Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina
Pós-Graduação em Inglês e Literatura Correspondente

Lexical Signalling: A Study of Unspecific Nouns in Book Reviews

Antonia Dilamar Araújo

Tese submetida à Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina para a obtenção do grau de Doutora em Letras
opção Língua Inglesa e Lingüística Aplicada

Florianópolis
Agosto 1996

Esta tese foi julgada adequada e aprovada em sua forma final pelo programa de Pós-graduação em Inglês para a obtenção do grau de

Doutora em Letras

Opção Língua Inglesa e Lingüística Aplicada ao Inglês

Dr. José Roberto O'Shea
Coordenador

Dr. José Luiz Meurer
Orientador

Banca Examinadora:

Dr. José Luiz Meurer

Dra. Maria Irandé Costa M. Antunes

Dr. Vilson José Leffa

Dra. Désireé Motta-Roth

Dr. Hilário I. Bohn

Florianópolis, 27 de agosto de 1996

Dedico este trabalho,

com muito amor a:

meus pais, pela amizade e estímulos constantes no decorrer do doutorado;

meus irmãos, cunhados, sobrinhos, pela amizade e solidariedade;

amigos que confiaram em mim;

meu esposo e minha filha, pelo carinho, compreensão e estímulo constantes ajudando a tornar possível esse trabalho.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Professor Dr. José Luiz Meurer, my supervisor, for his friendship, patience, enthusiasm and dedicated supervision during the doctoral program at the Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina.

I am also indebted to Professor Dr. Michael Hoey, for having supervised the research developed at the University of Liverpool, and for his unfailing support and helpful suggestions for the improvement of this work.

My friends, colleagues and professors of the English Graduate Program at the Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, for their support and friendship.

The Departamento de Letras, at the Universidade Federal do Piauí, for releasing me from my academic activities so that I could obtain the degree.

To the CAPES, for the financial support in Florianópolis and Liverpool.

To everybody, who directly or indirectly, contributed to the accomplishment of this work.

To GOD for his magnificence and kindness who gave me strength of will to finish this work.

ABSTRACT

Lexical signalling: A Study of Unspecific Nouns in Book Reviews

Antonia Dilamar Araújo

Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina

1996

Supervising: Professor Dr. José Luiz Meurer

This thesis examines book reviews in the area of Applied Linguistics as an academic genre in terms of their communicative goal, overall rhetorical organization and the role lexis plays in the development and organization of such texts. The basic hypotheses of this study are two-fold: First, that book reviews as a genre have a typical rhetorical organization in terms of content, form and use of linguistic devices in spite of stylistic variations. Second, that unspecific nouns, as important cohesive devices, help to connect meanings and organize the structure of book reviews. For the investigation of generic features of the reviews and the use of linguistic devices, Swales' move-type analysis, Hasan's notion of genre and Winter's and Hoey's clause-relational approach were followed. Such approaches offer views that contribute to the identification of the elements of the organization of book reviews and the way these texts are linguistically realized. The results reveal that despite some variation, the examplars analysed have a number of shared features which allows one to assert that they are instances of the same genre and that unspecific nouns, besides helping to organize the genre, also guide the reader's interpretation of a portion of discourse. The thesis is concluded by showing the pedagogical implications of this research for the teaching of writing and by making suggestions for further research.

Number of pages: 274

Resumo

Esta tese tem por objetivo examinar a organização retórica do gênero lingüístico 'resenha crítica', bem como o papel dos substantivos 'não-específicos' enquanto elemento coesivo na organização do referido gênero. Para essa investigação, foram selecionados e analisados oitenta exemplares de resenhas críticas acadêmicas em Inglês, na área de Lingüística Aplicada. As hipóteses para a investigação desta pesquisa são: primeiro, que as resenhas críticas acadêmicas, como um tipo de gênero lingüístico escrito, possui uma organização retórica típica considerando conteúdo, função e forma; segundo, que os substantivos 'não-específicos', enquanto importantes elementos coesivos, ajudam a criar sentidos e organizar a estrutura das resenhas. A teoria de Swales - 'move-type analysis', a noção de gênero proposta por Hasan e a teoria de Winter e Hoey - 'a clause-relational approach' - foram aplicadas na análise dos dados. Os resultados revelam que há regularidades de conteúdo, função e forma, e que os textos analisados pertencem a um mesmo gênero textual, apesar das variações estilísticas. A presença de substantivos não-específicos, através de suas relações anafóricas e catafóricas, é significante, e demonstra que além de ajudar na organização do gênero, estes elementos lingüísticos ajudam o leitor na interpretação do discurso escrito. Considerando esses resultados, conclui-se esta tese mostrando as implicações pedagógicas desta pesquisa para o ensino de redação e apresentando sugestões para futuras pesquisas.

Número de páginas: 274

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

CHAPTER II

CHAPTER III

CHAPTER IV

CHAPTER V

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 3

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX C

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

1.1. Introduction

The past decade has witnessed a great shift in research on texts and text analysis. One area that has deserved increased attention in recent years is genre analysis. Although genre is associated with literary studies, nowadays, the notion of genre has been expanded to include other texts. Genre analysis has been viewed as offering a new perspective on the rhetorical organization of academic texts and in the ways they are linguistically expressed. Within this perspective, linguists and ESL (English as a Second Language) and EFL (English as a Foreign Language) teachers have examined a variety of academic genres - research articles, abstracts, dissertations, essays- with the aim of producing analytical frameworks for some of the main sections of the genres analysed and help, especially, non-native speakers of English understand and produce written communication effectively.

Although the book review is an instance of an important academic written manifestation, it seems underinvestigated as a typical instance of genre and little is known about its linguistic realizations, especially concerning the issue of lexical signalling and unspecific nouns.

The general aim of this thesis is to investigate the overall organization of book reviews (hereafter abbreviated as BR) and the role lexis plays in the development and organization of such texts. This topic is set within the context of the study of written discourse analysis.

Within this context, Labov (1972), Widdowson (1979), Selinker, Lackstrom and Trimble (1976), Tadros (1985), Swales (1981, apud Swales, 1984, 1990), Hoey (1979, 1983), and Bhatia (1993), are among well-known scholars who have developed theories on textualization and on the use of rhetorical devices. As part of the textualization, the studies on signalling which deserve emphasis here are those conducted by Halliday & Hasan (1976), Winter (1977, 1982, 1986, 1992), Hoey (1979, 1983), Francis (1986, 1994), Ivanic (1991) and Swales (1984, 1985, 1990) who have highlighted that discourse-signalling words are of great importance in structuring and organizing written texts. But in examining the lexis, I shall concentrate on the study of **unspecific nouns** (Winter, 1977, 1982, 1989, 1992) as discourse-signalling devices within the overall organization of BRs.

1.2. Basic hypotheses of the study

The basic *hypotheses* of this study are as follows:

1) In spite of stylistic variations that exist among reviewers, **BRs**, as instances of a written genre, have a typical rhetorical organization in terms of content, form, and use of linguistic devices;

2) **Unspecific nouns** are important organizational devices that connect meanings and organize the structure of BRs.

1.3. Aims of the study

My **aims** in this thesis are the following:

(a) To identify the rhetorical structure of BRs in order to establish the characteristic 'moves' for this genre (Swales, 1990) and the most typical and less typical elements, as well as their sequencing and recursion (Halliday & Hasan, 1989);

(b) To identify and categorize unspecific nouns and their specifics and show their relation to the genre of BRs in the area of Applied Linguistics;

(c) To examine how unspecific nouns operate as interactive signals in BRs;

(d) To investigate the evaluative nature of BRs in relation to unspecific/specific textual realizations.

As one of the assumptions of the thesis is that BR is a linguistic genre, the questions which summarize my interest in the field are:

(a) How can the overall organization of BRs in the area of Applied Linguistics be characterized following Swales' and Hasan's lines of research?

(b) How do unspecific nouns signal the rhetorical organization? How do they operate as interactive signals in BRs?

(c) How can unspecific nouns and their specific clauses be categorized according to their semantic contexts in BRs?

(d) How do unspecific nouns signal evaluation in BRs?

In the following sections, I shall attempt to justify why this investigative study focuses on the genre and unspecific nouns in relation to BRs as well as why BRs and the field of Applied Linguistics were chosen.

1.4. Rationale: The Study of Genre

As mentioned in section 1.1, the rhetorical organization of academic texts has become an area of intensive interest to different scholars and ESL/EFL teachers. Such interest arose especially in the field of ESP (English for Specific Purpose) (Tarone et al, 1981; Swales, 1990; Dudley-Evans, 1986,1994) due to the need to establish general features of specific types of texts as well as to the need in ESP work for models of communicative activities intended to inform material production, especially for inexperienced academic writers in English. The notion of genre developed by such scholars stresses the writer's communicative purpose as the main principle characterizing the conventions of a genre, but without forgetting to take into account the audience, the situation in which the text is produced, and its effect. It is this defining feature - the communicative purpose - which distinguishes different genres. The way these scholars approach genre reflects that they have been influenced by disciplines like sociology, anthropology, psychology and linguistics.

Even within Discourse Analysis and ESP, however, different kinds of orientation have motivated studies in applied genre analysis connected with linguistics, sociology and psychology. Of these orientations, my interest is in the field of linguistics in which one is concerned with the linguistic description of rhetorical organization of texts. In this field, we find two of the most widely used genre-based approaches nowadays namely Swales' and Hasan's. These approaches will be applied in the analysis of the overall organization of BRs.

The main interest for using a genre approach in this study is that such an approach tends to associate certain specific features of language with certain types of writing. Furthermore, the assumption is that by analysing book reviews - one specific kind of academic text, produced by professionals and students of higher education in a specific rhetorical context - a description of the rhetorical and communicative conventions of these texts can be provided to help 'novice' writers understand and produce exemplars of this genre.

Despite different ways of defining 'genre' in the literature of text analysis, it is the concept of genre proposed by Swales which is adopted in this study. In one of his earlier articles (1985:4, apud Hewings & Henderson,1987:157), 'genre' is defined as 'a recognized communicative event with a shared public purpose and with aims mutually understood by the participants within the event'.

According to his definition, the role of the text, its purpose and the context in which it is produced are extremely important suggesting that the meaning of a text is determined by the contextualization of language in use and by the reader's interpretation of the message. Such interpretation may be the result of the reader's ability to call up the appropriate schemata to allow full comprehension of a particular text genre. For Swales the main feature of genre is 'the communicative purpose(s) that it is intended to fulfil' (Bhatia, 1993:13). The communicative purposes shared by the expert members belonging to the discourse community constitute the rationale for the genre. Such a rationale 'shapes the schematic structure of the discourse and influences the constraints, choice of content and style' (Swales, 1990a:58). The communicative purpose, according to Swales, is the main feature which distinguishes different types of genre.

Swales' genre-approach consists of establishing '*moves*' that writers use in order to write various sections of a text or to develop their argument. Unfortunately Swales has not properly defined the notion of move nor the boundaries of each move. Some other researchers, however, have attempted to establish what a move is. McKinley (1983, apud Dudley-Evans, 1986:131), for example, defines *move* as 'a semantic unit which is related to the writer's purpose.' Bhatia (1993) defines moves as 'discriminative elements of generic structure' and strategies as 'non-discriminative options within the *allowable contributions* available to an author for creative or innovative genre construction' (p.32). Although the words 'discriminative' and 'non-discriminative' are not made clear by Bhatia, what he means by

moves and strategies is that 'moves' are elements which serve a typical communicative intention which is always subservient to the overall communicative purpose of the genre while 'strategies' are options the individual writer may use to realize a particular intention. In spite of the fact that these terms ('moves'/'steps') have been largely used by Swales and followers, so far 'moves' and 'steps' are still not clearly stated in the literature of genre analysis.

Barthes' (1977:90) notion of *function* when discussing the structure of narrative texts may be added to the discussion of the concept of 'moves'. According to Barthes, narrative is made up by functional units. Each unit is made of meaning, each function is a unit of content: '"it is what it says" that makes of a statement a functional unit, not the manner in which it is said' (p.90). Thus each unit represents a function such as 'reporting', 'describing' which realizes the writer's communicative purpose in the text. In this sense, moves can also be correlated to functions since they are units of content which can be expressed by a sentence or higher units such as a group of sentences or a paragraph. For the purpose of this thesis, by *move* I mean a unit of information which realizes the writer's communicative purpose in a given portion of discourse (a sentence or paragraph). Each move may be realized by means of a rhetorical strategy or a combination of strategies. Such strategies are the choices that writers make in order to convince readers of their claims, increasing thus the credibility of certain propositions in the reader's mind and achieving the writers' goal when expressing a particular intention or function.

A more recent study on genre analysis (Motta-Roth, 1995) has attempted to provide a clearer definition of 'move' and for the purposes of the analysis it has been adopted as a complement of the definition given above. According to Motta-Roth (ibid:60), a 'move'

> is a text block, a stretch of discourse that can extend for one or more sentences, that realizes a specific communicative function, and that together with other moves constitutes the whole information structure that must be present in the text to allow it to be recognized as an exemplar of a given genre.

A 'move' for Motta-Roth encompasses a series of smaller functional units or speech acts that realize the writer's intentions in accordance with the constraints imposed by the genre. She calls these series of smalller functional units 'sub-function'. This enlightening definiton makes a useful contribution to move-type analysis in that it helps genre analysts more clearly distinguish the terms 'move' and 'steps' (in Swales' terminology). These concepts will be of great value in the establishment of moves and strategies (instead of 'steps' or 'sub-function') in the present research. They will be discussed in detail in Chapter 3.

One of the problems in the analysis of genre concerns the criteria for establishing moves, strategies and other semantic/cognitive generic units. It seems that there is a consensus among discourse analysts that texts are 'staged' and that there is a need to determine the boundaries of structural elements in texts since this issue 'has received little attention in

discourse studies' (Ventola 1987:181). According to McCarthy and Carter (1994:292) different genres are differently 'staged'. This means that chronological and non-chronological forms are structured according to the nature of information they convey. Regarding staging in narrative, for example, one of the most widely known analytical models is that developed by Labov (1972). He divides the personal narratives in *abstract, orientation, complicating action, evaluation, resolution* and *coda.* Labov defines these stages as 'recurrent characteristics to be produced and recognized by the participants of an interaction as appropriate instances of personal narratives, i.e., language use for a given context' (Labov, ibid.). In this sense, BRs which will be analysed in this work are also staged in terms of 'moves' following Swales' model.

Scholars who share a pragmatic perspective like Paltridge (1994:295) have criticized the intuitive character of Swales' definition of 'moves' and 'steps'. Paltridge (ibid) asserts that although structural divisions can be recognized by 'physical indicators such as gaps on pages, paragraph divisions, and chapters', they are most clearly seen in terms of content, i.e, 'it is a *cognitive* rather than *linguistic* sense' that guides the reader's perception of textual division. This position finds support in Bhatia's (1993) work who points out that genre analysts have 'underplayed psychological factors in their descriptions of textual staging' (p.16). The point he makes is that 'the search for structural divisions in texts should be seen as a search for cognitive boundaries in terms of *convention, appropriacy*, and *content* rather than only as a search for linguistically

defined boundaries' (p. 295). This means that there are also non-linguistic reasons for generic staging in texts.

Hasan (Halliday & Hasan, 1989) and Bhatia (1993) have claimed that it is not always possible to determine the boundaries in texts based on patterns of cohesion such as lexical cohesion or reference. Their analyses have revealed that structural elements can be determined most clearly in terms of 'semantic property', e.g., the content rather than linguistic patterning.

Although Swales has not been explicit about this issue in his works, Crookes (1985, 1986, apud in Paltridge, 1994) has observed that the division of textual boundaries in the work of Swales is also 'content-based'. That is why Swales uses terms such as 'establishing the field', 'occupying a niche' to label the moves he identifies in the Introductions to Research Articles.

As I am following Swales' approach in the analysis of BRs, I have also used the criterion of 'content' or 'function' plus linguistic evidence to identify the moves and strategies in BRs. I believe that linguistic analysis of texts should be seen as a process which involves a combination of linguistic and discursive features (Dudley-Evans, 1994; Halliday, 1985a). Within this perspective, to identify boundaries of a specific genre, one must look at language in terms of what it displays as linguistic form, content, and function in a given context. The claim here is that the structural boundaries must be

'formal, semantic and functional, just like any linguistic analysis focused on real language should be' (Motta-Roth, ibid.:60).

In addition to Swales' notion of genre and his approach to genre analysis, Hasan's (1978, 1984, Halliday & Hasan, 1989) notion of *generic structure potential (*abbreviated by Hasan as GSP) will underlie the analysis of the corpus of this study. It is recognized that Hasan's work on the identification of genre in terms of a GSP has brought a significant contribution to the description of generic structures in instances of texts. Due to the fact that the GSP allows a classification of text instances into types and accounts for their textual structure, the concepts of obligatory (most typical), optional (less typical) and iterative elements in Hasan's approach to genre will be of relevance in the analysis of BRs.

According to Hasan (ibid), the 'generic structure potential' is defined by the presence of obligatory elements in text structure. In this sense, the GSP predicts what elements come next and allows the reader to perceive whether the text is complete or not. It is the use of obligatory features in a relatively fixed or in a conventional sequence which determines the completeness or incompleteness of a text and allows us to distinguish between different genres. According to Ventola (1987), obligatory elements are therefore 'genre specific and genre defining' (p.43). Optional elements can possibly occur in texts of the genre, although they are not indicators of completeness. Ventola (ibid) claims that they 'are not seen as necessary in every instance of the realizations of the social process' (p.43/44) but their

occurrence may be predicted in texts and allows us to make certain claims for the identification of genre (Halliday & Hasan, 1989:62/63). Iteration or recursion occurs when particular (set of) elements appear more than once in a text. As a linguistic phenomenon, iteration is always optional. These notions taken from Hasan will be seen as complementary to Swales' genre-approach in the identification of most typical moves and strategies in BRs.

