

GENDER DIFFERENCES IN THE PERCEPTIONS OF THE RHETORIC ORGANIZATION OF AN ACADEMIC GENRE: A QUANTITATIVE STUDY

Merve GEÇİKLİ (*)

Abstract

The present paper attempts to extend the research carried out for a master degree through the application of a 5 point rating scale. The study investigates how variation in rhetorical strategies employed in introductory sections of master theses is put between genders in terms of their perceptions and, in this regard , it proceeds with a hypothesis that claims a significant difference between males and females involved in the field of ELT on the employment of rhetorical strategies in the modified version of Swales' CARS model. The results show that there is statistically significant difference between genders in terms of the perceptions on the application of the rhetoric suggested in the model, which, hereby, promotes the hypothesis of the study.

Keywords: CARS model; Gender Differences; Perception; Master Thesis Introductions; Rhetorical Strategies

Akademik Bir Metnin Söylem Düzenlemesine Yönelik Algılarda Cinsiyet Farklılıkları Üzerine Nicel Bir Çalışma

Öz

Bu çalışma; daha önce yapılmış olan bir yüksek lisans tez çalışmasının, beşli likert ölçeği aracılığıyla farklı bir boyutunu ele almaktadır. Çalışma yüksek lisans tezlerinin giriş bölümlerinin söylem düzenlemesinde algı boyutunda cinsiyetler arası farklılıklardaki değişkenliğin ne yönde olduğunu ortaya koymayı hedeflemektedir ve bu bağlamda, araştırma, söylem stratejilerinin uygulanması noktasında İngiliz Dili ve Eğitimi alanı üzerine çalışan bay ve bayanlar arasında algı yönünden farklılıklar olduğu varsayımı üzerinden ilerlemektedir. Sonuçlar, Swales'ın düzenlenmiş versiyonundaki modelde sunulan söylem yapısının uygulanmasında cinsiyetler arasında anlamlı bir farklılık olduğunu göstermiştir. Bu sonuç, çalışmanın ortaya attığı varsayımı doğrulamaktadır. Bu noktada, sonuçlar genel olarak modelin düzenlenmiş versiyonundaki yapının uygulanmasında bay katılımcıların bayan katılımcılardan daha fazla önem atfettiğini göstermektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: CARS modeli; Cinsiyet farklılıkları; Algı; Yüksek lisans Tezi Giriş Bölümleri; Söylem Stratejileri

*) Arş.Gör., Atatürk Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi (e-posta: merve.gecikli@atauni.edu.tr)

1. Introduction

The study of basic differences between sexes in writing tendency is, actually, an important aspect of knowledge on contextual factors systematically determining all the process of writing experience. That is, the data on the preferences of males and females in the structural and linguistic organization of genres provide information on inter and intra-cultural, and contextual drivers effecting the structural and linguistic arrangements of written texts. However, strikingly, the related literature examining manuscripts seems to fall behind examining sex differences with just a few researches carried, and whether females and males differ in how they write and why they differ or not are two raising questions of genre research at present. What is more, the studies have been generally focused on the differences in terms of verbal ability (e.g. Pennebaker *et al.* 2003) rather than writing so the data on gender differences in terms of writing performance is rather limited.

Studies conducted up to now have varied in terms of the genres selected to measure the similar and different employments between genders. In one side of research, there are studies which have mainly focused on the sex differences in essay genres which were produced by undergraduate students as assignments or as the tools of assesment (e.g Hartley *et al.*, 2007; Robson *et al.*, 2002). The findings of these studies interestingly show significant similarities between genders in application rather than differences except for some situation-based nuances. However, the analyses of these texts were carried through counting of words by hand and this reduced “both the numbers of students and essays involved, and the lengths of the texts that are sampled” (Hartley, 2008, p. 162). Thus, as the data obtained in these researches were the products of data collection procedure from fairly small samples, and, as the reliability and validity of the results are in question in such cases, there raises a demand for replication of these studies with a larger sampling for more generalizable findings.

