out. Their warm remarks also encourage me greatly as a novice researcher and writer in the field.

Special thanks must be extended to my participants in this study, Chris and Anne. But for their patience and generosity of answering my seemingly never-ended questions, and without their wholehearted sharing of their experiences, the results would not have been that fruitful. Moreover, I feel privileged to interact with their respectable advisors, Professor Shen and Professor Liu. Enlightened by their illuminating remarks, I become increasingly aware of numerous hidden rules and strategies of academic writing and research.

I am also indebted to the encouragement and love of my beloved family, including my parents, my younger brother, my aunties, and my just deceased grandma. Nervous and panic as I often was, they soothed, comforted, and motivated me, propelling me to continue to try and continue to learn. Finally, I am thankful for my endeared friends: Karen, Gary, Wales, Joseph, Patrick, Kevin, Elisa, and Louie. Because of their wacky behaviors, endearing personalities, agreeable companions, the quest for knowledge is never lonely but filled with joyful and memorable moments.

Thank you all for those who care and support me for the past three years. Another journey awaits me. Blessed and grateful, I will continue to learn and keep these fond memories forever in my heart.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

中文摘要…….. ii
ABSTRACT ……..... iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS……..... vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS …… vii
LIST OF TABLES …….. x
CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION ……..... 1
CHATPER TWO LITERATURE REVIEW ……..... 7
Move Analysis of RA Introduction …….. 7
Macro-level Studies on RA Introduction…….. 11
Macro-level disciplinary variation ……... 13
Micro-level Studies on RA Introduction …….. 18
Micro-level disciplinary variation ……..... 21
Citation practice …….. 21
Metadiscourse ……. 23
Difficulties of L2 Researcher-writers ……... 27
Difficulties in writing RA Introduction …….. 31
L2 Writers' Composing Process …….. 35
Coping strategies ……. 39
The use of L1 ……... 39
Using previous literature as models ……..... 40
Exploiting the linguistic resources at hand ……..... 41
Consulting resource material ……... 42
Seeking external help from NSs ……..... 43
Opting for certain types of research ……..... 44
Rhetorical strategies ……..... 46
CHAPTER THREE METHOD …… 50
Participants …….. 50
Data Collection ……..... 53
Questionnaire ……... 54
Textual data …….. 54
Interviews …… 55
Data Analysis ……... 57
CHAPTER FOUR RESULTS ……..... 60
Background of Case 1 …….. 60
Perceptions of Writing Major Rhetorical Sections ……... 62
Process of Writing Introduction ……... 64

Drafting process ……... 64
Difficulties in early drafting process ……... 64
Ascertaining the method before writing Introduction …….. 65
Difficulties in summarizing and paraphrasing previous studies ……... 65
Summarizing others' methods based on published texts …….. 66
Using integral citations to arouse readers' interest …… 68
Being cautious about negative evaluations ……... 69
Difficulties in summarizing his method in Introduction …….. 70
Advisor's revision before journal submission ……. 71
Adding a clear illustration of the model …… 72
Adding more specific information in positive justification and principal findings …… 73
Making "itemized" presentation of the contribution claims …….. 75
Difficulties in proclaiming contributions ……... 75
Negotiating knowledge contributions with the journal referees …….. 76
Dealing with reviewers' comments …….. 76
Foregrounding contribution claims ……... 77
Justifying and providing sufficient background information for new terms …….. 78
The story goes on …… 82
Citing the lab's works …… 82
Citing the works from the target journal ……... 83
Learning to grasp main points from various academic generic experiences ……... 83
Background of Case 2 ……. 86
Perceptions of Writing Major Rhetorical Sections …….. 87
Process of Writing Introduction …….. 88
Drafting process …….. 88
Making a detailed outline and using her mother tongue to plan …….. 88
Difficulties in sequencing and making transitions ……... 89
Using CARS model as outlining scheme ……... 90
Using "purpose statements" to generate her outline …….. 91
Difficulties in providing general background knowledge at the outset of Introduction …… 91
Dealing with local development of text with confidence …… 93
Using her advisor's published works as stylistic models ……... 94
Forming awareness of coherence and cohesion ……... 95
Making notes as reminders for herself and for her advisor …….. 96

Using integral and non-integral citations for different purposes …… 97
Making arrangement of the reviewed studies to lead to her research aims …… 98
Advisor's revision before journal submission …… 100
Difficulties in presenting logical and coherent arguments …… 101
Difficulties with citations to support knowledge claims …… 104
Adding citations strategically …… 105
Irrelevant review breaks the coherent flow of the review theme…… 108
Difficulties in making forceful and concise propositions …… 108
Difficulties in indicating a forceful gap …… 109
CHAPTER FIVE DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS …… 112
Summary of the Findings …… 112
Pedagogical Implications …… 122
Limitations of the Study …… 125
Suggestions for Future Research …… 126
REFERENCES …… 127
APPENDICES …… 136
Appendix A Consent form for student participants …… 136
Appendix B Consent form for advisors…… 137
Appendix C Questionnaire …… 138
Appendix D Interview questions with student participants …… 142
Appendix E Interview questions with students' advisors……..…… 147
Appendix F The combined CARS model for data analysis …… 149

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1	The CARS Model for RA Introduction	8
Table 2.2	Functions of Metadiscourse in Academic Texts	25
Table 3.1	Participants' Demographic Information	51
Table 3.2	Self-evaluated Language Proficiency in General English	52
Table 3.3	Self-evaluated Academic Literacy	52
Table 3.4	Participants' English-medium Scholarly Publication Experiences	53
Table 4.1	A Timeline of Chris' Scholarly Publication Process	61
Table 4.2	Chris' Perceived Difficulty Level of Each Rhetorical Section	62
Table 4.3	Addition of Specific Positive Justification of the Proposed Method	73
Table 4.4	Addition of Specific Information in Principal Findings and Contributions	74
Table 4.5	Focused Presentation of the "Omni-directional Camera" and "Circular Landmarks"	78
Table 4.6	Anne's Perceived Difficulty Level of Each Rhetorical Section	88
Table 4.7	The Sequence of the Cited Studies in the Review of Lexical Bundles	99
Table 4.8	Difficulties in Making Logical and Coherent Presentation	102
Table 4.9	Difficulties in Supporting Knowledge Claims	105
Table 4.10	Insufficient Review and Irrelevant Review	106