1.5. Rationale: The Study of `Unspecific Nouns'

In addition to the overall organization of BRs, another area of interest in this thesis is **lexical signalling**, which has also been studied by several authors, mainly by Halliday, Hoey, Francis, Winter, who stress the importance of such phenomenon in structuring and organizing written texts.

Lexical signalling is seen here within the **clause-relational approach** developed by Winter (1977, 1982, 1986, 1992) and Hoey (1979, 1983). Acoording to this approach, the most general types of clause relations are 'Basic Text Structure' (problem-solution, general-particular, hypothetical-real) and 'Basic Clause Relations' (matching relations and logical sequence relations). The meanings of a text are built around at least these two types of clause relations which contribute to the global rhetorical organization of discourse. Such clause relations can be identified by the interaction between different types of signalling, between clauses and also through repetition, which connects meanings in the text.

One type of clause-relational signal deserving attention by linguists is that of **lexical items** (Vocabulary 3 in Winter's terms) which have the cohesive feature of connecting meanings between clauses. Winter (1992) has claimed that a group of nouns- **unspecific nouns**- which is part of Vocabulary 3 also belongs to a larger metalanguage vocabulary and is very important to the understanding of the message of the text. They are 'metadiscursive items' in that 'they inform readers about how messages are to be interpreted by indicating something about the writer's intentions and feelings' (Crismore, 1989:52). Unspecific nouns will be examined in BRs because as they are important devices connecting meanings and as BRs are essentially evaluative texts, studying U-nouns (abbreviation for unspecific nouns) is one way of looking into how authors evaluate the books they review.

Unspecific nouns may be defined as a group of nouns that require 'lexical realization in order to be fully understood in discourse' (Winter, 1992:153; Carter & McCarthy, 1988:207; Ivanic, 1991:95)). Such nouns may be 'modified and qualified' (Francis, 1994:84/85), which heightens their evaluative potential. Their main function is 'making explicit the semantic relations that may exist between two clauses, sentences or group of sentences' (Hoey, 1988:144), in addition to being an essential tool in the description of the structure of the texts to be analysed. This will be further developed in Chapter 4.

relations that may exist between two clauses, sentences or group of sentences' (Hoey, 1988:144), in addition to being an essential tool in the description of the structure of the texts to be analysed. This will be further developed in Chapter 4.

Another reason for studying these nouns in BRs is that of interactivitiy. One view of interaction looks at texts as a kind of dialogue between the writer and the reader or between the text and the reader. According to this view, the writer uses linguistic signals to orient the reader as to how s/he should interpret the relations between the segments and perceive the writer's intentions (Winter, 1977; Hoey, 1979, 1983, 1994; Widdowson, 1979). This view highlights the way written or spoken monologue may be regarded as a dialogue. In respect to this, the use of questions or comments by the analyst helps to explain the relations that hold between a sentence and its context. Within this view, *unspecific nouns*, perform a connecting function in the text. They function as 'signposts' by requiring lexical realisation (Winter, 1992; Carter & McCarthy, 1988) for their meaning to be complete in the text. The lexical realisation, in turn, 'must be seen to relate directly to its signal in order to fulfil the expectations of the reader' (Winter, ibid). Nouns like **assumption, aspect, claim, purpose, problem, disappointment** are some of the unspecific nouns in my data whose lexicalization is made explicit in the discourse itself. The notions of *unspecific nouns, lexical realization*, and *lexically unique* will be discussed and illustrated in Chapter 4.

1.6. The Design of the Study

In order to achieve the objectives outlined in section 1.3. above, I selected eighty (80) authentic English BRs (about 224,938 words examined) drawn from applied linguistic journals (*Studies in Second Language Acquisition-SSLA* (50), *Applied Linguistics Journal* (14), *System* (9) and *TESOL Quarterly- Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages* (7)) published in the period between 1987 and 1994. In addition to the popularity of these journals among specialists and ESL/EFL teachers, the choice of the titles was constrained to their availability at the Federal University of Santa Catarina and the University of Liverpool. The chosen BRs vary in length, from 450 words to 2182 words and from 4 to 24 paragraphs. In selecting the BRs two criteria were observed: first, they are all texts evaluating books related to the field of applied linguistics and secondly most of them are written by well-known specialists. I judge that by their name and institution the un - known reviewers work for they are native speakers of English.

The list of the 80 BRs referred to in this thesis (titles in bold), appear in Appendix A. Each article and its sentences are numbered to facilitate reference. These numbers are also used in the text when citing examples. Individual articles are referred to by the capital letters BR followed by numbers which identify the sequence of BR, the paragraph and sentences from which the excerpt was taken. Such information appears between brackets at the end of each example cited in the text, for instance, [BR 1, 2-2/4]. This means that the example provided belongs to book review 1, paragraph 2, sentences 2 to 4.

the rhetorical moves commonly found in BRs and **the clause-relational approach** developed by Winter (1982, 1992) and Hoey (1979, 1983), specifically on **unspecific nouns**. Although the thesis is oriented towards two different approaches, each one offers a view which is important to the study of BRs. Swales' approach, which is a functional approach, will contribute to the identification of the elements of the structure of BRs. Winter and Hoey's approach, the study of signalling, and more precisely, the study of unspecific nouns is highlighted as a means to make explicit the meanings of text as well as to show the interactive structure of text. In order to develop an accurate and reliable analysis of *unspecific nouns,* the selected texts are stored on computer together with the concordancing software designed by Tim Johns and Mike Scott (1993) which both help observe the frequency of such items in the corpus and retrieve them for language description.

1.7. Rationale: the choice of BRs

BRs have been chosen for investigation of the overall organization of texts and lexical signalling for several reasons. The first is related to both pedagogical and linguistic concerns. As an EFL composition teacher at the university level I have witnessed the difficulties students face in organizing and expressing ideas in the texts they have to produce. In addition, certain kinds of academic writing are not taught in schools, BRs being one of these. I have also noticed that no orientation on how to write them is provided in composition books. As to the linguistic concern, text structure and unspecific

nouns, as cohesive devices, have been recognized by Winter (1982,1992), Francis (1986,1994), Hoey (1979,1983,1986), Ivanic (1991) as important aspects in the writing of different types of texts as they help both to comprehend and produce messages. Here I am concerned with how the ideas in BRs are expressed linguistically, i.e., what role lexis plays, especially the role of unspecific nouns as contributors to the development and organization of BRs.

Second, as Swales (1985a:213) claims, it is 'only within genres that language is sufficiently conventionalized and the range of communicative purposes help to establish pedagogically employable generalizations that will capture useful relationships between form and function'. Thus by examining language in BRs I expect to characterize the communicative purpose and rhetorical conventions of this genre.

Third, because an increasing proportion of BRs written in English and published in popular scientific journals are being both read and written by members of the scientific community for whom English is not the native language. Furthermore, BRs have been neglected for research purposes in the literature of genre analysis and little is known about this academic genre.

BRs are expository academic texts with aim of reporting on the content and organisation of a book in order to evaluate it positively or negatively. The ultimate purpose of the reviewer is to present a personal

opinion on the content of the book reviewed in order to recommend it to those interested in the field of applied linguistics in the present case. Reviewers use language not only to express ideas and talk about facts but also to express their attitude, opinion, reactions, feelings. BRs have an evaluative function that aims at influencing the academic community to accept the book under review as worth reading or not. The search for this objective motivates the reviewer to employ specific lexis and rhetorical structures typical of the genre s/he is producing. In investigating BRs I shall observe how evaluation is realized in such texts concentrating on unspecific nouns to see how they establish evaluation. Here Francis' work (1986, 1993) and Hoey's work (1979, 1983, 1991) will be applied to explain evaluation in BRs.

1. 8. Rationale: The choice of the field

The choice of the field of Applied Linguisitcs in the study is related to the interest of this researcher in her own area of study. By analysing the corpus belonging to the same area of knowledge, it is expected that the specificity of the object of study allows drawing reliable conclusions about the common features concerning the rhetorical organization of BRs. Among the chosen BRs in this field the preferred topics are those related to the current literature on genre analysis, rhetoric, composition, grammar, language acquisition, language learning, bilingualism and sociolinguistics.

By looking at the context of applied linguistics BRs, I expect to provide valuable information about the relationship between the

communicative function of BRs and their linguistic realizations, including, mainly, the U-nouns. Such analysis will also provide information about how writers elaborate BRs and how the context is reflected in the genre.

1.9. The Organization of the Thesis

This thesis is structured as follows: it starts with Chapter 1 (present chapter) which discusses the theoretical basis to genre analysis and clause relational approach, emphasizing the study of unspecific nouns in sections 1.2 and 1.3 of the present chapter. The rationale for study of genre, the study of unspecific nouns, the choice of BRs, the choice of applied linguistic field are also treated in sections 1.4, 1.5, 1.7 and 1.8 respectively. In addition, an overall view of the data is presented in section 1.6. Chapter 2 surveys the genre approach and its application to discourse studies concentrating on the work of Swales. In Chapter 3, I shall describe the move-type analysis of BRs as a whole and develop the first level of analysis: the overall rhetorical organization of BRs.

Chapters 4 and 5 deal with the topic of unspecific nouns. In Chapter 4, I shall discuss the clause relational approach and the importance of unspecific nouns for the organization of texts including the criteria for their identification. I shall also categorize U-nouns into groups according to the meanings they convey in the texts and exemplify the categories proposed. In Chapter 5, I shall continue the analysis of unspecific nouns showing their organizational function as well as their evaluative function in texts, relating

them to the genre of BRs. Sample analyses are presented throughout the chapter.

Chapter 6 draws conclusions connecting the analyses with the theoretical background, discusses the pedagogical implications of the study as a whole for the teaching of writing and briefly makes suggestions for further research.

CHAPTER 2

Genre Studies in Academic Discourse

2.1. Introduction

In Chapter 1, an explanation of the purpose, the hypotheses and organization of this study were provided. The main concern of this study is to describe the overall rhetorical organization of BRs and the use of U-nouns as organizers of the structure of these texts. The present chapter aims to survey the main genre theories and their application to academic discourse studies. It begins with a discussion of the origin of the notion of genres (section 2.2) and of genre studies developed within a sociological perspective (section 2.3). Then I will discuss Swales' (1990) approach to genre (section 2.4) and Hasan's (1989) generic structure potential (section 2.5) and its application to the analysis of BRs (section 2.6). Finally, the interrelation between the terms *genre* and *register* will be discussed (section 2.7).

2.2. The Origin of Genres

In written communication, the study of genre is not new. Genre has been associated with classical studies especially the study of literary texts. Traditionally, genres were regarded essentially as text types. They were characterized as being 'primarily literary'; defined by 'textual regularities in form and content'; they were 'fixed and immutable' and were classified into

'mutually exclusive categories and sub-categories' (Freedman & Medway, 1994:1). Literary texts were then classified into 'lyric', 'dramatic' or 'epic' and these were classified into sub-categories e.g., lyric texts were subclassified into sonnets and odes, and 'each of these was distinguished according to its distinctive features of form and content' (p.2).

For a long time, teachers of writing were influenced and guided by the genres that appeared in the classical literature on rhetoric. The teaching of composition included the practice of text types like *exposition, argument, narration* and *description* as larger categories and within these categories, the *short story*, *the business letter*, *the report*, as subcategories (Freedman & Medway, ibid).

The origin of the notion of genres is linked to Aristotle's studies on rhetoric and, throughout history it has also been associated with education. Aristotle defines *rhetoric* as 'the faculty [power] of discovering in the particular case... the available means of persuasion' (Rhetoric, p.7, apud Lindemann, 1982:36). According to this definition, rhetoric is a broad discipline which comprises many types of arts and forms of communication, including oral and written texts. Rhetoric can also be seen as 'a process of choosing and organizing the information for a specific purpose and a specific audience' (Trimble, 1985:10). As a discipline as well as a process, rhetoric enables writers to produce different types of texts for particular audience and purpose. In producing different types of texts, writers make decisions about the subject, audience, point of view, purpose, the sequence

of ideas and the best language resources to express these ideas. In so doing, writers produce genres which convey a particular rhetorical aim and which take into account social motives in response to social contexts. One of the characteristics of rhetoric concerns the use of persuasion. In order to produce particular text types people make use of persuasion and also of other factors (topic, audience, linguistic forms, etc) with a rhetorical aim. These texts are commonly identified as genres.

Rhetoric as practiced in the past has been characterized by *invention* (ways of discovering relevant ideas and supporting evidence), *arrangement* (ways of organizing parts of discourse), *style* (ways of ornamenting discourse), *memory* (mnemonic techniques) and *delivery* (techniques for practising and giving oral speeches). Aristotle argues that when rhetoric is rightly practiced, it serves a useful purpose. Rhetoric, besides 'inducing cooperation and persuasion' (Lindermann, 1982:37) enables writers and speakers to elaborate messages for particular audiences and purposes. Rhetoricians have claimed that 'discourse which affects an audience, which informs, moves, delights and teaches, has a rhetorical aim' (Lindermann, ibid:37). It must be stressed that not all verbal or written communication aims to create an effect in an audience. However, when people use language in more formal ways, the purpose is rhetorical, since people express the intention of changing attitudes or behaviours, or explaining a subject matter, or any other function. In this sense, texts which are used aiming at these functions are considered genres. As rhetoric is a dynamic and ever changing process, so are genres, because society also

changes when its members use language to communicate with each other, to meet the needs of those who wish to make communication effective. These ideas influenced and shaped, according to Freedman and Medway (1994), the current thinking and research about genre, especially the teaching of composition. Such ideas lead students to make decisions of strategies and appropriate language forms when producing their texts as well as about the textual characteristics of a good writing.

In the light of the discussion of the origin and existence of genres, Todorov (1991:15) argues that genre comes from other genres, i.e., 'a new genre is the transformation of an earlier one or of several, by inversion, displacement or combination'. Sharing this same view, Schryer (1993:208) also argues that genres 'come from somewhere and are transformed into something else' through their relations with past texts and present texts.

Todorov associates the notion of genre with the notion of 'text' or 'discourse' (for him the words are synonyms). He defines genres as 'classes of texts' while defining text or discourse as 'not made up of sentences, but of uttered sentences, or more succinctly, of utterances'. Taking into account that in a given society the recurrence of certain discursive properties is institutionalized and that the texts are produced and perceived in relation to the norm constituted by that codification, Todorov (ibid:18) views genres as 'the codification of discursive properties'. By *discursive properties* he means any aspect, feature or element of discourse that can be made obligatory and that distinguishes different genres (Todorov, ibid:15). As an example, he

shows that the difference between songs and poems lies in phonetic features and the difference between tragedy and comedy lies in the thematic elements. He argues that each epoch has its own system of genres which stands in some relation to the dominant ideology. Genres, then, like any other institution reflect 'the constitutive features of the society to which they belong' (Todorov, ibid:19).

Genres, in Todorov's view, are also associated with speech act theory in that language - especially utterances - involves ways of acting in the world. For him, an utterance can not be disassociated from context. In a communicative situation, an utterance can only be comprehended as an action, when the context is regarded and understood in the same way by all participants (Freedman & Medway, 1994:6). In this relation between genre and speech act, he concludes that some genres like 'novel' may derive from a simpler speech act like 'telling' while others do not, like 'sonnet' where there is no act of 'sonneting' (p.21). Sharing Todorov's view is Bakhtin's theory of speech genres (1986) which highlights the idea of genres as 'typical forms of utterances' (Bakhtin, 1986:63, in Berkenkotter & Huckin, 1995:2) and he suggests that they should be studied in 'their actual contexts of use'.

Today genres are seen as dynamic and ever changing process. Several studies have been carried out on the analyses of the features of written and oral texts revealing such a process and stressing genres as social actions (see Bazermann, 1988; Campbell & Jamieson, 1978 apud

Swales, 1990; Miller, 1984; Swales, 1990, to cite just a few). In the section that follows, I will survey the more recent literature on genre studies in academic discourse which reflect such view.

2.3. Genre studies as social action

The view of genre from a sociological perspective highlights the recurrent social situations, practices of everyday life and the use of genres for particular rhetorical purposes. Such a view has influenced several scholars in rhetoric and the sociology of science (Bazerman, 1988; Bakthin, 1986, apud Berkenkotter & Huckin, 1995); Kress, 1985, 1993; Swales, 1984, 1990). Terms like 'recurrence', 'social context/situation', 'discourse community', and 'communicative purpose' have been taken into account in this view of genre as a dynamic and social process.

One of the advocates of this view is Miller (1984) who proposes to look at genres as 'rhetorical action' or as deriving from 'recurring situations' (p.155). This means that genres only acquire meaning from a situation and from social context when they are shared by people who participate in the actions of a community. Her contribution to the discussion of genre as accomplishing 'typified rhetorical actions' based on recurrent response to a rhetorical situation (p. 159) has been widely accepted by those scholars who share the view of genre as social action. Such a notion of typification implies the recognition of regularities and similarities among individual texts in recurring situations leading people to the construction of representations or conventions of these typified actions. These representations result from

shared social interpretations and perceptions of the situation and of social experience of events, participants and language.