As for the other line of research, it covers those which have assesed differences between the language of male and female in e-mail texts (Colley *et al.*, 2004; Thomson and Murachver, 2001) and academic manuscripts (e.g. Martin, 1997; Hartley *et al.*, 2002; Hartley *et al.*, 2003; Rude *et al.*, 2004; Fox, 2005; Peterson, 2006). In studies examining e-mail writing, the results show some significant differences between genders from certain aspects. For example, Colley *et al.*, for instance, found that female students’ emails were longer than those of men, involved less offensive language, and contained more humour and exclamation marks when they were sent to other women (Hartley, 2008, p.162). As to those ones on academic manuscripts, again, minor differences have been found between sexes. For instance, in his study, Hartley *et al.* (2003) states that the clearest difference was that single men and pairs of women produced texts with higher readability scores than did pairs of men and single women, on which no explanation could be provided even by the researchers themselves.

As the literature shows, the research has tended to focus on measurement of writing tendencies of males and females and comparison between these tendencies to a lower

extent, and, since there have been few studies on sex differences in the writing, there are fewer results to report. Then, it would thus be of interest to learn any difference between males and females in terms of their writing inclinations during the production of a manuscript. Moreover, it would seem that further investigations are needed in order to measure the perceptions of each gender about writing besides the analysis of texts they produce. Thus, driving from this emphasized gap in the literature on gender differences in writing, the present study extends the research to graduate-level writing performance to hypothesize the differences in perceptions of each gender on arrangement of an academic text introduction – arrangement of master thesis introductions. At this point, to the knowledge of researcher, in previous literature, there is no any recorded study focusing on variation of the ideas on the organization of an academic genre between different genders, and therefore, it would seem that this study can be the first one to address such an issue within the research domain of writing studies. From this aspect, it is believed that this study will contribute to the scope by broadening the perspectives of the scholars with the introduction of a different dimension of writing continuum.

From this point forth, this paper uses a five-item likert scale, developed for a master degree proficiency (Geçikli, 2012) based on the revised version of Swales' CARS model (Soler-Monreal and et al.'s, 2011) (see Appendix 3 and Appendix 4), to investigate whether there is any difference between the perceptions of females and males in the arrangement of the introductory parts of master theses in the field of English Language Teaching. Specifically, the researcher draws the study on a hypothesis:

There is a significant difference between the perceptions of males and females involved in the field of ELT on the application of the rhetorical strategies in the introduction sections of master theses.

2. Methodology

2.1. Data Source

2.1.1. Participants

Four hundred and three Turkish practitioners (research assistants, lecturers, associate and assistant professors, professors, and students enrolled in doctorate programme in the institutes of social sciences at different universities), who are actively involved in ELT field and enrolled in and completed Master of Art Graduate Programmes within this field at different universities in Turkey, volunteered to participate in this study. All the respondents of the study attended master programmes within the institutions of social sciences, and their major field is English Language Teaching. The percentage of female participants form % 55,8 of the total number (N=225) and the percentage of male participants is %44,2 (N= 178). (Geçikli, 2012, p.86)

2.1.2. Scale

A five-item likert scale, which was developed on the basis of a revised version (Soler-Monreal et al.'s model, 2011) of CARS model and adapted to Turkish context, was used

in order to assess the significance ratio of creating a research space (CARS model) within introductions of master theses from the perspectives of practitioners involved in the field of ELT. It measures three phases of CARS model -*Establishing a Research Territory, Establishing a Niche and Occupying the Niche*- through three separate sections, each of which aims to answer a specific question with the items characterized for each part. (see Appendix 2) (Geçikli, 2012, p.87)

The basic rationale applying such a data collection tool is its efficiency “in terms of researcher time and effort and financial resources:by administrating a questionnaire to a group of people, one can collect a huge amount of information less than an hour”(Dörnyei, 2011, p.115). At this point, Johnson and Christensen (2004) states that researchers use questionnaires so that they can obtain information about the thoughts, feelings, attitudes, beliefs, values, perceptions, personality, and behavioral intentions of research participants (p.164). In other words, as they go on, researchers attempt to measure many different kinds of characteristics using questionnaires (p.164). With such a versatile application content, it was thought that to use questionnaire for data collection would be the valid and informative one in terms of the generalizable results to obtain.

2.2. Data Collection Procedure

Consent forms were distributed and collected before the administration of scales (see Appendix 1). These consents forms provided a brief explanation of the study and stressed out the confidentiality of participant responses. Then, a total of 450 scales were administered to the practitioners involved in the field of ELT and who had a graduate-level degree of Master of Arts. They were administered through e-mail, that is the researcher emailed the scales to the members of the sample, and by one-to-one. Forty seven scales were not included in the data analysis due to two basic reasons: two or more of the questions were not answered or more than one answer was given to any question. Of the 403 usable scales, 225 were completed by female participants and 178 were completed by male participants. (Geçikli, 2012, p.88)

2.3. Data Analysis

Quantitative data were analyzed through Statistical Package for the Social Sciences Programme (SPSS 18.0). In the analysis procedure, descriptive statistics were conducted through frequency analysis, calculations of mean scores, standard deviation, and percentile ranks. As to inferential statistics, t-test analysis was conducted, and p- value for each question was calculated. The significance level determined for this study was $\alpha = 0,05$ and the sampling error was $\pm 0,05$. (Geçikli, 2012, p.92)

3. Results

The hypothesis of the study was confirmed by the results of t-test analysis that statistically significant differences were found between genders in terms of the perceptions on the employment of the steps involved in the model. In general, males expressed a significantly higher importance about the application of the rhetorical strategies identified

for each move than females. This result may suggest that male participants heavily stress on a more complex organization of introductions with a specific involvement of each detail about the work done than females. At this point, it seems that female participants support a more abstract introduction sections by pointing out the explanation of some certain dimensions of the study. Besides these, this divergency may be based on the different academic contexts, of which they are members, in which different procedures are followed in the rhetorical, structural, and linguistical arrangements of the academic manuscripts. Finally, this result may lead to the assumption that to appeal to the discourse community in terms of the validity and credibility of the study and thus to locate their study in the research territory males seem to support using a wide range of strategies.

3.1. MOVE-1- Establishing a Territory

Means and standard deviations for each item of Move-1 (Establishing a Territory), for females and males, are presented in the Table 1. The results of the SPSS analysis show that there is a significant difference between females and males in terms of the importance degree given to the each item of Move-1($p = .000$ for each item, and $p = .032$ for females and $p = .028$ for males for the second item, $p < 0,05$). For claiming centrality, males and females did not have striking different scores, but males find to show that the general research area is interesting and central more important than females. The findings were also similar for the second item; that is, again they did not have significantly different scores so that the importance degree of making topic generalization given by both females and males was almost the same and each group found presenting general information about the research area moderately important (means for females= 3,0533 and means for males=3,1910) .

Table 1. *T-Test results, means(m), standard deviations(s.d.) and sigma(p) for both female and male participants according to the items of MOVE I(Establishing a Territory)*

Items	Gender	N	m	s.d.	t	p
1.claiming centrality	female	225	4,2756	1,48341	-5,219	,000
	male	178	4,8764	,44646	-5,755	,000
2.makig topic generalization	female	225	3,0533	,69230	-2,154	,032
	male	178	3,1910	,55999	-2,207	,028
3.reviewing items of previous research	female	225	3,5867	1,20371	-4,634	,000
	male	178	4,0225	,39709	-5,092	,000
4.explaining the institutional /research group context	female	225	2,9600	,65683	-17,172	,000
	male	178	3,9326	,41979	-18,037	,000
5.defining terms/classifying	female	225	3,7156	,55820	-4,321	,000
	male	178	3,9438	,48385	-4,393	,000
Total		403				

*Number of female and male

Males attributed much more importance to the providing background information on the research area through reviewing the items of previous research than females do. At this point, as it is illustrated in Table.1, there was a significant gender difference that, compared to the females' one (3,5867), the mean value of males for this item is fairly higher. As to the fourth item, *explaining the institutional/ research group context*, males and females show a significant difference in terms of the extent to which informing the readers about the situation of the research area within the research context is essential. According to the values in Table 1, males seem to find that explaining the institutional/ research group context is important (mean=3,9326) whereas females seems to attach little importance to this item (mean =2,9600).