Miller's seminal redefinition of genre draws, mainly, on the work of Kenneth Burke's (1969, apud Miller, 1984:152) who discussed 'rhetorical acts as strategies for responding to situations' and also on the work of Lloyd Bitzer (1968, apud Miller, ibid:152) who defined a 'rhetorical situation' as a 'complex of persons, events, objects, and relations' in which an 'exigence' is presented by means of discourse. Based on these works, Miller, then, defines genres 'as typified rhetorical actions based on recurrent situations' (Miller, ibid:159) in which 'the process of interpretation' is very important and it is in the center of human action (ibid:156). In examining the implications of genres for rhetorical education, Miller concludes that genre is useful for students in that it 'serves as keys to understanding how to participate in the actions of a community' (p. 165).

Genre as social action has also been stressed by a group of scholars in Sydney, Australia, whose work was initiated by Michael Halliday and whose orientation has been to show 'the political and ideological implications of genre' (Freedman & Medway, 1994:10). Their approach is based on a social-semiotic perspective on language description (Halliday & Hasan, 1989)[1] . Among the well-known scholars in this group are: Martin (1986, 1992), Ventola (1987), Martin & Rothery (1981), and Christie (1986). Such scholars have worked at describing and understanding specific genres

in education as social actions within particular social and historical contexts, in this case, the Australian educational context.

Another important contribution in the area of genre analysis from Australia is that by Kress (1983, 1993) who sees *text* as 'the social unit of language' (p.25)[2] . A text has a social origin and he argues that it can be explained in terms of the social context in which it was produced. Kress also argues that in examining the text in its complete social and cultural context, it provides 'the relevant starting point for any speculation about the forms, uses and functions of language' (p.27). In this account, genre is the 'product of particular social relations between people involved in the production of a text' (p.28). He argues that the regularities of recurring situations give rise to regularities in the texts which are produced in that situation - whether in the writing up a classroom essay for the teacher or a political pamphlet attacking the government. Genre, as conceived by Martin and Rothery (1981, 1989, apud Kress 1993) is seen as 'a term which describes the whole complex of factors which needs to be described and understood about a text' (p.32). In this perspective, the term genre is seen to cover both what is to know linguistically and ideologically about a text.

Within the systemic-functional approach to language use, there are other studies which reflect a form-oriented perspective of genre e.g. Hasan (Halliday and Hasan, 1989) and Ventola (1987) who analysed genres-service encounters - in terms of the rhetorical pattern of language in response to a social context. In the next section, Hasan's view of genre will

be discussed because her approach has been influential in the analysis of configurations of genres.

2.4. Hasan's view of genre

In Hasan's (Halliday & Hasan, 1989) view of genre text and context are so 'intimately related that neither concept can be enunciated without the other' (p.52). She defines genre as 'language doing the job appropriate to a class of social happenings' (ibid:108). A central feature of Hasan's theory is the notion of generic structure potential (abbreviated as GSP). The GSP of a text is its 'actual structure', its overall shape which is characterized by the occurrence of a range of obligatory and optional elements in such a order within a particular configuration which is determined by the social contexts. This means that each genre has its own GSP and this is said, according to Hasan, to vary across different genres.

By contextual configuration (abbreviated as CC), Hasan means the features of the situation which allow us to make generalizations about the structure of a text. A CC is 'a specific set of values that realises field, tenor and mode' (Halliday & Hasan, 1989:55). According to Hasan, such a configuration determines the obligatory and optional elements in the text structure, their sequence and recursion.

Within the concept of contextual configuration, the element *context* is subdivided into three variables already mentioned:

a) **Field of discourse**- refers to the nature of the social activity in which the participants are engaged as well as its goals (e.g. informing, requesting, praising, etc);

b) **Tenor of discourse** - refers to the nature of participants and their roles and status in the interaction;

c) **Mode of discourse** - refers to what part the language is playing, what it is that the participants are expecting the language to do for them in that situation.

In addition to the context of situation, the individual background is also important and is always present and active in any communicative situation. The interrelationship between 'the immediate context and the cultural background' is also stressed by Freire (1992:23) who claims that such relationship 'provides vital information which contributes to the understanding of the real context and transmission of cultural patterns' in any kind of interaction.

In proposing that specific values are associated with field, tenor and mode, Hasan claims that these have an additional effect on texts, that of overall, global schematic patternings of texts (ibid:108). Generic text typology is, in Hasan's view, based on the study of these global structures, as also observed by Ventola (1987:42). The term 'schematic structure' is viewed as a staged unfolding of a text.

Hasan (ibid) emphasizes that when a CC contains 'the same elements in a number of social event instances, i.e., when they are produced in the same kind of social context', are likely to be found similarities among the elements which comprise the text as well as in the way they unfold linguistically. Due to the similarity of unfolding among texts, these can be classified as belonging to the same genre.

The term *potential* which grounds Hasan's view of genre means that what defines a genre is a combination of obligatory and optional elements. Thus the GSP is defined by the presence of obligatory elements in text structure predicting what elements come next and indicating to the reader if the text is complete and representative of a genre or not. It is the use of relatively fixed, obligatory elements in a particular sequence which determines the limits of a genre and allows us to distinguish between different genres. As already suggested in Chapter 1, such obligatory elements 'are therefore genre specific and genre defining' (Ventola, 1987:43).

In addition to the obligatory elements, a set of optional elements can sometimes occur in texts of the genre although they are not indicators of completeness. 'They are not seen as necessary in every instance of the realisation of the social process' (Ventola, ibid:44), but they are seen to be shared in related genres (Halliday & Hasan, 1989:61). The use of optional elements indicates that the writer has at his/her disposal 'a range of available choices which allow him/her to vary the expression of his/her

language within a generally fixed generic structure' (McCarthy & Carter, 1994:27). Any text belonging to such a genre would then be predicted to have as constituents certain semantically defined elements. The GSP both defines the permissible sequential order and the variations of generic elements. Another kind of textual element is Iteration or Recursion which encompasses those elements that occur more than once in texts, but without following any strict order.

Hasan analysed the CC of the genre of 'service encounters' of buying and selling perishable food in face to face interaction between a vendor and a customer and described it as:

a)**Field:** service encounter

b)**Tenor**: institutionalised agents

c)**Mode**: phonic channel; spoken medium.

Hasan identified the following GSP for this genre:

Sale request^ sale compliance^ sale^ purchase^ purchase closure

Figure 2.1. Generic Structure Potential of Service Encounters Hasan (1989:64)

The obligatory elements identified in this genre are SR, SC, S, P and PC in that order while the optional elements are Greetings ('saying hello') and Finis ('saying goodbye'). She identified Sale Enquiry as an iterative element in the structure of this genre in that it can occur at any

point after SR, its function being to determine some attribute of the goods contemplated for purchase.

Hasan's framework has been very influential in the analysis of the text structure of genres and it will be useful in the identification of the status of textual elements of the BRs (most typical, less typical and iterative elements) which will be analysed in the present study. However, despite the fact that Hasan's work on the identification of the genre of service encounters in terms of GSP has made a significant contribution to the description of generic structures in instances of related genres (Ventola, 1987; Ramos, 1992, Freire, 1992), her framework has been deemed ample enough to allow for more precise representation of the rhetorical structure of academic genres. Thus in an attempt to provide a more detailed description of the structure of BRs, Swales' model will be adapted in the description of moves and Hasan's framework will be used as complementary to Swales' model in the identification of the status of textual elements.

2.5. Genre and academic discourse

Genre theory has made a great impact in education and as a consequence, a great number of studies have been carried out on academic genres, especially in the areas of EST (English for Science and Technology) and ESP (English for Specific Purpose). One of the well-known publications in EST is that of Tarone, Dwyer, Gillette and Icke's (1981) on the use of passive forms as a typical feature of English for Science and Technology. Other well-respected names who have carried studies in EST are: Selinker,

Lackstrom, and Trimble (1972, 1973), Trimble (1985) and Huckin (1984, apud Johns & Dudley-Evans, 1993). Undoubetdly, the most important representative of ESP, as an international movement which is characterized by a concern with non-native speakers and writers of English within a specific learning context, is Swales (1981, apud Swales, 1990) who among other important publications, has analysed the rhetorical organization of research article introductions. His work has led other scholars to research different academic genres, acknowledging the importance of genre analysis to language teaching and, especially, to ESP.

The following scholars have continued the line of research started by Swales: Dudley-Evans (1986) analyses the Discussion section of Msc dissertations written by native speakers in the School of Biological Sciences at the University of Birmingham; Crookes (1984, unpublished thesis) investigates article introductions from various academic disciplines; Bhatia (1982, 1993) analyses the various moves of legal English; Salager-Meyer (1989) examines the grammatical-rhetorical relationships which characterize the style of medical English papers; Santos (1995) analyses the rhetorical organization of English abstract articles; Motta-Roth (1995) analyses the rhetorical structure of book reviews in three different disciplines: economics, chemistry and linguistics. All these studies are seen as valuable contributions to our understanding of the rhetorical features of the genres analysed and the ways genres are produced for a particular purpose within a professional and discourse community.

Besides motivating researchers to examine academic genres, Swales' work has also led to the production of materials which reflect a more focused approach to the teaching of academic writing to non-native adult students or young academics learning to write in their subject. Thus the interest of scholars and teachers in understanding and applying his move-analytical approach continues to increase. The model which has served as framework for different researches in genre analysis will be discussed in the next section in relation to the genre originally studied by Swales - the research article.

2.5.1. Swales' view of genre

In examining the rhetorical organisation of forty eight research article introductions, Swales (1981, apud Swales, 1990) found that writers of research articles displayed remarkable similarities in the way they organized their article introductions. His analysis emphasizes the means by which a text realizes its communicative purpose rather than the establishment of a system for the classification of genres. By the term 'genre', Swales (ibid) means 'a more or less standardized communicative event with a goal or set of goals mutually understood by the participants in that event...' (p.10).

For Swales, a given communicative purpose in recurrent situations is the defining feature of genre. Genre analysis is able to reveal something of the pattern of organization of a 'genre', its purpose and discourse community.

In his later work published in 1990, Swales extends his definition of genre, as follows,

> a genre comprises a class of communicative events, the members of which share some set of communicative purposes. The purposes are recognized by the expert members of the parent discourse community, and thereby constitute the rationale for the genre...(p.58).

According to this definition, the main feature of a genre is the communicative purpose(s) or the common goals shared or understood by the members of the community where the genre occurs. Every text has a communicative function or purpose and it is this purpose which distinguishes it from other genres. The communicative purpose is reflected in the overall structure of genre.

Another important aspect which is worthy of comment is the notion of genre as 'a class of communicative events'. A communicative event as conceived by Swales comprises 'not only the discourse itself and its participants, but also the role of that discourse and the environment of its production and reception, including its historical and cultural associations' (Swales 1990:46). This means that everything related to the production and reception of discourse including previous knowledge of the world and of previous texts is a communicative event[3] .

The concept of 'discourse community' in Swales' notion of genre has also received attention. Swales locates genres within discourse communities, which are defined as 'socio-rhetorical networks that form in

order to work towards sets of common goals' (p.8). Swales refers to those who work professionally with a particular genre as having greater 'overt knowledge of the conventions' (ibid:4). This knowledge allows them to respond in similar ways to similar communicative purposes. Members of the community are assumed to have knowledge of the communicative goals of a particular genre, the structure of this genre, its specific vocabulary and its boundaries, because of their participation in the actions of the community as part of their daily work (Bhatia 1993:14). The conclusion to be reached here, then, is that only those who write and read a certain genre regularly will be aware of the conventions. In order to become accepted members of the academic community, young learners will have to learn the conventions that apply to the writing of academic texts, including BRs, and they also need to become sensitive to variations of style preferred by particular journals in a certain area of knowledge. Genre knowledge, as already discussed previously, is derived from the participation of the members of the community in the communicative activities of professional life. Such knowledge 'is transmitted through enculturation as apprentices become socialized to the ways of speaking in particular disciplinary communities' (Berkenkotter & Huckin, 1995:7). The notion of discourse community has been regarded as relevant for understanding of the way genres work in educational settings.

Besides the common goals and knowledge of the structure of genres, another aspect which seems relevant and which should be considered in the notion of genre is *background knowledge* i.e., knowledge

of the world, of a particular community, of a discipline, that writers and readers of the genre are assumed to have when producing a particular genre (Berkenkotter & Huckin, 1995:14). Such knowledge enables readers and writers who are familiar with the genre to understand and produce it more effectively.

Swales summarizes the main characteristics of a genre in terms of the following set of criteria (1990:58):

a) A genre comprises 'a class of communicative events', with a number of common communicative goals;

b) The shared set of communicative purposes can be recognized by the specialist members of the discourse community and thus constitute the rationale for the genre;

c) This rationale shapes the genre in terms of form and content;

d) Exemplars of a genre display similar patterns in terms of structure, style, content and intended audience;

e) If all probability expectations are accomplished, the exemplar will be seen as prototypical by the discourse community.

The last criterion brings to our discussion of genre analysis the concept of *prototype*[4]. Prototype theory 'aims to explain why people and cultures categorize the world in the way they do' (Paltridge, 1995:394). In categorizing items and concepts people build in their mind a prototypical image of the item or concept in focus. This notion of prototypicality which is generally discussed in 'lexical and syntactic terms', may be applied to

genres. Thus 'the closer the representation of a genre is to the prototypical image of the genre, the clearer an example it will be as an instance of that particular genre' (ibid:394). This position is supported by Swales (1990:52) who claims that such a notion 'releases the genre analyst from the task of producing "unassailable definitions of a particular genre" with the understanding that instances of a genre may vary in their prototypicality' (p. 395). McCarthy and Carter (1994:35) also shares the same position by positing that underlying different genres there are textual prototypes which are characterized by recurrent features which, in turn, are prototypically present in particular groups of texts. This notion is claimed to be important in language teaching.

2.5.2. Move analysis of research article introductions

Swales' approach to genre is applied to the description of language use in terms of rhetorical *moves* and their component *steps* as particular units of analysis assigned to instances of Research Article Introductions.

Swales (1981, apud Swales, 1990, 1984) posited a four-move structure for a typical article introduction, which he called CARS (Create A Research Space) for article introductions. They are:

Move 1 - Establishing the research field
Move 2 - Summarizing previous research
Move 3 - Preparing for present research
Move 4 - Introducing the present research

Figure 2.2. Swales' model for article introductions (1984:80)

In the case of article introductions, the model reveals that communicative purpose is accomplished through four rhetorical moves which give this genre its typical schematic structure. Such schematic structure is the conventionalized and standardized organisation used by members of the professional community. But in order to realize a particular communicative intention at the level of a move, a writer may use different steps depending on constraints, such as the nature of topic/field, reader-writer relationship, the intended audience, etc.

In Swales' framework, *move is* defined as a 'schematic unit of information', as 'a unit of discourse structure which presents a uniform orientation, has specific structural characteristics and has clearly defined functions' (Nwogu, 1990:98,127 apud Motta-Roth, 1995:46). Each move includes a number of *steps* which are constituent elements that combine to convey the information which makes up a move. Steps as defined by Swales (1990b:150) are 'elements that make a paper or any other text coherent to genre-experienced readers'. Thus in a description of RA introductions, such moves and steps characterize the rhetorical organization of this part of the genre.

Later, Swales (1990:141) revised his model and reduced the four moves to three and showed that each move may be realized by one or several steps capturing a number of characteristics of research article introductions as follows in Figure 2.3.

Move 1 - Establishing a territory
S1 - Claiming centrality
and/for
S2 - Making topic generalization(s)
and/or
S3 - Reviewing items of previous research
Move 2 - Establishing a niche
S1A - Counter claiming
or
S1B - Indicating a gap
or
S1C - Question-raising
or
S1D - Continuing a tradition
Move 3 - Occupying the niche
S1A - Outlining the purposes
or
S1B - Announcing present research
S2 - Announcing principal findings
S3 - Indicating RA structure

Figure 2.3. CARS model for RA Introductions (Swales, 1990:141)

This revised model is a modification of his earliest attempt to offer an account for the rhetorical organization of article introductions. As the critics of his model detected certain flaws concerning the identification of moves and, especially, with regard to separating Move 1 and Move 2, Swales examined a great number of articles observing the recycling possibilities in longer introductions and then restricted the 'four-move' structure to three moves as described in Figure 2.3 above.

As was stated before, these moves and steps are said to capture the characteristics of RA introductions as pointed out by Swales (ibid:142) which are: 'the need to re-establish in the eyes of the discourse community the significance of the research field itself; the need to "situate" the actual

research in terms of that significance and the need to show how this niche in the wider ecosystem will be occupied and defended'. Swales notes that in the writing of research article introductions the writer organizes the information in three moves which reveal the rhetorical movement of the genre as characterized by the way information conveys each move. Swales perceives that the ideas presented in Move 1 are characterized as a 'declining rhetorical effort' in which the information has a narrow effect on the reader since the writer offers an account of what has been found and who has found it besides providing a summary of previous research. In Move 2, the writer's ideas move towards a 'weakening of knowledge claims' i.e., the writer plays the role of establishing a niche either by counter-claiming or indicating a gap or continuing a tradition. Finally, in Move 3, the writer 'increases explicitness' of the purpose of his/her article (Swales, ibid.:141) by creating a research space that justifies the writing of it.

In the examination of academic texts, it is particularly important to comment that some variation must be allowed for moves and steps in that, although this is a typical order found in RA introductions (Swales 1990:145), it is not the only order used. Swales claims that although there is freedom concerning the order of elements, textual elements may occur in certain preferred orders rather than others and that the sequence of these elements may reveal the rationale behind these major preferred ones.

As Swales' schematic model reflects a functional description of language use, each move and step is signalled through linguistic features-

microstructural elements- which convey the rhetorical function of portions of text. In spite of limitations and criticisms towards the model, Swales' ideas have brought relevant contributions for an understanding of the nature of written communication in the areas of genre and discourse analysis.