As to the last step of Move I, *defining terms/ classifying*, both females and males scored significantly similar by stating that definition of terms and/or classification of them is essential in the introductory sections of master theses (mean for females=3,7156, and mean for males=3,9438). Here, it is seen that, there was no striking difference between females and males.

3.2. MOVE-2- Establishing a Niche

Table 2 illustrates the results of the second section of the scale across groups, which is mainly based on obtaining the ideas of the participants on the steps of second move, *Establishing a Niche*.

As it is in the results of Move 1, the results show a significant variance across groups in the description of the importance level of each item of Move 2 from the perspectives of females and males ($p = ,000$ for the sixth and seventh items for both males and females; $p = ,004$ for females and $p = ,003$ for males for eighth item; $p = ,071$ for females and $p = ,067$ for males for ninth item ; and $p < 0,05$). In counter claiming, females' scores are significantly different from scores of males. The mean value of females is 3,6667 while males' mean value is 4,0225, which shows that females scored significantly lower on the making a claim or claims opposing to the results of the previous studies. A similar finding for indicating a gap in the previous literature is shown in table 2 that, again, there is a significant difference between females and males;nevertheless, in contrast to the result in the item of counter claiming, here females scored higher on the presentation of such information with a mean value of 4,3467 than males scored (mean value = 3,2697).

Table 2 T-Test results, means(m), standard deviations(s.d.) and sigma(p) for both female and male participants according to the items of MOVE 2(Establishing a Niche)

Items	Gender	N*	m	s.d.	t	p
6.counter claiming	female	225	3,6667	,79620	-5,548	,000
	male	178	4,0225	,35183	-6,003	,000
7.indicating a gap	female	225	4,3467	,91359	13,182	,000
	male	178	3,2697	,66832	13,657	,000
8.question raising	female	225	4,1689	,46089	2,905	,004
	male	178	4,0506	,32369	3,022	,003
9.continuing/extending a tradition	female	225	3,9911	,63380	1,812	,071
	male	178	3,8820	,55501	1,840	,067
		403				

*Number of female and male

For the eighth item, *question raising*, there was no striking gender difference. Actually, the scores of each group are rather close to each other such that both females and males appear to find presenting the raising problem, need or interest in the literature necessarily important (mean value for females = 4,1689 and mean value for males= 4,0506). For the last step of the move, *continuing or extending tradition*, when we looked at the result, we found that there was no significant difference between females and males. The importance degree given to this step by both groups is nearly the same; that is, for each group, in the introductions of master theses, informing readers about whether the study follows up a tradition or extends the tradition is important at a significant level (mean value for females=3,9911, and mean value for males= 3,8820).

3.3. MOVE-3- Occupying the Niche

In Table.3, the differences between females and males in reported levels of each step of Move 3, *Occupying a Niche*, are presented. The scores show significant differences between groups in the levels of *outlining purposes, aims or objective, announcing present research, announcing principle findings/results, stating the significance/ justification of the study, listing research questions/hypotheses, explaining the thesis structure, explaining overall thesis structure, explaining chapter structure, explaining chapter contents, explaining chapter goals, stating method/materials/subjects, stating limitations of research* (p = ,000 for each item; and p< 0,05).