2.5.3. Applying Swales' move-type analysis to the study of BRs

The need to characterize the organizational structure of BRs as a genre has led me to opt for Swales' approach for several reasons. First, as already pointed out, it allows for the association of certain specific features of language with certain types of writing. Second, because it is a much more eclectic approach in its perception of the notion of genre. Third, the model Swales proposes and as conceived by Dudley-Evans (1986:133) can be adapted to the analysis of other types of genre as evidenced by other researchers who have applied it to the analysis of academic genres, especially, in ESP.

The definition of genre given by Swales (1990, 1993a) can be applied to the corpus analysed in this study. First, BRs, as a genre, comprise a set of communicative events. A BR is a communicative event in the sense that it is a piece of discourse produced by people (professionals) who share the same communicative purposes (to describe and evaluate new publications in the field) in a certain social situation (a scientific journal), performing certain roles commonly associated with that situation. In its production, the conventions (rules) of the genre including its cultural, linguistic and discoursal associations are taken into account.

Second, the communicative purposes are recognized by the expert members of the discourse community. Expert writers (reviewers) and readers recognize exemplars of this genre using their genre knowledge (conventions) as well as previous knowledge of the world, of the discipline and of generic textual features of BRs. The generic constraints concerning the intent, positioning and form of academic BRs reflect the regulating activities of the academic community on its members.

Third, exemplars of BRs, as is the case with other genres, vary in their prototypicality because factors like form, structure, audience expectations and linguistic resources operate to affect the extent to which an exemplar is seen as prototypical of a particular genre.

Finally, the common goals shared by the members of the discourse community constrain the shape of the genre. On the one hand, readers look at BRs in order to search for an appraisal of recent publications in the field. On the other hand, reviewers, while producers of BRs, tend to write BRs in response to their readers' expectations. As a consequence, instances of BRs may have similar patterns in their rhetorical organization that will help to define the genre.

As already defined in Chapter 1, section 1.4., a BR is a kind of evaluative academic text in which the reviewer attempts to persuade the reader to read or not the new book. The main function of a BR is, as already

pointed out as well, evaluative and persuasive in the sense that the reviewer aims to elicit a specific response from its reader(s), that is, s/he tries to show why the book reviewed is worth reading or not. Irrespective of whether readers want to read the book or not, the reviewer also aims to approve or refute the theoretical rationale which underlies the new book .

In order to capture the attention of the reader, the reviewer offers an appraisal of the book in terms of aims, content, strengths and weaknesses of the book, giving to the reader an overview of the book and his/her opinion about it based on a given theoretical perspective. All the information is presented in a concise way because the space for publication of BRs in journals is restricted.

Besides what has been said about genre so far, one further issue deserves attention. It is the interrelation of the notions of genre and register, which will be discussed in the next section.

2.6. Genre and Register

There has been a lot of discussion among those who study language about the dividing line between genre and register. In fact it seems unclear and, that for some scholars, there seems to be an overlapping. *Register*, which is considered a rather imprecise term, refers to 'the variety of language which is appropriate for the situation of the speech event' (Steffensen, 1986:1). Steffensen also claims that features of language are selected by the writer in accordance with context, purpose, and the relation of the language user

to an audience. Register, in a Hallidayan view of language as social semiotic, comprises 'the linguistic features of the text that reflect the social context in which it is produced' (McCarthy, 1991:32).

Halliday (1978:32) defines register as,

> a form of prediction: given that we know the situation, the social context of language use, we can predict a great deal about the language that will occur with reasonable probability of being right.

Register, in Halliday's terms, expresses the notion of prediction of the language use that can occur in a communicative situation or even of the text structure, if one knows the social context of a particular instance of language use (Adams Smith, 1987:10). Halliday (Halliday and Hasan, 1989:5) also stresses that a register is a 'variety of language that is oriented to a particular context to a certain type of activity, involving certain types of people, with a certain rhetorical force'. Swales (1990) claims that where the members of a community have a commonly shared goal in a given context, these will produce 'a more or less standardized communicative event'. In this way, the notion of genre is associated with communicative event and text structure and it is interrelated to register.

According to Steffensen (1986:71), register is established in a text through the linguistic forms and structures and it varies according to the social context, participants, topic, modality and purpose which comprises the discourse community. Such notion indicates that within any discourse

community we are likely to find areas of specialized information which are realized linguistically.

Examining her notion of register, we can perceive that such notion clearly overlaps with the notion of genre developed by different scholars (Swales, 1990; Kress, 1993; Halliday & Hasan, 1989) in that all refer to the concept of language variation according to the social context, the purposes and the participants involved. In Swales' conception of genre, a variety of features may be identified which are constrained in terms of 'positioning, form and intent' (1990:52) and which are specific characteristics of genre.

In this study I am specifically concerned with the description of the rhetorical organization of BRs in terms of moves and strategies showing which moves are more or less typical and which strategies are used to realize the specific moves of this genre. The description which will be provided in Chapter 3 should not be seen as a definite or prescriptive model for the genre but rather as a critical and evaluative exercise which will help students in the creation of more effective texts. Although scholars mentioned above recognize that there is an interconnection between the concepts of genre and register, the notion of register is left out in this study because we are interested in examining instances of texts belonging to the same genre in terms of their overall organization observing the purpose, meanings and functions which shape the genre and also in terms of how a group of nouns, unspecific nouns, organizes the information conveyed in the genre.

2.7. Summary

In this chapter I have provided an overview of the theoretical background on genre analysis from the origin of theories of genre to present studies of academic genres. I have surveyed mainly the two main approaches which underlie the analysis of the selected corpus (BRs) - Swales' move-type analysis and Hasan's GSP as being those which best encompass the notion of genre as 'social practice', 'as a social activity of a typical and recognizable kind in a community which is realized in language' (Mauranen, 1993:4). I have shown how BRs is an instance of genre according to Swales' view of genre. Finally, the terms 'register' and 'genre' were also briefly discussed to show how they are interrelated and that language variation is the central feature of these concepts.

In the next chapter, I proceed to the first part of the analysis of book reviews, namely the rhetorical organization of these texts.

Notes

[1] Systemic functional linguistics was originaly formulated by M. A. K. Halliday, based on the work of Firth and Malinowski (see Kress, 1976; Halliday, 1985a.; Halliday and Hasan, 1989).

[2] For Kress (1981), 'text' is distinguished from 'discourse' and 'genre' in that 'discourses' are 'systemically-organized modes of talking' (p.6), while 'text' is 'the material realization of discourse' (p. 18) and 'genre' is 'the conventionalized forms of the occasions of a community leading to conventionalized forms of texts' (p.19).

[3] A 'communicative event' may be defined in a simple way as a piece of oral or written interaction which contains a complete message (Nunan, 1993). The event itself may involve oral language or written language.

[4] For a full discussion on the concept of 'prototype' see, for example, Swales (1990), McCarthy and Carter (1994), Paltridge (1995).

CHAPTER 3

The Rhetorical Organization of Book Reviews

3.1.Introduction

In this chapter I assume that BRs, a kind of expository and evaluative written text, are characterized by a typical rhetorical organization. It is my purpose in this chapter firstly to devise an account of the methodological procedures for the analysis of academic BRs (section 3.2). I shall then present my structural analysis of BRs according to Swales' updated framework by looking at the features of text organization and the linguistic clues which convey these features (section 3.3 and 3.4). Next, I shall take up an instance of BR and illustrate the structural interpretation by showing its main features (section 3.5). I shall discuss the textual boundaries of BRs (section 3.6) and the flexibility of move-structure of these texts (section 3.7). Finally, I shall discuss the limitations and difficulties found in the analysis (section 3.8).

3.2. Methodology

The corpus of the analysis which was collected from applied linguistics journals published between 1989 and 1994 comprises a total of eighty representations of the genre, containing a total of 224,938 running words.

The selected texts are analysed both qualitatively and quantitatively to discover the rhetorical moves which are more or less frequent and typical in the texts.

As already stated in Chapter 1, (section 1.6.), academic journals in the area of applied linguistics were surveyed and four journals in this area were selected. The main criteria for the selection of the journals were:

(i) the ease with which texts could be obtained by this researcher. This criterion constrained the choice to titles which are available at the Federal University of Santa Catarina and the University of Liverpool where I was working in 1993 developing the pilot study for this research;

(ii) the consistency of the texts appearing in the journals. Only those texts which appear in a clearly stated Book Review section were collected. Based on this criterion I have found that most applied linguistics journals, however, carry BRs;

(iii) the length of texts. This criterion is not the most important one adopted in the choice. As a BR is a short and critical appraisal of a new publication presented in a concise way to the reader, the selected BRs vary in length from 1 to 3 pages;

(iv) the nationality of the reviewer was also considered in the choice. Only texts written by native speakers of English were selected. By their names, as well-known specialists in the field and the institutions they work for, I could

identify the reviewers as native speakers of English (British, American, Australian).

The number of exemplars of the genre per journal varied depending on the number of texts published per issue and on who was the reviewer (i.e., whether a native speaker of English). Based on this criterion, SSLA (Studies in the Second Language Acquisition Journal) is the journal from which a greater number of texts was extracted (see section 1.6.).

3.2.1. Text Analysis

Early in the investigation of the rhetorical organization of the BRs, a colour-system was used in order to identify the different moves in the texts. This system allowed me to vizualize and to consider each move at a detailed level of analysis which would allow me to extract maximum semantic information and language relevant to the purposes of the investigation being carried out. The analysis took into account the function, meaning and form of the texts as they relate to the rhetorical organization of BRs.

The qualitative analysis of the data consists of a detailed investigation of the 80 selected BRs with the aim of identifying the rhetorical organization of the genre in terms of moves and strategies, and the linguistic clues which express these moves and strategies. The texts were analysed as many times as necessary for comparison of moves and strategies. Some difficulties arose

in the identification of text parts that seemed not to fail into any of the moves which were clearly identified. Such difficulties will be discussed in section 3.8.

To identify the rhetorical organization of BRs, the texts are analysed on the basis of regularities and relatedness of the information they convey and the way they are organized. Such organization is identified through a functional view of discourse structure in terms of moves and strategies (Swales, 1990). Moves and strategies are identified by reference to function and linguistic signals that reveal the rhetorical movement in the texts.

The analysis of the data is carried out in two stages. In the first stage, linguistic signals including nouns, adjectives, adverbs, verbs, connectives which may express evaluation are examined in order to identify the rhetorical moves and strategies. In a second stage, a specific linguistic signal is examined: unspecific nouns as organizers of information of BRs (see Chapter 4). From the analysis, a model of rhetorical moves of BRs is proposed and a list of lexical items employed to convey positive and negative evaluation of BRs is carefully worked out.

By taking into account the linguistic manifestations present in the different BRs, I investigated whether or not there were regularities which would enable me to categorize and identify specific moves in these BRs. I first examined the overall rhetorical structure of these texts based on the content.

The analysis revealed the existence of two main rhetorical functions: reporting and evaluation. Within each rhetorical function, moves and strategies were then identified. By examining the frequency of information in the eighty BRs it was possible to identify which moves and strategies are most typical and which ones are less typical. Taking into account the variety of information presented in the exemplars of the genre, it was necessary to set a continuum along which the most typical and the less typical elements are identifed[1] (Motta-Roth, 1995). Thus, the most typical components appearing in the texts are those which are set along a continuum of 60% and 100% of occurrences while the less typical elements are those which are less frequent, i.e., between 1% and 59%. Those elements which appear more than once in the same text are deemed iterative.

The categories I used for analysis were based on Swales' updated framework for introductions to research articles but with some modification because Swales' moves were not designed to analyse BRs. The modifications took into account the communicative purpose and the great variety of information presented in the selected BRs. I have identified three moves and several strategies which characterize the rhetorical organization of BRs.

As already mentioned in Chapter 1, 'moves', for the purposes of analysis, are 'units of information', 'stretches of discourse that can extend for one or more sentences, that realize a specific communicative function, and that together with other moves constitute the whole information structure that must

be present in the text to allow it to be recognized as an exemplar of a given genre' (Motta-Roth, 1995:60). A move encompasses a series of smaller functional units which I call 'strategies'. These are rhetorical acts or tactics employed by the reviewer in order to achieve a certain goal in a move. In using one or more strategies, the reviewer tries to pursue and convey his/her particular communicative goal or purpose.

It should be stressed that moves and strategies do not occur in a specific order. Thus the order of presentation here represents the most frequent patterns of occurrence in the eighty BRs examined. I shall now look in detail at these moves and the strategies which realize them. Excerpts from the corpus are used to illustrate the analysis.

3.3. - Structural description of the moves

The most typical rhetorical moves occurring in the data are:

Move 1 - Establishing the field
Move 2- Summarizing the content of the book
Move 3- Providing final assessment of the book

Figure 3.1 - Typical BR moves

The analysis revealed that not all moves had the same length. In most cases, the introductory and closing moves are short (in general one paragraph only), while Move 2 is a longer section encompassing several paragraphs

(from 4 to 20). The fact that Move 2 is longer may suggest that this move is more argumentative than the opening and closing ones in that the reviewer tends to report and evaluate the book under focus.

The boundaries of each move are visually set by paragraph shifts. However, the boundaries of each strategy is not easy to establish, since the analysis revealed that two strategies may appear within the limits of one sentence. This question will be discussed in sections 3.6 and 3.8.

The analysis revealed that with few exceptions all eighty BRs comprise the three moves described above (Figure 3.1) displaying a very consistent pattern of information and organization in the texts. Such organization can be defined in the sequence the moves appear in the texts. Table 3.1. shows the frequency of occurrence and sequence of the three moves in the corpus[2] , which, because of their high incidence, justifies us in regarding this as a prototypical pattern of organization in BRs.

Moves	Book	Reviews
	N	%
1	77	96.25
2	80	100
3	66	82.5

Table 3.1. Frequency of moves in BRs

Move 1- Establishing the field.

One typical move which characterizes the selected BRs is 'Establishing the field'. This move is clearly present in the opening paragraphs of seventy seven of the texts (96.25%). In this first move, the reviewer begins the text by establishing the field of knowledge to which the book belongs. The reviewer introduces the book to the reader by providing information about the basic characteristics of the book, i.e., if the book is a collection of articles by different authors or if it is a text by one author, if it contains a variety of topics within a larger area of interest or if it concentrates on a single topic. This move also provides information about the aim of the book, to whom the book is addressed and the importance of the book in the specific area of knowledge.

Move 1 is regarded as the second most typical move in BRs, due to its frequency of occurrence. This demonstrates that in addition to situating the book within a theoretical or methodological context, this move also introduces the book to the reader by providing information on the topic, the author, aim, audience, previous studies and a brief evaluation of the book. All this information creates a context for the reader to accompany the reviewer in the summary of content and in the evaluation of parts of the book. It also allows the reader to make a judgement as to whether to read on, i.e. it tells the reader whether the BR will be relevant to him/her. The importance of this move for the genre lies in the fact that reviewer's contribution seems to keep the literary tradition in the field. In the case of the three BRs where Move 1 is

missing (3.75%), reviewers start with a description of the organization of the book instead of characterizing and inserting the book within a field of knowledge.

Move 2 - Summarizing the content of the book

After having established the field of knowledge of the book, the reviewer goes on to fulfil the communicative purpose of the genre through Move 2 - 'Summarizing the content of the book' - which includes information about the organization of the book in parts, sections, chapters etc, a summary or discussion of the content of the parts, sections and chapters, a focused evaluation on specific features of the new publication and suggestions for improvement. This move, which is usually the longest one, is more predictable in terms of structure, information and signalling, although it varies in length (from two to twenty paragraphs). Move 2 is realized by up to four strategies which will be discussed in section 3.4.2. This move is the most frequent typical and important of all, appearing in BRs (100%): it occurs in each one of the BRs and reflects their descriptive and evaluative nature.

Move 2 describes the context of the book in relation to the overall organization following the same sequence of information as it appears in the book as well as it highlights specific parts of the book. As this move is present in all BRs it can be identified as a typical one. Although evaluation can be spread throughout the text, as discourse analysts have noted (Hoey,

1993; Jordan, 1984; Hunston, 1985), it is in this move that reviewers concentrate a definite portion of text evaluating certain features of the book which seem highly relevant. Reviewers let the reader know what parts of the book deserve special attention, either by criticizing them or praising them or both.

Move 3 - Providing final assessment of the book

The closing move, 'Providing final assessment of the book' is a very typical move and the third one appearing in BRs. It provides the final evaluation of the book under review by looking at the book as a whole, despite the comments (criticism or appraisal) in the body of the text. This move consolidates the reviewer's stance towards the book, which sometimes is clearly stated in Move 1 and which has the aim of recommending the book or not for readership.

Due to the evaluative nature of BRs, this move functions as the closing section and provides the final evaluation of the book. This move is the third most frequent in the corpus (82.5%) appearing in sixty six texts. Although this move signals the end part of the BRs, fourteen texts (17.5%) lack an explicit Move 3, ending the text with either a description of the content of parts of the book or with a specific emphasis on a particular chapter, section or part. The difference of evaluation contained in Move 2 and Move 3 lies in focus. Move 2 focuses partly on the content of the book and partly on evaluation of parts of it

whereas Move 3 focuses on the book as a whole concentrating on future applications of the book and recommendation for the readership.

The analysis also revealed that in all texts, there is at least one kind of evaluative move, i.e., whenever evaluation in Move 1 or 2 is lacking, Move 3 provides evaluation. However, one of the BRs (BR 7) lacks evaluation in Move 2 and 3 and it closes the text with a discussion of the content of the book under review. The reviewer does not provide an evaluation of specific parts of the book and the text comes to the end by examining only the content of the book. Some texts lacking Move 1 or Move 3 are published as BRs in journals indicating that the absence of one of the moves does not affect the overall organization of the genre revealing that this is a question of prototypicality, according to Swales (1990) in that instances of the genre are allowed to vary.