For outlining purposes, aims or objectives, participants scored significantly different that the mean value given by females for this item is 3,0133 while the mean value reported by males for the same item is 4,8146. Here, it is seen that males attribute greater importance to the presentation of purposes, aims or objectives in the introductory sections than females who find this kind of information moderately important. There were similar findings for announcing present research but here, when compared to the score of males

(mean=3,2416), it is seen that females were overrepresented with a higher score (mean = 3,7467) in the importance level of informing on the work done in the introduction parts of the theses. As for announcing principle findings/results, when we looked at the differences between groups, we found that females and males did not have significantly different scores; however, males scored significantly higher on this step with a value of 4,0393. At this point, for the next three steps - *stating the significance/ justification of the study, listing research questions/hypotheses, explaining the thesis structure* – the findings were strikingly similar: there was no significant gender difference but males were overrepresented in the results for each item with a higher mean values in the importance level of these items (means = 4,8146, 4,0618 and 4,0225, respectively for each item).

Table 3. *T-Test results, mean(m), standard deviation(s.d.) and sigma(p) for both female and male participants according to the items of MOVE 3(Occupying the Niche)*

Items	Gender	N*	m	s.d.	t	p
10.outlining purposes, aims or objectives	female	225	3,0133	1,09169	-20,106	,000
	male	178	4,8146	,54660	-21,567	,000
11.announcing present research	female	225	3,7467	,82527	6,906	,000
	male	178	3,2416	,58519	7,178	,000
12.announcing principle findings/results	female	225	3,6044	1,19858	-4,705	,000
	male	178	4,0393	,32525	-5,206	,000
13.stating the significance/ justification of the study	female	225	4,0489	1,51549	-6,418	,000
	male	178	4,8146	,54660	-7,023	,000
14. listing research questions/ hypotheses	female	225	3,6089	,85456	-6,667	,000
	male	178	4,0618	,33883	-7,261	,000
15.explaining the thesis structure	female	225	3,7200	,59522	-5,830	,000
	male	178	4,0225	,39709	-6,098	,000
16. explaining the overall structure of thesis	female	225	3,2800	,55646	-11,955	,000
	male	178	3,9045	,47166	-12,187	,000
17. explaining chapter structure	female	225	3,4044	,80233	5,443	,000
	male	178	3,0449	,40922	5,830	,000
18. explaining chapter contents	female	225	3,5511	,80640	5,110	,000
	male	178	3,1966	,51044	5,372	,000
19. explaining chapter goals	female	225	2,9200	,97870	-13,073	,000
	male	178	3,9494	,42880	-14,154	,000
20. stating method/ matermaterials/subjects	female	225	3,4444	1,19065	-6,797	,000
	male	178	4,0674	,31165	-7,529	,000
21.stating limitations of research	female	225	3,6222	,86316	-6,479	,000
	male	178	4,0730	,38364	-7,008	,000
	Total	403				

*Number of Females and Males

As to another item, which is the substep of *explaining the thesis structure step*, *explaining overall thesis structure*, females and males had significantly different scores. The findings show that females scored significantly lower on informing the audience about the overall thesis structure in introductory sections than males (mean= 3,2800 for females, and mean = 3,9045 for males). For the other substep of *explaining the thesis structure*, that is, for *explaining chapter structure*, there was a significant gender difference and females seem to attribute much more importance to the presentation of such information than males (mean = 3,5511 for females, and mean = 3,1966 for males).

As for another substep , *chapter content*, it is seen in Table 3 that the findings were similar: females and males showed significantly different scores in the importance level and again females were overrepresented in the importance level given to this item with a higher value of 3,5511. Coming to the last substep, *explaining chapter goals*, there was a significant difference between groups in the importance levels determined by each group: males reported significantly higher importance on the explanation of goals of each chapter in the introductions than females (mean= 3,9494 for males, and mean= 2,9200 for females).

To the last two steps of the move *stating method/ materials/subjects, stating limitations of research* -, the findings of the independent samples t-test analysis show that females and males did not show a significant difference but females were significantly less represented with a lower values for each item (means =3,4444 and 3,6222, respectively for twentieth item; means=3,6222 and 4,0730, respectively).

4. Conclusion and Discussion

The aim of this paper was to uncover the perceptions of males and females in the arrangement of the master thesis introductions and to compare their ideas to hypothesize any difference between sexes in terms of writing. In order to identify and analyze differences, a scale was applied to participants, and descriptive and inferential statistics were calculated through SPSS 18. The results of the analysis showed that there is a significant difference between the perceptions of males and females involved in the field of ELT on the application of the rhetorical strategies in the introduction sections of master theses, through which the hypothesis the study draws on seems to be confirmed. According to the data obtained from the scale, female participants tend to support the arrangement of a more abstract introductory part for master theses compared to male participants, who emphasize a detailed and comprehensive introductions for this academic genre. On the basis of this finding, it may be deduced that male participants prefer the presentation of each point on the study done in order to inform target community from the beginning of the work and thus to supply a systematic description of the thesis, which then may work as a guidance for readers – or target community. In other words, in this way, the reader would know what they will get to coincide and to know. Besides, they may aim to motivate and persuade the readers that their study is a well-structured and thorough one, and a master

copy greatly contributing to the research realm so it is worth examining. As for female participants, it seems that they want to present a brief summary of their thesis instead of the involvement of each specific point, and they may believe that the introduction parts can just work as a introduction where the overall content of the thesis is presented. At this point, it is also possible to indicate that females may tend to broaden the scope of other parts of the thesis but a further and more-comprehensive research, also covering the study on the ideas of participants about the organization of other sections, is needed to put certain deductions on this aspect.

The results of this study are relevant to not only writing process of an academic genre and attitudes of genders in this aspect but also discourse analysis and context. At this point, the lack of research in this field is striking, despite the fact that the data is required to comprehend the writing performance from various dimensions, and so this study would be a significant contribution to the field by adressing to this gap.

An obvious limitation of this study is the number of the participants. In order to paint a more comprehensive picture of writing tendencies of each gender, more research is required based on not only one specific part of a specific genre but also different academic genres and their sections involving more individuals participating in similar studies. Furthermore, extending the study to involve different genres will result in different findings and provide alternative perspectives on the issue. Still, it is hoped that this research project will be of interest to scholars involved in the field of academic writing, and the methodology it uses can also serve as a basis for similar investigations in the future.

REFERENCES

- Colley, A., Todd, Z., Bland, M., Holmes, M., Khanon, R. & Pike, H. (2004). Style and content in emails and letters to male and female friends. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 23(3), 369–78.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2011) *Research methods in applied linguistics*. Oxford Press:UK
- Fox, M. F. (2005). Gender, family characteristics, and publication productivity among scientists. *Social Studies of Science*, 35(1), 131–50.
- Geçikli, M.(2012) *Rhetoric in Master Thesis Introductions in the field of English Language Teaching within Turkish Context: A Genre Analysis*. Master Thesis, Atatürk University, Graduate School of Educational Sciences, Erzurum
- Hartley, J., Betts, L. J. & Murray, W. (2007). Gender and assessment: Differences, similarities and implications. *Psychology Teaching Review*, 13(1), 34–47.
- Hartley, J., Pennebaker, J. W. & Fox, C. (2003). Using new technology to assess the academic writing styles of male and female pairs and individuals. *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication*, 33(3), 243–61.

- Hartley, J., Sotto, E. & Pennebaker, J. W. (2002). Style and substance in psychology: Are influential papers more readable than less influential ones? *Social Studies of Science*, 32(2), 321–34.
- Hartley, J. (2008). *Academic writing and publishing*. Routledge:USA and Canada
- Johnson, B. & Christensen, L. (2004). *Educational Research: Quantitative, Qualitative, and Mixed Approaches*. Pearson Education Inc.:USA
- Martin, M. (1997). Emotional and cognitive effects of examination proximity in female and male students. *Oxford Review of Education*, 23(4), 479–86.
- Pennebaker, J. W., Mehl, M. R. & Niederhoffer, K. (2003). Psychological aspects of natural language use: Our words, our selves. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 54, 547–77.
- Peterson, S. (2006). Influence of gender on writing development. In C. A. MacArthur, S. Graham & J. Fitzgerald (Eds.). *Handbook of writing research* (pp. 311–23). New York: Guilford.
- Robson, J., Francis, B. & Read, B. (2002). Writes of passage: Stylistic features of male and female undergraduate history essays. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 26(4), 351–62.
- Rude, S.S., Gortner, E-M. & Pennebaker, J. W. (2004). Language use of depressed anddepression-vulnerable college students. *Cognition and Emotion*, 18(8), 1121–33.
- Soler-Monreal, C; Carbonell-Olivares, M & Gil-Salom, L.(2011) A contrastive study of the rhetorical organization of English and Spanish PhD thesis introductions. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 30, 4-17
- Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Swales, J. (2004). *Research genres: explorations and applications*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