In the next section, I will examine this rhetorical organization in terms of the rhetorical strategies which belong to and help convey and realize each move described in this section.

3.4. - Description of Rhetorical Strategies for BRs

As previously stated, each move encompasses a series of smaller units of information which are labeled here 'strategies'. A combination of rhetorical acts employed by reviewers realizes a certain goal or purpose in a move.

Thus, the eighty BRs were examined in detail in the qualitative analysis in order to identify the rhetorical strategies within each move. The results of the analysis revealed the following pattern of rhetorical strategies (Figure 3.2).

Move 1 - ESTABLISHING THE FIELD
Strategy 1 - Making topic generalizations
and/or
Strategy 2 - Claiming centrality
and/or
Strategy 3 - Indicating the intended audience
and/or
Strategy 4 - Informing the reader about the origin of the book
and/or
Strategy 5 - Stating the aim of the book
and/or
Strategy 6 - Referring to previous publications
Move 2 - SUMMARIZING THE CONTENT
Strategy 7- Describing the organization of the book
and/or
Strategy 8 - Reporting/discussing the content of the book
and/or
Strategy 9 - Evaluating the book
and/or
Strategy 10 - Presenting suggestions for improvement
Move 3 - PROVIDING FINAL ASSESSMENT OF THE BOOK
Strategy 11- Recommending/disqualifying the book
and/or
Strategy 12 - Making suggestions for future applications

Figure 3.2. - Description of rhetorical structure for BRs

The structural description for BRs above portrays the way information is presented in the texts through twelve strategies distributed in the three typical moves. Althougth the three moves may be present in most of the exemplars of BRs, a considerable variation was noted in the frequency and in the order in which these moves appear. One explanation for this fact may be

that, because the BR as a genre has been little investigated in the literature of discourse analysis, there is a lack of explicit guidelines for the genre. Thus reviewers are free to organize their texts, to construct their arguments. In this chapter, this variability of strategies will be examined in the analysis of excerpts from the corpus.

In order to demonstrate how portions of discourse realize the rhetorical strategies and in order to show the linguistic signals that are associated with these strategies, a discussion illustrated with examples will be presented in the next section.

3.4.1. Strategies realizing Move 1 - Establishing the field

In the introductory paragragh of BRs, reviewers provide the reader with up to six types of information which are conveyed by one or a combination of the following strategies:

Strategy 1 - Making topic generalizations
and/or
Strategy 2 - Claiming centrality
and/or
Strategy 3 - Indicating the intended audience
and/or
Strategy 4- Informing the reader about the origin of the book
and/or
Strategy 5 - Stating the aim of the book
and/or
Strategy 6 - Referring to previous publications

As previously stated, each of the six strategies can convey Move 1 alone or in combination, providing information about the book in terms of the topic, audience, aim, origin, previous studies and importance of the book for the field of knowledge. Such information is necessary to contextualize the descriptive and evaluative sections of the texts. It should be highlighted that these strategies rarely occur at the same time and in this specific order. But the order of presentation in Figure 3.2 represents the frequency of occurrence of the strategies in the eighty BRs examined.

Strategy 1- *Making topic generalizations*

This strategy is largely used, appearing in fifty three of the eighty BRs (66.25%)[3] especially in the first sentence of the first paragraph. Due to its incidence and to the criterion of the continuum (section 3.2.1), this is treated here as one of the most typical strategy realizing Move 1. Indeed, making topic generalizations is one of the main features of scientific discourse. Typically when using this strategy, reviewers present statements about knowledge of theories in the field as facts or general truth, provide generalizations about concepts of the discipline in focus or background information on specific topics explored in the book. Reviewers give the reader an idea of what the book is about. In Swales' CARS of research article introductions (Swales, 1990), this strategy is also called 'Making topic generalizations'. As Swales explains in his model, by making topic generalizations, writers refer to 'the current body of knowledge in the area or to the state of the art, of knowledge, of technique,

or...current requirements for further progress' (Swales, ibid.:146). This strategy, as the examples below show, is signalled by the title of the book in italics and by the cataphoric nominal phrase 'the/this/book/volume' followed by a reporting verb such as 'discuss', 'summarize', 'introduces', 'be', 'focus', etc, in the present tense. A comprehensive list of reporting verbs used in the corpus is provided on pages 82/83. Instances of Strategy 1 are:

Example 3.1

(1) *Contexts of Competence* **is** essentially an overview of functionally based communicative approaches toward second language instruction. [BR 35, 1-1]

Example 3.2

(1) This book **discusses** the concept of the task as a primary unit of analysis for syllabus design and materials development. [BR 22, 1-1]

Less often reviewers draw the reader's attention to the topic or approach used by the author by referring to the author of the book through the nouns *the author(s)* or by citing the name of the author *Ellis'* as in the example 3.3. Sometimes, both book and author are mentioned in the opening sentence. For instance,

Example 3.3.

(1) Ellis' book **summarizes** research into how classroom learners develop their internal grammar of a second language (SL). [BR 33, 1-1]

Example 3.4

(1) The introduction to Second Language Research Methods **makes clear** that the authors do not try to accomplish the impossible: they do not intend to describe 'all the possible methods or all the possible types of research', but have settled for a description of 'paradigmatic types and principles of second language research' (p.3). [BR 61, 1 -1]

Example 3.5

(1) David Nunan's book *Designing Tasks for the Communicative Classroom* **covers** a number of topics relating to the central notion of 'second language learning: how to analyse tasks into component parts; how to relate tasks to syllabus design; how to grade and sequence tasks; how recent research into skill development might inform task design; and how tasks might be used in teacher education programs. [BR 58, 1 -1]

The examples show that even if the first sentence focuses on the topic of the book, the authors are mentioned as a way to relate their names to a particular field of knowledge as well as to emphasize authorship.

Strategy 2- Claiming centrality

The most frequent strategy realizing Move 1 is called claiming *centrality.* It appears in fifty four all BRs (67.5%). As BRs are essentially evaluative texts, evaluation is to be found in every move which makes up the exemplars of the genre. Strategy 2, which is typically present in BRs whose evaluation is positive, seems relevant to support the reviewer's role in evaluating the new

book and influencing the reader to read it. Here the reviewer may introduce the book by showing interest or by highlighting the central importance of the book.

In conveying this strategy, reviewers may emphasize the role of the book under review as filling an existing gap or highlight the new book as: continuing an existing tradition of research on the topic or they may refer to events that relate to the topic of the book. Examples are:

Example 3.6

(1) The appearance of this collection of articles, edited by Ulla Connor and Robert Kaplan, **marks an effort to extend the research field of** text/ discourse analysis from studies in which focus has been spoken language and, more recently, reading comprehension to the analysis of written texts and to the teaching of ESL composition. [BR 21, 1-1]

Example 3.7

(1) This volume provides a **helpful contribution to the field of language testing.** [BR 29, 1-1]

Example 3.8

(1) This volume from Australia will **make an important contribution wherever educators** struggle to meet ever-changing student needs. [BR 67, 1-1]

Reviewers may praise the author(s) of the book as innovative and competent professionals in the particular topic or area of knowledge. Examples are:

Example 3.9

(1) A new book from Michael Halliday **must be always cause for pleasurable anticipation.** (2)Since the early 1960s, he has made **significant contributions to the study of syntax, semantics, language acquisition, sociolinguistics, discourse analysis, stylistics, and other areas of linguistic importance.** [BR 2, 1 - 1/2]

Example 3.10

(1) In articles and papers throughout the past decade and within his new book, *Sociolinguistics and Second Language Acquisition,* Dennis Preston has written **eloquently and convincingly** about his concept of the "competent bilingual", a non-native speaker (NNS) who accommodates to the second language (L2) speech community in ways that satisfy its needs and pose it no threats. [BR 28, 1 - 1]

Example 3.11

(5) In *Engiish for Specific Purposes: a learning-centred approach,* Hutchinson and Waters, **two respected and innovative members of the international ESP community,** provide a **comprehensive, if brief, overview of the field.** (6) **These authors** have always had **their feet on the ground**, so to speak, and **this book is no exception**. [BR 14, 2 - 5/6]

Although this strategy has an evaluative status, it is different from evaluative strategies which realize Moves 2 and 3. The difference between this strategy and those that realize Moves 2 and 3 lies in the fact that Strategy 2 makes an appeal to those with a specialized interest in applied linguistics by referring to the central character of the issue or by claiming that there are many other investigations active in the area, while reviewers use Strategies 9 and 11

appearing in Moves 2 and 3 respectively to comment on specific features of the book, highlighting positive and negative aspects in order to recommend it for readership.

The centrality claims made by reviewers are typically expressed in one or two sentences and they appeal (in keeping with Swales' findings in relation to research article introductions) to the discourse community whereby members are invited to recognize or otherwise that the book being reviewed is part of a significant or well-established research area or that it is useful for a group of professionals or students. This strategy is achieved by the use of expressions like 'marks an effort to extend', 'an important/helpful contribution', adjectives in superlative form e.g. 'the most outstanding', 'best', ' the greatest', to imply positive evaluation; words like 'lack', 'miss', 'least', to imply the idea of negative evaluation of previous publications, as shown in examples on page 65 and 66.

Strategy 3 - Indicating the intended audience

After having stated the topic or provided an appraisal of the book or author, reviewers continue to introduce the book by indicating to whom the book is addressed. This strategy makes clear that the new book is of interest to a certain group of professionals or for those readers that do not have much knowledge on the topic. Strategy 3 appears in twenty of the BRs (25%) and was considered less typical. It usually appears in the second sentence of the first paragraph or in the first sentence together with Strategy 1. In twelve texts

(15%), Strategy 3 seems to be iterative since it occurs twice in the same text, at the beginning and at the closing move of the review. Typical examples of this strategy are:

Example 3.12

(2) The book is **addressed** specifically to **language teachers** rather than to testing specialists and is intended as a guide for those wishing to integrate an oral testing component into their language curriculum. [BR 8, 1-2]

Example 3.13

(7) It is clearly **intended** to be a practical guide for **ESP teachers and teacher-trainers,** not a survey of research or a theoretical treatise. [BR 14, 2-7]

Example 3.14

(2) As such, the author admits that her **targeted audience** is primarily **the researcher** in child language. [BR 24, 1-2]

The linguistic items which signal Strategy 3 'intended audience' are (i) the verbs 'address', 'intend', 'direct', 'design', 'indicate' in the past participle; (ii) the expressions 'targeted audience', 'intended readership', 'useful for/to', 'for those'; (iii) level of education such as 'undergraduate/postgraduate students and (iv) the nominal groups specifying the kind of professional to whom the book is addressed, namely 'language teachers', 'teacher trainers', 'ESP teachers', 'testing specialists', 'translators', 'SSLA readers', 'advanced ESL students'[4] , 'researchers'.

Strategy 4- Informing the reader about the origin of the book

This strategy may occur before Strategy 1 and it is less typical in that it appears in nineteen of the BRs (23.27%). In general it is used in BRs dealing with collections of different articles written by different authors. The reviewer attempts to give an indication of the source of motivation for the book. So the function of this strategy is to show how the book originated, whether it is a result of a project or of a symposium. Examples of this strategy are:

Example 3.15

(1) This volume is one of four composed of selected papers **presented at the 1981 Language Proficiency Assessment Symposium**, funded by the National Institute of Education... [BR 7, 1-1]

Example 3.16

(1) This is a selection of papers **from the Sixth Delaware Symposium Language Studies, sponsored by the University of Delaware Program in Linguistics in 1984.** [BR 19, 1-1]

Example 3.17

(1) This collection of papers **derives from the Hypertext 1 conference** held at **the University of Aberdeen in March 1988.** [BR 78, 1 -1]

Linguistically, as the examples above show, this strategy is signalled by nouns like 'collection', 'selection', followed by the verbs 'presented' or 'derive' plus the preposition 'from' indicating the name of symposium or conference

which motivated the publication of the new book and also by the place where this event took place.

Strategy 5 - Stating the aim of the book

This is another less typical strategy as it occurs in only seventeen texts (21.25%). The reviewer makes clear the main purpose or aim or goal of the book reviewed. In the eighty BRs examined it occurs in the first paragraph (17.5%) or at the beginning of the second paragraph (3.7%). Linguistically, this strategy is frequently realized by using the nouns 'aim', 'purpose', 'goal', and 'objective', followed by the verb 'to be' in the present tense plus the main verb in the infinitive form, as shown in the following examples, clearly indicating the particular intention of the reviewer:

Example 3.18

(2) The explicit **aim of the book** is to develop a model for the analysis of bilingual conversation in general and "not to analyse the linguistic situation of Italian migrant children in Germany" (p.9). [BR 4, 1-2]

Example 3.19

(2) One of **Sellnker's purposes** in this new book is to explain why that IL (interlanguage) hypothesis immediately filled a semantic gap in SLA studies, and how the theoretical construct of IL has provided SLA researchers with a field of enquiry that continues to merit explorations[5] . [BR 80, 1 - 2]

Strategy 6- *Referring to previous publications*

Strategy 6 appears in only ten of the BRs (12.9%) and is thus considered less typical. Its most frequent occurrence in the corpus is in the second paragraph. The function of this strategy in Move 1 is to show that there are other publications in the same field of knowledge by the same or different authors. By referring to other publications, the reviewer wants to highlight the new book and insert it in the context of the literature of the discipline, besides showing that s/he knows 'who is who' in the area. In addition, reference provides authority to the reviewer of the BR.

Strategy 6 usually makes reference to the author's name in association with terms related to professions such as 'North American scholars' and with the specific area in which the author is well-known such as 'Linguistics', 'Contrastive Rhetoric', 'Cognitive Psychology' or 'Language'. Typical examples of this strategy found in the data are:

Example 3.20

(1) The cross-disciplinary results of such developments are already apparent enough in such areas as Linguistics and the Professions **(Kaplan, 1987),** in Contrastive Rhetoric **(Connor & Kaplan, 1987),** and in...../// [BR 20, 1-3]

Example 3.21

(6) The observation that educational theory as well as theoretical linguistics is pertinent to second language learning is nothing new. (7) Such insights have been proposed with somewhat narrower focus by North American scholars

working in the area of cognitive psychology and language **(see, e.g., McLaughlin, 1987, Ch 6).** [BR 23, 2, 6-7]

It is worth noticing that reference to other publications generally comes between parentheses (see examples 3.20 and 3.21 above). However, such a strategy also appears in Move 2, Strategy 9, when the reviewer reports the content of each chapter/part/section of the book in order to provide him/herself with credibility regarding to what is reported in the text.

To sum up what we have discussed so far, Move 1 can be realized by the combination of up to six different strategies which introduce the book in terms of general information on its topic (Strategy 1), the importance of the book in the field and reviewer's evaluation of the book (Strategy 2), audience (Strategy 3), the origin of the book (Strategy 4), the aim of the book (Strategy 5) and reference to previous publications (Strategy 6). These strategies do not have a specific order of presentation in the texts. This fact indicates that there is flexibility at the level of textual realization, i.e. in the way writers use strategies to achieve a particular intention in the text. This question will be further discussed later in section 3.7. Although some strategies - 'making topic generalizations' and 'claiming centrality' have not appeared in all BRs, they are very important components in the introductory paragraphs for establishing the field of knowledge of the book and because of their level of frequency, they may be assigned a status of most typical strategies realizing Move 1. The

remaining strategies characterizing Move 1 are less typical (optional) due to their low frequency of occurrence in the corpus.

After having established the field of knowledge of the book, the review goes on to fulfil the communicative purpose of the genre through Move 2 which describes the organization and content, and evaluates parts of the book. The strategies that realize Move 2 are analysed in the section below.

3.4.2. Strategies realizing Move 2 - Summarizing the content of the book

In addition to describing the organization of the book, Move 2 also reports on the content of the chapters/articles/sections/parts, evaluates specific parts of the book and suggests improvements for the book. Although this move varies in length (from two to twenty paragraphs), it is more predictable in terms of structure, information and signalling. This move is realized by one or a combination of strategies as follows.

Strategy 7 - Describing the organization of the book
and/or
Strategy 8 - Reporting /discussing the content
and
Strategy 9 - Evaluating the book
and/or
Strategy 10 - Presenting suggestions for improvement

Strategy 7 - Describing the organization of the book

Strategy 7 labelled *Describing the organization of the book* is one typical element and is frequently realized by one sentence in which the reviewer

describes how the book is organized, the types of division and the number of divisions. Strategy 7 occurs in fifty four texts representing 67.5% and due to its frequency and, again to the continuum criterion (section 3.2.1) it is deemed obligatory. As already observed in section 3.3, the analysis revealed that three BRs (3.75%) lacked Move 1 and had as introductory paragraph a Move 2, without providing a general information about the topic of the book.

This strategy is characteristically signalled by the expressions 'the/this book, chapters, articles, collection, volume', etc, followed by the verbs 'have', 'consist', 'make up', 'be divided', 'comprise' in the passive voice or simple present plus a numeral indicating the quantity of chapters, articles, sections, etc, indicating how the book is organized. For instance,

Example 3.22

(5) **The monograph comprises six chapters,** including a general introduction to oral testing and **five chapters covering** the aims and resources of an oral testing program, test types, elicitation techniques, scoring procedures, and test evaluation. (6) Also included are **two appendices:** one describing three commonly used British test of oral proficiency and another containing a short and briefly annotated bibliography. [BR 8, 1-5,6]

Example 3.23

(1) This volume **is divided** into **four parts,** each with between 2 and 5 separate articles, for a total of **15 articles.** [BR 39, 1-1]

Example 3.24

(6) **The book is coherently organized into seven chapters** each of which takes us a neat logical step forward. [BR, 74, 2-6]

As previously mentioned, this move is more predictable in terms of information, structure and signalling. Through the signalling that is characteristic of Strategy 7, the reviewer predicts and commits himself/herself to make clear a certain number of items in the stretch of text that immediately follows. Thus, this rhetorical act falls into one of Tadros' (1985) categories of prediction[6] labelled 'enumeration'. If Strategy 7 is signalled by 'the book is divided into four parts', this statement predicts that the next strategy should bring some description of each one of the four parts previously mentioned. The reviewer promises to the reader to discuss the four parts of the book. Example,

Example 3. 25

(Strategy 7) The book is divided into two principal parts. (Strategy 8) Part I, covering chapters 1 and 2, consists of a truly excellent review of the literature on the role of age in language acquisition in general and second language acquisition in particular. Part II, chapters 3-5, is a detailed report of the author's own empirical study (her doctoral research) of the relative performance in French of three groups of students learning that language at school in southern Ontario who underwent, respectively, *early total immersion, late immersion, and early immersion.* (italics words in the original) [BR 9, 2 - 5/7]

According to Tadros (ibid) prediction involves 'a dual relationship between two members of a pair: one element which predicts' (Strategy 7)

through the words 'chapters', 'parts', 'sections' preceded by a numeral, and the 'other element which fulfills the prediction' (Strategy 8) keeping the pair in a complementary relation.

Instead of indicating the organization of the book through the numeral plus the words chapters/sections/parts, reviewers express Strategy 7 through a definition of the main parts of the book with the idea of sequence expressed by means of the words 'begin', 'introduction', 'opening chapters', 'concludes', 'filling', 'closes' and the prepositions of movement 'through' and 'from...to'. For instance,

Example 3. 26

(5) In her introduction, Patricia L. Carrell clearly delineates the colloquium themes and subthemes underlying the papers included here. (6)In general, reading is seen as a multifaceted, complex, interactive processes involving many subskills and different types of reader and text variables. [BR 16, 2 - 5/6]

Example 3.27

(19) The book closes with a realistic discussion of the value of teachers becoming researchers of talk in their own classroom, as some are doing on both sides of the Atlantic. [BR 53, 6 - 19]

Example 3.28

(7) Language and Writing is constructed as a kind of sandwich, with the opening three chapters and chapters 10 through 15 forming the outside, while Chapters 4 through 9 ("a concise self-contained introduction to linguistics" (p. xiv)) comprise the filling. [BR 20, 2 -7]

Strategy 8- *Reporting/discussing the content of chapters/ sections*

After describing the organization of the book, the next strategy of the reviewer is to report the content of the chapters, sections or articles. This is the most typical element in BRs and it occurs in all BRs (100%), mainly from paragraphs 2 to 10. It gives an overview of the book under review and it seems to be essential for this reason. Here the reviewer not only reports the content but also discusses relevant issues concerning the topic of each chapter or part of the book. In the shortest BRs, reviewers only make a brief summary, in one or two sentences, on the content of each part or chapter. In longer texts, reviewers discuss the content, by bringing to the text other paradigms postulated by different authors. Here reviewers make use of references to enrich the discussion and provide credibility.

Common lexical items which signal Strategy 7 are:

(i) the use of the words 'chapter', 'section', 'article', 'part', plus a numeral making explicit reference to each part of the book, e.g.,

Example 3.29

(4) Chapter 4 **gives** a brief history of the interest in language as central to processes of school learning, and **introduces** some technical concepts. ...(8) Chapter 2, 'on characteristic patterns of classroom talk', briefly **summarizes** 'the distinctiveness of classrooms as communicative contexts... the deep grooves along which most classroom talk seems to run, even in settings designed for the breaking of new ground' (p. 27). ...(13) Chapter 3 **is** an excellent discussion of some of the methodological decisions faced by all researchers. (18) Chapters 3 to 5 **give** more details on the strengths and

limitations of several widely used approaches: systematic schemes for on-the-spot coding; more interpretive analyses by ethnomethodologists and ethnographers of communication; and a mixed group of 'more linguistic' analyses, notably the large project on children's language at home and school directed by Gordon Wells at Bristol, prior to his move to Toronto. (19) The book **closes** with a realistic discussion of the value of teachers becoming researchers of talk in their own classroom, as some are doing on both sides of the Atlantic. [BR 53, 2/6 - 4/19]

(ii) the use of nouns that refer to different parts of the book such as 'introduction', 'opening', 'end';

(iii) the use of discourse markers such as 'first', 'second', 'next', 'following' indicating the parts/ sections/ chapters of the book as well as the sequence between items that relate to each other in the book, e.g.,

Example 3.30

(Strategy 7) (3)The volume is divided into ten chapters. (Strategy 8) (4)The **first three examine** some of the general issues that tend to arise in any treatment of transfer - a concept which, one notes, Odlin defines broadly (p.27) as 'the influence resulting from similarities and differences between the target language and any other language that has been previously (and perhaps imperfectly) acquired'. (5) **Chapter 1 ('Introduction') notes** the significance of the everyday recognition and...(8) The **next four chapters relate** the transfer phenomenon to different linguistic subsystems. ...(13) Each of the **final three chapters has** a very particular theme. (14) **Chapter 8 ('Nonstructural factors in transfer') examines** various kinds of extralinguistic circumstances ....[BR 55, 2/4 - 3/16]

(iv) the use of reporting verbs in the third person singular in the present tense indicating that the reviewer is reporting the author's stance concerning the content of the book, e.g., 'identify', 'provide', 'summarizes', 'introduces', etc .

(v) the use of author's names preceded by preposition 'by' indicating authorship in books containing a collection of articles edited by different authors. For instance,

Example 3. 31

(Strategy 7) (1) This volume is divided into four parts, each with between 2 and 5 separate articles, for a total of 15 articles.....(Strategy 8) (6) Part 1, entitled "Political and Historical Perpectives", contains two articles. (7) The first, **by Tucker, sets** the stage in terms of national needs for foreign language learning, at least since the 1979 report of the President's Commission. (8) The second **by Thompson, Christian, Stansfield, and Rhodes, is** a fine overview of the history of foreign language teaching in the United States from the pre-World War II era to the present. [BR 39, 1 / 2 - 1/8]

As previously stated, in Strategy 8 reviewers may still discuss the content of the book by bringing to the review other paradigms or theoretical perspectives postulated by different authors in order to compare or support a point in the discussion of the topic. In the discussion, reviewers may quote sentences or expressions from the original text besides using references in order to provide authority for what they are reporting and to enrich the discussion of the topic. For instance,

Example 3.32

(6) Nunan **observes** that the idea of using the learning task as a basic planning tool in second language education is a relatively recent one. (7) In the last ten years, a variety of proposals have been made for implementing task-based language teaching syllabus. (8) What these proposals have in common is an assumption that the units of second language syllabus design, and decisions about how to sequence those units, should be based on something other than a structural analysis of the language system to be learned. (9) Nunan's book **makes** reference to some of these proposals, and it is as well to **consider** two of them briefly, as a way of clarifying Nunan's own position regarding the role of tasks is syllabus design.

(10) In the case of Prabhu (1987) and the work of the Bangalore project which **began** in the late 1970s, the units of syllabus design are 'classroom' tasks which **are performed** by learners as vehicles for the development of their procedural ability in language use. (11) Such an approach **uses** tasks to promote development of the 'means' of communication, identified as the procedures deployed in successfully conveying information, giving reasons and expressing opinions. (12) Prabhu's claim (which he does not, it must be said, motivate with respect to psycholinguistic research into SLA processes) **is** that the effort expended by learners in using these procedures 'to work out meaning content is...a condition which is favourable to the subconscious abstraction - or cognitive formation - of language structure' (Prabhu 1987:70).

(13) In contrast, Long (1985) **proposes** that the 'ends' of learning, identified as a series of non-classroom 'target' tasks that learners will have to accomplish at home or at work and requiring language skill, should be the initial focus for syllabus design. (14) This **permits**, it **is claimed**, clearer decisions to be made about what tasks should and should not be included in a syllabus. (15) These target tasks can subsequently be broken down into classroom or 'pedagogic' tasks which have then to be sequenced to form a syllabus.

(16) Nunan's view of the relationship of tasks to the language syllabus **is** somewhat different from Prabhu's, or Long's...../// [BR 58, 3/5 - 6-16]

Example 3.33

(5)Communication strategies are introduced with interlanguage and error analysis as theoretical background. (6)Koike believes "error analysis is absolutely necessary for the understanding of the mechanism and process of acquisition" (p.10). [BR 1, 2-5,6]

Such quotations are generally short and placed inside the paragraph, but the reviewer may also use long quotations which are indented and placed outside the reporting paragraph. The citation of secondary sources are generallly accompanied by a list of references placed at the end of the BR.

Considering that the BR is a critical expository text in which the reviewer reports on book content and presents his/her opinion about the book, the use of a great number of reporting verbs (see Thompson and Yiyun, 1991)[7] is to be expected. Most of the reporting verbs found in the corpus are, especially, textual verbs which refer to verbal processes expressed in the author's text. These reporting verbs range from highly frequent choices to less frequent ones.

The most frequent textual reporting verbs used are:

---

adopt, analyze, argue for, ask, address, apply, be, begin, bring, comprise, comment, compare, concentrate, contain, continue, consist, contribute, conclude, claim, classify, criticize, deal with, define, devote, demonstrate, distinguish, discuss, draw on, emphasize, end, explain, examine, explore, follow (up), give, highlight, include, indicate, introduce, investigates,

illustrate, look at, make (clear), move, note, offer, outline, organize, presuppose, present, propose, provide, raise, regard, relate, respond, review, recognize, recommend, report, reveal, represent, suggest, start, summarize, show, stress, treat, use, view, underline.

The less frequent textual reporting verbs are:

---

admit, appeal, add, adjust, advocates, allude, appraise, assess, assert, assume, base, build, challenge, chart, characterize, cite, compress, confront, consolidate, contend, counter, cover, close, delineate, disclaim, disentangle, enunciate, establish, excel, exhibit, express, expand, expound, facilitate, familiarize, function, hypothesize, invite, interact, isolate, lay (out), list, mention, operate, perform, portray, point (out), place, pursue, promise, promote, question, reckon, reinforce, refer, reject, revive, set (forth), shift, state, substantiate, synthesize, tackle, tend (to), testify, touch (on), trace, translate, unite, yield.

Mental verbs referring to author's mental processes were also used. The most frequent choices in the corpus were:

---

acknowledge, attempt, believe, consider, concern, find, focus, hope, see, think, view.

The use of reporting verbs in BRs as a whole also involves a choice of tense and voice and these may be highly significant. In this study, most of the reporting verbs were used in the present tense signalling that the reviewer is referring to the author's text or still making generalizations, since it is 'a

convention that the content of a text can be reported using the present tense no matter what tense is used in the original text' (Thompson & YiYun, ibid.:378). Some verbs were used in the present perfect, signalling that the reader should expect further discussion of the topic/book. E.g.

Example 3.34

(4) Taking a responsible attitude to this relatively fresh idea, David Nunan **has produced** a very accessible overview of the current state of play in this area. [BR 22, 1- 4]

Agentless passive voice was also used but less frequently. For instance, 'The notions of interference and fossilization **are discussed** and **illustrated** with numerous examples' [BR 1, 2-7]; 'The last three papers in the collection **are** all **written** from the view of hypertext...' [BR 78, 8-27], are employed perhaps to emphasize that 'the notions of interference and fossilization' and 'the last three papers' are very important topics to be discussed in addition to conveying impersonality.

In addition to describing the organization of the book and reporting on the content of each chapter/section/part, Move 2 also serves the function of evaluating specific features of the book and of presenting suggestions for improvement. This is the role of Strategies 9 and 10.

Strategy 9 - Evaluating the book

This strategy is essentially evaluative. Evaluation here means 'to have an opinion about something, particularly in terms of how good or bad it is' (Hunston, 1994:191). Expressing evaluation involves 'both a statement of personal judgement and an appeal to shared norms and values which are influenced by cultural considerations, socialization, and philosophical background' (Hunston, ibid.:193). While reporting and discussing the content of the book, reviewers evaluate specific features of the book, i.e., they present their positive and negative comments on the book. Thus a shift is noted in the body of text from description to evaluation. Evaluation may occur mainly in two basic ways: (i) together with Strategy 8 or, (ii) in a separate paragraph by signalling that certain aspects of the book deserve special attention.

Strategy 9 is highly frequent in Move 2 appearing in seventy-three of the eighty BRs (91.25%). Strategy 9 is, then, not only the most typical and important component occurring in the texts but also it is the defining feature of the genre in that it reflects their evaluative nature. For this reason and high frequency of occurrence, it is an obligatory strategy in the writing of BRs.

In conveying Strategy 9, there is no preferred order of evaluation of specific aspects of the book. Reviewers may point out the strong points and merits of the book before commenting on their negative evaluation of parts of it

or vice-versa. When evaluating positively/negatively, reviewers basically signal evaluation by means of:

(i) positive/negative items or expressions of all grammatical kinds (nouns, adjectives, adverbs, and verbs) such as 'merits', 'strong areas', 'shortcomings', 'drawback', 'weakness', 'clearly organized', 'excellent/valuable text', 'well-written', 'insightful account', 'succeeds', 'suffers', 'miss', etc. A comprehensive list is provided on page 101. Typical examples are:

Example 3.35

(4) Particularly **strong areas** are the book's description of large patterns in oral and written texts and its survey of work on intonation, especially its explication of (largely British) interactive approaches to pitch, rhythm, and intonational contours. (5) For most of the topics taken up within each chapter, McCarthy explicitly discusses pedagogical implications and likely teachability as well as offers suggestions for classroom practice or citations to literature that discusses curricula and pedagogy. (6) The book covers its areas **clearly and competently;** ....(7) Though in each chapter McCarthy hits **an accessible and helpful level of detail**, the reader should be forewarned that for nearly every topic discussed there are a great many technicalities and complexities **not covered**, because this is **a fairly short and nontechnical introduction**.... (9) McCarthy is **far more sanguine** than I would be about the efficacy of direct classroom instruction in regard to discourse and, indeed, to second language generally. (10) The book **does not deal at all with** controversies in this area...../// [BR 30, 1/2 - 4 /10]

Example 3.36

(22) The writing style of the book **might be faulted** due to the sometimes long and complex sentences, the overuse of Brittish idioms that might put off a few readers who do not live on the "emerald isle", and the **occasional infelicities**

of the copy editor. (23) But these are **minor points** in light of the **comprehensive and thoughtful research synthesis** which Singleton has presented to the language community at large. (24) Overall, the book is a **much-needed and highly valuable resource** that is worth the time and effort that readers will devote to it. (25) It is certainly one of the most detailed and most current works available concerning the age factor in both L1 and L2 acquisition. [BR 75, 7- 22/25]

(ii) by superlative expressions e.g., 'the/one of the most/ best/greatest', followed by 'part/ section/ chapter/ article.

Example 3.37

(20) The **greatest merit of the book** is that it discusses general scientific methodological and statistical considerations that should ideally be with one when designing and carrying out a research project in any discipline, without ever losing track of the particular interests of those engaged in SLR. (21) As a result such considerations are made **much more transparent** and, what is more, their direct and fundamental relevance for any SLR project is **made clear.** (22) At the same time, this could be argued to be one of **the book's weaknesses:** it relies very **heavily**, certainly in parts, on 'classical' methodological texts, such as Campbell and Stanley's **well-known** work on internal/external validity and on (quasi-) experimental research designs.[8] // [BR 61, 10- 20 /22]

Example 3.38

(28) Perhaps **the most serious weakness** of the book is the **confusion** it shows over the distinctions (or lack of them) between three categories of strategies: learning, communication and production strategies. [BR 74, 5-28]

(iii) by attitudinal markers such as 'unfortunately', 'clearly', 'admirably', 'disappointingly', 'convincingly', 'eminently'. E.g.,

Example 3.39

(6) Cruse appears to build systematically on what is available in the literature and does an **admirably creative job** of supplying categories not covered in other lexical descriptions. [BR 10, 3 -6]

Example 3.40

(15) Dechert seems to arrive at other conclusions, but, **unfortunately,** the paper is **so poorly written** and its conclusions **so poorly stated and substantiated** that it is almost **impossible** to derive anything of interest or value from it. (16) The paper should have been carefully edited before being published. [BR 15, 4 - 15/16].

(iv) by metadiscursive statements that predict positive or negative evaluation. Such statements corresponds to Tadros' (1985) category of 'advance labelling', e.g., "The book has a few weak spots', 'The book has many strong points'.