APPENDIX**APPENDIX 1: Consent Form**

Dear Colleague,

As a graduate of master of arts, you have experienced a writing process of academic manuscripts. As you and other graduates know, the content and organization of a manuscript are designed on the basis of presentation of ideas, expression, precision and clarity. In this respect, your response to this survey can greatly broaden our perspective.

The main aim of the study is to explore whether the authors from different academic institutions in Turkey employed the same rhetorical strategies to introduce the work presented in English through a genre analysis.

Your participation in this research is voluntary. Your confidentiality and anonymity are assured. Return of the survey to me is your consent for your responses to be compiled with others. Although the survey is coded to allow for follow-up with non-respondents, you will not be individually identified with your responses. Please understand that use of this data will be limited to this research, as authorized by Ataturk University, although results may ultimately be presented in formats other than the dissertation, such as journal articles or conference presentations. You also have the right to express concerns to me at the number below and, my advisor, Dr. Oktay YAĞIZ at the Department of English Language Teaching address shown in a parenthesis below, or the institutional board of Educational Sciences Institute.

We greatly appreciate your participation in this research. The survey will take approximately 15-20 minutes to complete. Please return the survey within two weeks.

Thank you for your interest and participation in this study. We genuinely appreciate your time.

Sincerely,

MERVE GEÇİKLİ

Research Assistant, Department of English Language Teaching,
Kazım Karabekir Faculty of Education, Ataturk University, Erzurum 25240
Telephone Number: (0442) 2314255
E-mail Address: merve.gecikli@atauni.edu.tr

OKTAY YAĞIZ

Assistant Professor, Department of English Language Teaching,
Kazım Karabekir Faculty of Education, Ataturk University, Erzurum 25240
Telephone Number: (0442)2314244

APPENDIX 2: Scale

Dear Participant,

In the following section, we would like you to help us by answering the following questions concerning the content and organization of the introduction of a manuscript. There are a number of items with which we would like you to indicate your opinion after each item by putting [X] in the box that best indicates the extent to which you believe the item is important or unimportant according to the statement of each section. This is not a test so there are no “right” or “wrong” answers and you do not even have to write your name on it. We are interested in your personal opinion. Please give your answers sincerely as only this will guarantee the success of the investigation.

For example: *How important would you rate the following factors in affecting the extent to which a manuscript is scientific?*

	1- Unimportant	2-Of LittleImportance	3-Moderately Important	4- Important	5- Very Important
Economy of expression	[]	[]	[X]	[]	[]
Precision	[]	[]	[]	[X]	[]
Coherence	[]	[]	[]	[X]	[]
Cohesion	[]	[]	[]	[]	[X]

I. Background Information

Please complete the following items as appropriate.

Institution:

Department:

Gender:

Female() Male()

Have you ever taken academic writing course? Yes() No()

II.Scale					
<i>A: How important would you rate the following factors in best establishing the significance of a research area?</i>					
	1- Unimportant	2-Of LittleImportance	3- Moderately Important	4- Important	5- Very Importan
1.Claiming centrality (importance of topic)	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
2.Making topic generalization	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
3.Reviewing items of previous research	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
4.Explaining the institutional/research group context	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
5.Defining terms/classifying	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
<i>B: How important would you rate the following factors in best establishing the context where a particular piece of research makes particularly good sense?</i>					
	1- Unimportant	2-Of LittleImportance	3- Moderately Important	4- Important	5- Very Importa
6.Counter claiming(making a claim /cliams opposing to the results of previous studies)	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
7.Indicating a gap in research area	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
8.Question raising (raising a question, need or interest)	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
9.Continuing/extending a tradition (applyig or extending the findings of the previous studies)	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]

C: How important would you rate the following factors in best making an offer to fill the gap?