Example 3. 41

(16) **The book has a few weak spots, of course.** (17) Most are minor , but there are two more serious ones. (18) First there is some confusion created by their use of the concepts "declarative" and "procedural" as types of knowledge. ....(26) Similar arbitrariness in use of the two labels recurs on p. 58, where we are told that a SL/FL learner's interianguage is her *declarative knowledge* and that *procedural knowledge* serves to "activate" declarative knowledge..../// [BR 74, 4 -16/26]

(v) evaluation can be signalled by means of an evaluative statement followed by a sentence or stretch of text functioning as 'basis' (Hoey, 1983), justifying the reviewer's argument. 'Basis' is expressed by 'due to', 'for this reason', especially when the argument conveys a negative evaluation. E.g.,

Example 3.43

(22) The paper by Edwards and Hardman: *'Lost in Hyperspace: Cognitive Mapping and Navigation in a Hypertext Environment'* is one of those very **interesting** but **potentially dangerous papers**. (23) It is **interesting** because it confronts the difficulty a reader has conceptualising a hypertext document compared with a book. (24) Instead of attempting to describe possible ways of presenting information to the reader which would facilitate a conceptualization of the document, the writers go on to describe an experiment into how a number of readers coped with different forms of document organisation and suggest that certain forms of hypertext organisation are preferable to others...../// (BR 78, 7 - 22/26]

The analysis revealed that negative evaluation generally occurs after positive evaluation (88.7% appearing in this position in seventy one texts). Besides the signals for evaluation mentioned above, negative evaluation is generally introduced by conjuncts such as 'but', 'however', 'although', 'despite', 'in spite of', just to cite a few.

Negative evaluation can also be introduced in the texts in two basic ways:

(i) reviewers introduce the argument or opinion with a positive evaluation and then change into a negative evaluation. This device is called matching relation of contrast (Hoey, 1983)[9] and in the case of BRs it is employed as a way of mitigating the reviewer's negative opinion of aspects which are not significantly important in the new book.

Example 3.44

(33) **In spite of several contributions** among the papers collected in this book (I find the papers by Mägiste, Masny, Snow, Donato and Coen, and Guthrie the most interesting and thought provoking), on the whole **I do not find it to be a particularly valuable contribution to the second language literature.** [BR 19, 9-33]

Example 3.45

(10) **Although providing studies** in text analysis that may be useful to the ESL composition teacher is a worthy endeavour this book **falls somewhat short** of its goal. (11) This is due in part to a less than clear cut notion of an intended readership. (12) In fact, it is never clear just who the audience for this book will be. [BR 21, 3-10/12]

Example 3.46

(12) **Much of this book is very useful.** (13) **One weakness, however,** is the author's use of several apparently arbitrary classifications: Behaviourism is **excluded** from the chapter on naturalistic learning, although behaviourism is a model for natural learning.....in chapter 5, there are **inevitable problems in** grouping the seven hypotheses. [BR 33, 4-12/13]

(ii) Sometimes negative evaluation is introduced directly without any matching relation of contrast. For instance,

Example 3.47

(19) **Misprints** occur (some in the bibliography and in a suitable) as well as **mistakes** in the type-face of headings (and the distinction between headings and subheadings is, in any case, often **unclear**). (20) The **greatest disappointment** is the way in which the book leads the reader away from instructional settings and from a hypothesis-testing stance. [BR 33, 6-19/20]

Example 3.48

(7) **One drawback** is that the chapters are of **unequal quality** and only Scarcella's refers to other chapters. (8) This leads to a **curious lack of discussion** about the usefulness of the Canale and Swain framework or about whether the new competencies included in this have features which distinguish them from the original ones. .../// [BR 71, 3 - 7/8]

(iii) Evaluation is also signalled by the use of the personal prononun 'I ' as a rhetorical device to signal the reviewer's personal interest and commitment to the topic being reported. According to Crismore (1989:85), the reviewer uses the personal pronoun 'to bring himself into his text as a thinker'. Examples are:

Example 3. 49

(33) In spite of several useful contributions among the papers collected in this book (**I find the papers** by Mägiste, Masny, Snow, Donato and Cohen, and Guthrie **the most interesting and thought-provoking**), on the whole **I do not find it to be particularly valuable contribution** to second language literature. [BR 19, 9 - 33]

Example 3.50

(59) There is one argument that might be advanced in defense of the insularity **I have criticised.** (60) The book is based on class notes, and the intended readership of the book clearly includes undergraduate and postgraduate students. (61) Such students, the argument would go, do not want to be drawn into matters of academic debate, they want a workable, replicable, practical grammar, and discussion of alternative analyses are unlikely to contribute to this. [BR 2, 15 - 59/61]

As a complementary strategy to the evaluation provided in Strategy 8, reviewers close Move 2 with Strategy 9 by presenting suggestions or advice for improvement of the new book.

Strategy 10- *Presenting suggestions/advice*

Following strategy 9, another less typical rhetorical device is Strategy 10 in which reviewers *present suggestions* for improvement of the book not only in terms of editing but also in terms of topic and methodology of presentation. In general, this strategy is realized by one long sentence which may merge when the reviewer points out the flaws of the content or organization of the book in Strategy 9. It appears in fifteen of the BRs analysed (18.5%). Suggestions are indicated by the reviewer's use of modal verbs, mainly, 'might' and 'could' and the expression 'for example'. Strategy 10 also reveals that such suggestions could have been implemented but they have not been. They may indicate possible solutions for improvement of the new book according to the reviewer's point of view. Examples:

Example 3.51

(11) And, given his conviction that membership is so central to his social definition of the native speaker, one wonders why he does not forge links with published work on language and ideology. (12) He **might, for example, have found** common cause with Gee (1990), for whom the standard language community is an (elitist) discourse which 'colonizes' outsiders-learners aspiring to native-speakerhood. [BR 60, 2 - 11/12]

Example 3.52

(10) The chapter which is simultaneously the most compelling and yet the most difficult to read concerns theoretical perspectives on the age factor in L2 acquisition....(11) The long, dense chapter discussing these theoretical issues **could have been made much easier** to grasp by means of summary charts showing different theoretical points of view and the degree of variety of each one (perhaps with a system of pluses and minuses based on the empirical research on each topic). .....(15) It **might have been useful** to have separated the chapter into two main parts, "discredited theories" (or "less explanatory theories") and "potentially valuable theories" (or "more explanatory theories"), with further divisions within each of these two parts to refer to each of the theoretical perspectives. [BR 75, 4 - 10 /15]

In these cases modal verbs are used as 'a major carrier of evaluation' (Thompson & Yiyun, 1991:373) and as an important part in conveying the reviewer's stance. When a modal is used it seems to indicate that the reviewer is not a passive receiver of the author's message but 'he commits himself at that point to judging the validity of the content of what is reported'. The use of these verbs, besides revealing the reviewer's voice in the BR, also indicates

that s/he is making the reader aware that some improvement should be made concerning the content of the book, although in most cases the suggestions are not capable of being taken into account by the author of the book. The most frequent forms used in the texts were **can, could, might** and **should.**

As argued above, the main characteristics of Move 2 are those of reporting, commenting and discussing the content of the new book and of evaluating parts of the book and presenting suggestions for improvement. In so doing, the reviewer uses textual reporting verbs, both verbal and mental ones, and linguistic clues that signal the strategies realizing Move 2. He may also quote the author in question or different authors to support a point, to evaluate the author(s) of the present discussion in the book. Finally Strategies 9 and 10 can vary in position: they can occur in combination with Strategies 7 and 8, where most often, each aspect of the book and the content of the chapters are commented and evaluated at a time. But Strategies 9 and 10 can also appear in a separate stretch of text commenting and evaluating specific features of the book.

Considering that evaluation is a central feature of BRs, it might be expected that Strategy 9 would occur in all BRs. However, a lack of this typical strategy in BRs was noted in thirteen texts (16.2%). This fact may be explained by the presence of Move 3 which is also essentially evaluative, significantly it is present in texts where Strategies 9 and 10 are missing. Therefore, all BRs have

at least one kind of evaluation, realized by Strategy 9 in Move 2 or by Move 3 (or most frequently by both).

3.4.3 -Strategies realizing Move 3- Providing final assessment of the book

The third most typical move of BRs serves the purpose of evaluating the book as a whole appearing as a closing move in the concluding paragraph and as a consolidation of the reviewer's stance towards the book. Move 3 carries out a final evaluation of the whole book by either recommending or disapproving the book or a combination of both, regarding the criticism which appears in Strategy 8 (reporting the content). Move 3 signals to the reader through the closing expressions e.g., 'in sum(mary)', 'in short', 'all in all', 'overall', 'finally', 'on the whole', 'all the above' or the use of logical conclusion 'thus', 'therefore' that the text is coming to an end. Move 3 is composed of one of the following strategies:

Strategy 11 - Recommending/disqualifying the book
and/or
Strategy 12 - Making suggestions for future applications

Strategy 11 - Recommending/disqualifying the book

Strategy 11 appears in seventy seven BRs representing 96.25% of occurrence. Due to its high frequency, it is the most typical element in Move 3. Reviewers signal final evaluation through typical signals such as:

(i) the verbs 'recommend', 'deserve' or 'should'; evaluative items such as 'great use', 'wide readership', 'worth reading', 'interest', recommending or not the reading of the book to a specific audience such as teachers, educators, and researchers. Examples from the corpus are:

Example 3.53

(35) **Language teachers** and perhaps even **testing specialists** will find Underhill's book **worth reading.** [BR 8, 8-35]

Example 3.54

(24) In general, the articles in this volume have been carefully selected and well edited. (25) Each paper offers a brief but valuable look into specific aspects of immersion programs and issues of bilingualism. (26) The volume is an **excellent sampler** of various topics, which **should encourage the interested reader** to look into them **in greater depth.** [BR 39, 9 - 24/26]

Example 3.55

(27) **Typical classroom teachers** will find this book **challenging** and sometimes **difficult,** but **the more sophisticated ones** in that group will be able to use and apply much of the information found here. [BR 37, 6 - 27]

(ii) One characteristic of the ending paragraphs is that they are generally signalled by a matching relation of contrast (Hoey, 1983) already discussed on page 90. When the reviewer evaluates positively, s/he tends to introduce the paragraph with a negative sentence, and when s/he evaluates negatively, s/he tends to introduce it with a positive signal. To indicate this contrasting

relationship between what was said in Strategy 9 (Move 2) and Strategy 11, adversative conjuncts are used, e.g., 'despite', 'although', 'but', 'inspite of', 'nevertheless'. A few examples from the data will suffice.

Example 3.56

(22) **In spite of excellent passages,** the book **sadly illustrates the limited help** that research currently provides in illuminating the teachers' experience of instructed second language acquisition. [BR 33, 7-22]

Example 3.57

(22) In short, this is **an interesting, even imaginative study, but its conclusions are seriously marred** by an inappropriate statistical treatment. [BR 44, 5-22]

Example 3.58

(34) **Despite its shortcomings,** this work **offers several worthwhile suggestions** and represents **a step** in the right direction in oral testing. [BR 8, 8 - 34]

In the case of unfavourable reviews (ten texts), the author ends by negatively evaluating or not recommending the book for readership. Examples,

Example 3. 59

(35) This is **not a book to be recommended** unless it contains a paper of central interest to the reader. [BR 15, 9-35]

Example 3.60

(23) It **should not be recommended to** numerate **readers** with high blood pressure. [BR 44, 5 - 23]

When reporting and evaluating the reviewer uses evaluative verbs. The main evaluative verbs used in BRs were:

---

applaud, believe, deserve, detract, fail, feel, find, help, interfere, lack, miss, omit, represent, succeed, suffer, support, think, underscore.

(iii) Reviewers may still signal recommendation by means of positive evaluatory words, but without employing items like 'recommend', 'deserve'. For instance,

Example 3.61

(20) While the reviewer must agree with the editors and the commentators that the texts (the ex-slave recordings and the transcripts) do not resolve the issues surrounding the origins of BEV (Black English Vernarcular) in the United States, he must agree as well with the editors that "given the contexts for interpretation provided by the essays presented here, **the texts thus offer a unique place to begin in reconstructing the history of BEV"** (p. 19). [BR 31, 6 - 20]

Although Strategy 11 occurs most often in the very last paragraph (96.25%), in two of the analysed texts (2.5%), recommendation of the book under review appears in the first sentence of the introductory paragraph (Move 1). This dislocation can be explained by the fact that the BR is an essentially evaluative genre, and evaluation may occur in different parts of the text. In

addition, such a position may indicate a device employed by the reviewer to inform his stance towards the book from the very beginning. The two examples found in the introductory paragraphs in the corpus are:

Example 3.62

(1) **I recommend this book to readers involved in applied linguistics for ELT.** (2) The author demonstrates his wide knowledge of contemporary approaches in linguistics and language acquisition research and deploys this knowledge consistently towards a pedagogic end. [BR 72, 1-1/2]

Example 3.63

(6) The book covers its areas clearly and competently: indeed, **I would recommend it for those interested in discourse analysis** even if they have no direct interest in language teaching. [BR 30, 1- 6]

It is worth mentioning that in one text (BR 7), the reviewer does not present any evidence of personal evaluation and recommendation of the book. The book review finishes discussing the content of the book and the reader is not allowed to know the reviewer's position towards the book under review.

Strategy 12- Making suggestions for future applications

This is a less typical strategy appearing in five of all BRs (6.25%) in the ending paragraph. Here the review refers the reader to future applications for the book in terms of descriptions of theories, applications of methodology. This strategy is realized through modal verb "*need" and "will".* Examples,

Example 3.64

(39) At the same time, the practical approach **needs to be supplemented by** more rigorous research procedures if our knowledge about L2 teaching... [BR 52, 6-39]

Example 3.65

(36) What we now **need is an up-to-date collection of descriptions of practical hypertext applications** based on some of the currently more generally available and affordable software packages such as Hyperpad, Toolbook, Linkway, Hyperland and Hypershell. [BR 78, 10 - 36]

The difference between Strategy 10 and Strategy 12 lies in the fact that in Strategy 10, the reviewer presents suggestions for improvement of the book based on the shortcomings pointed out in Strategy 9 while in Strategy 12, the reviewer presents suggestions in terms of future applications for the book.

It is worth noting that the great variety of evaluative signals used to evaluate the book consist of verbs, nouns, adjective phrases, and adverbs. Below I provide a list of the most frequent positive and negative lexical items which occur in the analysed texts.

Positive evaluative items: (v) *contributions, deserves, prevails, abound, can benefit, succeeds, be welcomed, familiarise, applaud;* (**adj**) *accessible, attractive, best, bright, broad, careful, concise, convincing, creative, clearest, ecletic, enlightened, excellent, fresh, formidable, generous, helpful, illuminating, important, impressive, innovative, interesting, influential, insightful, meaningful, noteworthy, optimal, practical, pleasurable, propitious, reasonable, refreshing, serious, significant, solid, substantial, surprising, stimulating, thought-provoking, valuable, well-written, worthy, worthwhile;* (**noun phrases**) *an important figure, an excellent resource, an exceptional achievement, very readable introduction, a clear admiration for, pleasurable anticipation, careful editing, thought-provoking collection, a well documented chapter, a decent read, an accomplished researcher, an outstanding paper, highly descriptive/useful/selective, important, excellent passages/ideas/sampler, very useful book, comprehensive theory, convincing contribution, valuable information/groundwork service/discussion, positive features, satisfactory outcome, insightful account, well-chosen, well-founded, well-written, well-organized, splendid, strongest papers, sensitive and intelligent book, competent, carefully selected, intelligent book/discussion, a very stimulating investigation/book, very clearly written, a very rich and detailed chapter, a thoughtful volume, the most comprehensive text, a complex and sophisticated book, a refreshing non-technical account/approach, intrinsic merits, particularly illuminating, worthwhile suggestions, triumph, a fair and balanced view, a scholarly book;* (**n**) *importance, enthusiam, optimism, significance;* (**adv**) *admirably, attractively, critically, convincingly, clearly, fortunately, greatly, more importantly, interestingly, increasingly, remarkably, surprisingly, undoubtedly, very successfully.*

Negative evaluative items: (v) deprive, confuse, *lack, misrepresent, neglect, overemphasizes, regret, are restricted, falls short; sit uneasily, stop short, suffer, take pains,* (**n**) *complaint, confusion, criticism, disappointment, drawback, flaw, gap, misprinting, shortcoming, weakness;* (**adj**) *ambiguous, contradictory, discomforting, disconcerting, fuzzy, incomplete, minimal, provocative, tedious, unsatisfying, unclear, unhelpful, imprecise, unfortunate, vague;* (**noun phrases**) *a general worry, an intentional bias, a poor book, a more problematic approach, a rather disappointing book, an unexplained discrepancy, a few surprising gaps, the problematic aspects, an obvious flaw, unnecessary attention, a very disturbing problem, unhelpful exemplification, an honest vagueness, unconvincing ideas, comparatively sparse, a few weak spots, inevitable problems, the limited help, the long dense chapter, scant discussion, the most startling omission, self-limiting applications, negligently undocumented, less successful;* (**adv**) *annoyingly, irritatingly, sadly, unfortunately;* (**negation**) *no space for discussion, it is not clear, not easy, there is no reference, there is no engagement, may not be clear.*

To conclude this part of the descriptive analysis of BRs, it is also worth highlighting that the moves and strategies that realize the BRs are constrained by the information that appears in the book. Thus, titles, headings and bibliographical reference of the book are not considered 'Move' or 'Strategy'. In general, information about the new book in terms of author's name, the title of the book, name and place of publication, data of publication and sometimes number of pages and price are placed outside the text, at the beginning. The name of the reviewer always occurs at the end of the text accompanied by the place s/he works at. Here are two examples taken from different journals and organized in different ways.

> **BASIL HATIM and IAN MASON:** *Discourse and the Translator.* Longman. 1990.
>
> **THE NATIVE SPEAKER IN APPLIED LINGUISTICS.** *Alan Davis.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. 1991. Pp. x+181. $29.00.

In the light of the structural description above I shall take up a typical instance of a BR and look at how these moves and strategies realize the communicative purpose of the genre.