	1- Unimportant	2-Of LittleImportance	3- Moderately Important	4- Important	5- Very Important
10.Outlining puposes, aims or objectives	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
11. Announcing present research(work done)	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
12.Announcing principal findings/results	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
13.Stating the significance/ justification of the study	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
14. Listing research questions or hypotheses	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
15. Explaining the thesis structure	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
16. explaining overall thesis structure	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
17. explaining chapter structure	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
18. explaining chapter contents	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
19.explaining chapter goal	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
20.Stating method/ materials/ subjects	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
21.Stating limitations of research	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]

APPENDIX 3: Revised Create- A –Research- Space (CARS) Model (Swales, 2004)

Move 1: Establishing a territory (citations required)

Step 1. Topic generalisation of increasing specificity (i) Reporting conclusion of previous studies

(ii) Narrowing the field

(iii) Writer's evaluation of existing research

(iv) Time-frame of relevance

(v) Research objective/process previous studies (vi) Terminology/definitions

(vii) Generalising

(viii) Furthering or advancing knowledge

Move 2: Establishing the niche (citations possible)

Step 1A: Indicating a gap

Step 1B: Adding to what is known

Step 2: (optional) presenting positive justification

Move 3: Presenting the present work (citations possible)

Step 1: (obligatory) Announcing present work descriptively and/or purposively

Step 2a : (optional) presenting Research Questions or hypotheses

Step 3: (optional) Definitional clarifications

Step 4: (optional) Summarising methods

Step 5: (PISFb) Announcing principal outcomes

Step 6: (PISF) Stating the value of the present research Step 7: (PISF) Outlining the structure of the paper

New sub-categories are in italics.

a Steps 2 to 4 are not only optional but less fixed in their order of occurrence than the others (Swales, 2004, p. 232).

b In regard to Steps 5, 6, and 7, which “probably occur in some fields, but are unlikely in others” [PISF] Swales (2004, p. 232).

APPENDIX 4: Soler-Monreal, Carbonell-Olivares, and Gil-Salom's model (2011) (modified and adapted version of Swales' CARS model)

Move 1: Establishing a Territory.

S1: Claiming centrality (importance of topic)

S2: Making topic generalisations and giving background information

SS2A: Indicating a problem/need

SS2B: Indicating limitations

SS2C: Giving examples

SS2D: Defining terms/classifying and commenting on terminology

SS2E: Giving or anticipating solutions (or ways to solve problems/to tackle needs) S3:

Defining terms/classifying

S4: Reviewing previous research

S5: Explaining the institutional/research group context

/Summarising previous background information/

Move 2: Establishing the niche

S1A: Indicating a gap in research

S1B: Indicating a problem or need

S1C: Question-raising

S1D: Continuing/Extending a tradition

Move 3: Presenting the present work

S1: Purposes, aims or objectives

S2: Work carried out/Announcing research

SS2A: Work done

SS2B: Work or aspects out of scope

SS2C: Previous requirements

S3: Field of research

S4: Method/Parameters of research

S5: Materials or Subjects

S6: Findings or Results: Product of research/Model proposed/ Contributions/Solutions S7:

Justification/Significance

S8: Thesis structure

SS8A: Overall thesis structure

SS8B: Chapter structure

SS8C: Chapter contents

SS8D: Chapter goal

/Research questions or Hypotheses/

/Application of product/

/Evaluation of product/

/Defining terms/

. . . indicates a step which is occasionally present in the model developed for Spanish PhD theses introductions (Authors, 2009)

Steps (S) and sub-steps (SS)