3.5. - A Sample Analysis

The BR to be analysed was published in **SSLA Journal (Studies in Second Language Acquisition)**, Vol. 10, N.2, in June 1988 and reviewed by James P. Lantolf from the University of Delaware. This text contains 966 words

distributed in eight paragraphs. The review can be assigned a three move structural description and it was chosen because it illustrates a typical instance of a favourable BR in the selected corpus. In the analysis that follows, sentences are numbered to facilitate reference.

TESTING SPOKEN LANGUAGE: A HANDBOOK OF ORAL TESTING TECHNIQUES. Nic Underhill. Cambridge University Press. 1987. Pp. vii + 117. $8.95.

(**Move 1**) (**1**) **Underhill's monograph treats one of the most controversial topics in the testing literature: oral proficiency.** (2)The book is addressed specifically to language teachers rather than to testing specialists and is intended as a guide for those wishing to integrate an oral testing component into their language curriculum. (**3**)Consequently, it assumes no prior knowledge of the field. (**4**)To this end, it is very clearly written.

(**Move 2**)(**5**) **The monograph comprises six chapters, including a general introduction to oral testing and five chapters covering the aims** and resources of an oral testing program, test types, elicitation techniques, scoring procedures, and test evaluation. (**6**) **Also included are two appendices**: one describing three commonly used Brittish tests of oral proficiency and another containing a short and briefly annotated bibliography.

(**7**) Underhill is to be applauded for his commitment to the *humans* involved in the testing process. (**8**) Test designers have given privileged status to the testing instruments themselves and to the ubiquitous statistical procedures used to corroborate research hypotheses and have virtually ignored the individuals subjected to the imposition of a test (see Lantolf & Frawley, 1985, 1988). (**9**) As the author cogently remarks: "In a genuine oral test, this order of priorities is reversed. (**10**) Real people meet face to face, and talk to each other...it is the people and what passes between them that are important, and the test instrument is secondary" (p. 3).

(**11**) The cornestone of Underhill's human approach to oral testing is his characterization of what counts as *communicative* and *authentic* language tasks. (**12**) For Underhill, a task is communicative if it is relevant, has truth value, and is interesting for the learner; it is authentic if it corresponds to human activities in everyday life (p.8). (**13**) The author goes on to present testing procedures that comply with these criteria. (**14**) Clearly, he has not set himself an easily attainable goal.

(**15**) To ensure the authenticity and communicativeness of oral tests, Underhill proposes testing learners in locations outside of the market context in which language testing usually occurs. (**16**) He suggests, for example, testing in such everyday places as a cafeteria or in any place where people normally sit and talk "like ordinary adults going about their ordinary business" (p. 42). (**17**) He also recommends simultaneous participation of more than one learner in a conversation (i.e., oral text). (**18**) This seems to be a sanguine, if not a somewhat deceptive remedy to the naturalness enigma that has plagued oral testing. (**19**) This procedure is not without its problems, however, not the least of which is how to rate learners under real-world conditions. (**20**) Nevertheless, we must attempt such daring procedures if we are ever to uncover learner's true language abilities.

(**21**) Several of the techniques discussed are, by the author's own admission, neither authentic nor communicative (e.g., reading aloud, sentence repetition and transformation). (**22**) They are included because they supposedly provide for a rapid assessment of grammatical and phonological control. (**23**) This caveat aside, Underhill's reasons for designing some techniques as authentic and communicative remain opaque. (**24**) Why, for instance, is it more *authentic* to use a combination of techniques than it is to use a single testing strategy? (**25**) Why is it more *natural* for an assessor to instruct a learner to ask a question of a third party than it is for the learner to direct questions exclusively to the assessor? (**26**) Why is it more *communicative* to describe a picture over the telephone than it is to describe the picture when both interlocutors

can see each other? (**27**) It is difficult to imagine that learners fail to realize they are being tested simply because an interacion occurs via the telephone; the real task from their perspective may not be, as Underhilll assumes, to describe what they can *see* in a picture but to relate what they can *say* about the picture.
(**28**) Turning briefly to rating procedures, one immediately notes the problem of determining the number of levels a proficiency scale should contain. (**29**) Underhill recommends against using more levels than are needed (p. 101). (**30**) Precisely what this means, however, is not at all clear. (**31**) Test designers have utilized as few as 3 and as many as 12 levels in their unending search for an adequate characterization of proficiency (Lantolf & Frawley, 1988). (**32**) Although Underhill presents a five-level scale, he argues that teachers might want to consider using only three levels (*elementary, intermediate, and advanced*) in order to achieve higher reliability (p. 100). (**33**) He wisely cautions, nevertheless, that no scale is perfect, because people rarely form homogeneous groupings (p. 99).

(Move 3) (**34**) **Despite its shortcomings, this work offers several worthwhile suggestions and represents a step in the right direction in oral testing**. (**35**) Language teachers and perhaps even-testing specialists will find **Underhill's book worth reading.**

REFERENCES

Lantolf, J. P., & Frawley, W. (1985). Oral-Proficiency testing: A critical analysis. *Modern Language Journal,* 69, 337-345.
Lantolf, J. P., & Frawley. W. (1988). Proficiency: Understanding the construct. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition,* 10, 181-195.

The following picture summarizes the moves and strategies used to realize the communicative purpose of the review.

Move 1 - Establishing the Field
S1- Making topic generalizations (sent. 1)
S3- Indicating intended audience (sent. 2/3)
Move 2 - Summarizing the content of the book
S7- Describing the organization of the book (sent. 5/6)
S8- Reporting the content of book (sent.11,12/13,15/17,21/22,24/27, 31/32)
S9- Evaluating the book (sent.4, 7/8, 9/10,14, 18/19, 23, 28/33)
S10- Presenting suggestions (sent. 20)
Move 3 - Provoding final assessment of the book
S11- Recommending/disqualifying the book (sent. 34/35)

Table 3.2. Description of moves and strategies of the BR

This book review starts with Move 1, 'Establishing the Field'. The reviewer makes clear the field of knowledge to which the book belongs in sentences 1 and 2 of the first paragraph. Two strategies are used by the reviewer to realize Move 1. The first strategy is Strategy 1 - *Making topic generalizations* which

appears with Strategy 9 (Move 2) - *Evaluating the book* together within the limits of the same sentence. Here the reviewer begins the text (sentence 1) by evaluating and informing the topic of the book which focuses on oral proficiency deemed as 'one of the most controversial topics in the testing literature'. The linguistic items signalling these strategies are the reporting verb 'treat', the noun 'topics' and the nominal group 'oral proficiency' (Strategy 1) and 'one of the most controversial topics' (Strategy 9).

In sentences 2 and 3, Strategy 3, *Indicating the intended audience* is signalled by the reviewer through the signals 'addressed specifically to language teachers rather than to testing specialists', and 'intended as a guide for those wishing to integrate an oral testing component in their language curriculum'. Here the reviewer indicates to whom the book is addressed. This strategy combined with strategy 1 attracts the reader's attention to the fact that the book under focus is of interest to a certain group of professionals.

After having established the field, the reviewer continues evaluating the book (*Strategy 9*) by commenting on positive aspect of the book through the words 'very clearly written' giving to the reader an indication of his stance towards the book (sentences 3 and 4).

Then, the reviewer shifts the focus of attention, from Move 1 to Move 2- 'Summarizing the content of the book' developed in the paragraphs that follow.

This move is realized by means of three strategies. Strategy 7, which describes the organization of the monograph and is expressed in sentences 5 and 6. Typical signals are: 'comprises six chapters', 'five chapters covering the aims', 'two appendices...'.

In the next paragraph (sentences 7 to 8) the reviewer, using Strategy 9, evaluates the way the topic is treated by Underhill by praising him with the book. Here this strategy is signalled by the words 'applauded for his commitment to the humans involved in the testing process' and comments on the 'priviliged status' of the topic. This evaluation is supported by a quotation taken from the book under appreciation providing credibility to the opinion presented in sentences 7 and 8.

Again, in sentences 12-14, the reviewer continues evaluating the monograph (Strategy 9) through the items 'the cornestone of Underhill's human approach', 'clearly', 'has not set himself an easily attainable goal', but such evaluation is embedded within a discussion of how Underhill distinguishes between communicative and authentic language tasks (Strategy 8) in sentences 11, 12 and 13. Typical signals of Strategy 8 are: 'For Underhill', 'the author goes on to present'.

The next three paragraphs characterize Move 2, through Strategies 8, 9, and 10 in which they are presented in an embedding way. In sentences 15, 16,

17, 21, 22 and 24 to 27, the reviewer reports and discusses the content of the monograph mainly the topic related to authenticity and communicativeness (Strategy 8). This strategy is finished when the reviewer asks several questions about the topic for reflection (sentences 24 -27). Typical signals are mainly reporting verbs such as 'propose', 'suggest', 'recommend', 'be' in the simple present and 'include' and 'discuss' in the passive voice. In sentences 18 and 19, the reviewer negatively evaluates Underhill's recommendation 'of simultaneous participation of more than one learner in conversation' (Strategy 9). Typical signals of negative evaluation are 'sanguine', 'deceptive remedy', 'plagued', 'problems'. Another negative evaluation is sentence 23 which is signalled by 'caveat' and 'opaque'. Sentence 20 contains a suggestion presented by the reviewer concerning the topic under discussion (Strategy 10) signalled by 'we must attempt such daring procedures'.

In sentences 28 to 33, the reviewer continues evaluating the monograph (Strategy 9) by commenting on the problem 'of determining the number of levels a proficiency scale should contain' and by discussing Underhill's position (Strategy 8, sentences 29, 32) through the signals 'recommends', 'presents', 'argues' and through citation (Lantolf & Frawley, 1988). Sentence 33, the reviewer closes Move 2 with a positive evaluation of the way the author treats the topic. Other markers of evaluation in these sentences are: 'not all clear', 'wisely cautions', 'no scale is perfect'.

With a short concluding paragraph (Move 3), the reviewer ends the text by evaluating the book positively 'in spite of the shortcomings' pointed out earlier in the BR and showing the importance of the monograph for the area of oral testing. This is Strategy 11 in which the reviewer provides final evaluation of the monograph including the recommendation for the readership. Typical signals are 'the work offers several worthwhile suggestions', 'represents a step in the right direction', 'language teachers and perhaps even testing specialists will find Underhill's book worth reading' (sentences 34, 35). To introduce the positive evaluation and recommendation of the book, a matching relation of contrast is used to signal a favourable opinion about the book, namely, 'Despite its shortcomings, this book offers several worthwhile suggestions and represents a step in the right direction in oral testing' (sentence 34). This is a commonly used pattern in favourable BRs.

As can be seen from the analysis, BR is a staged genre which contains the three typical moves. Move 1 provides general information about the book inserting it within a field of knowledge; Move 2 describes the organization, summarizes or reports the content of chapters/sections/articles and comments on positive and negative aspects of the book. Move 3 provides final evaluation of the book as a whole with the aim of recommending it for readership. Therefore, the presence of these moves reveals that the rhetorical movement of this genre is characterized by the way information conveys each move, i.e., from general information contextualizing the book within a field of knowledge

(Move 1) to specific details of organization, content and evaluation (Move 2) and to general information linking it to the opening move and consolidating the reviewer's point of view of the book (Move 3) .

In the present analysis it was also noted that move and strategy boundaries do not directly correlate with sentence boundaries, so that the same sentence may include different types of strategy, as it is the case with sentence 1, Move 1, which contains Strategy 1 and 2 together. Strategies can also occur dislocated from their particular position across move boundaries, such as the strategies of evaluation appearing in Move 2 and Move 3 which may appear at the beginning of the Move 1 as the first introductory sentence, indicating the reviewer's opinion on the topic or on the book as a whole. Thus the analysis shows that flexibility is allowed in the sequence of strategies which realize the moves. This issue will be discussed in section 3.7 in this chapter.

3.6. - The Textual Boundaries of BRs

As stated in Chapter 1, several approaches to genre analysis have offered important perspectives on the notion of genre. However, none of these has widely treated the question of identification of stages in texts. As this is also true for the move-type analysis postulated by Swales, this question needs to be further discussed.

In the present study, the identification of textual boundaries for moves and strategies was based on the criterion of 'linguistic evidence' (form) and on the interpretation of information in the text (content/function). The analysis revealed that the limits between moves and strategies are not always the same from text to text and the boundaries depend on the writer's style of organizing his/her text.

Thus functionally I have identified one move expressed in two paragraphs, two moves in the same paragraph, two different strategies within the limits of a complex sentence or even several paragraphs comprising the same move, as we can see in the examples below.

One move, Move 1, Establishing the Field, is realized by Strategy 1 - 'making topic generalization' (ss. 1-4) expressed in two paragraphs:

Example 3.66

(**Move 1**) (*Strategy 1)* (1) **Bernhardt advocates more principled research and instruction in second language literacy.** (*Strategy 2)* (2) This book is **a personal statement** based on her own theory and research as well as that of others. (Strategy 1) (3) It provides a comprehensive review of what is known about **the second language reading process** based on **principles** drawn from the synthesis of empirical data.
(*Strategy 1)* (4) The discussion is **set forth from four main** perspectives:an examination of theoretical models of the reading process and their application to second language contexts; a synthesis of empirical data of second language reading research from 1973 to 1989; description of reader-based

interactions with second language texts; and curriculum, instruction, and assessment. [BR 41, 1, 2 - 1/ 4]

The example above shows that the linguistic signals which convey Strategy 1 are: 'advocates', 'set forth', 'principled research and instruction in second language literacy', 'second language reading process', 'four main perspectives' etc, making generalizations about the topic of the book. These linguistic items signal Strategy 1 focusing the reader's attention on what the book is about.

Two different moves (Move 1, Strategy 4, the origin of the book (s.1), and Move 2, Strategy 7, which describes the organization of the book (ss. 2/3)) are realized within the limits of the same paragraph:

Example 3.67

(**Move 1**) (*Strategy 4*) (1) This is a **selection of papers from the Sixth Delaware Symposium on Language Studies**, sponsered by the University of Delaware Program in linguistics in 1984. (**Move 2**) (*Strategy 7*) (2) The papers **are organized in four parts**: plenary papers, psychological aspects, methodology research, and discourse. (3) There is an author and a subject index, but no commentary by the editors. [BR 19, 1- 1/3]

Example 3.67 is an instance that shows two different moves occurring in the same portion of text. The linguistic clues which realize both moves and strategies plus the interpretation of this stretch of text allows us to perceive the limits of both moves.

Two different moves (Move 1, Establishing the Field, realized by Strategy 1 -making topic generalization and Strategy 4 - the origin of the book as well as Move 2, Strategy 7, which describes the organization of the book in parentheses) occur in the same complex sentence. Strategy 1 is signalled by 'and', the reporting verb 'focuses' and 'the role of learnability theory...'.

Example 3.68

(Move 1) *(Strategy 4)* (1) This volume **(Move 2)** *(Strategy 7)* **(an introduction and eight articles) is the product of the 1982 University of Western Ontario Learnability Workshop**, *(Strategy 1)* and **it focuses on the role of learnability theory in current linguistic theory**, specifically, **parameterized Government Binding (GB) theory**. [BR 25, 1- 1]

The examples above show that it is not always possible to identify the limits of moves and strategies based on 'physical indicators' (sentence, paragraph) only. The structural divisions in texts should be done 'in terms of *convention'* (what features seems to be used as a norm by the writers of BRs), 'form' (what linguistic evidence is present in the texts realizing 'functions' in BRs) and *'content'* (what information is more relevant to be expressed in BRs) in which linguistic patterning contributes to the perception of boundaries based on the content. Thus the functional and linguistic criteria has led me to identify the most typical moves for BRs such as *Establishing the field, Summarizing the*

content of the book, and *Providing final asssessment of the book* as well as the strategies which realize them.

What seems clear here is that the issue of boundaries is not seen in terms of physical aspects of language. Rather boundaries are seen in terms of content and form and the analysis moves into the realm of psychological reality which 'is not linguistically constrained and can not operate in the realm of rules or conventions of the same kind' (Paltridge, 1994: 296). This position is supported by Bhatia (1993) who suggests that the perception of textual boundaries is cognitive, i.e., based on the content, rather than linguistic.

3.7. - Flexibility in the Move-Structure of BRs

The structural interpretation for BRs described in sections 3.3.and 3.4. clearly shows that moves do not necessarily coincide with paragraphs. It has already been mentioned that two or more moves are found in one paragraph, two moves in the same sentence and one move in more than one paragraph. Moreover, the variety of organization identified revealed that a certain degree of flexibility was found in the number of moves used in the texts analysed. I noticed that it is not obligatory for the reviewer to use all of the strategies which realize the moves. This degree of freedom in the sequencing of the moves and strategies justifies the occurrence of the Strategy 11- 'Recommending /disqualifying the book'- in the first position of introductory paragraph instead of the ending paragraph, letting the reader know in advance the reviewer's stance

concerning the book. The frequency of occurrence of moves also revealed that 'some moves are more essential than others' (Bhatia, 1993:56).

The same freedom in the sequencing of moves allows the reviewer to end the text without a concluding paragraph and consequently without including Move 3 and Strategy 11 'Recommending/disqualifying the book'.

Although I have proposed a framework of 'moves' and 'strategies' for BRs based on the frequency of occurrence of these in the texts, it should be clear that the reviewer is not always obliged, as a rule, to use them in the same order. However, so far as their positioning is concerned, most of them have a regular position in the texts, some are generally assigned the opening position and others the end position.

Thus Move 1 - *Establishing the field* - allowing for the exceptions already mentioned appears to be obligatory in the opening paragraphs in order to give an idea to the reader of the topic of the book, its aim and intended audience, although any of the strategies which realize it may occur in different positions and not in all BRs as shown in the examples catered for in this chapter. Out of the six strategies which realize Move 1, Strategy 1 (66.25%) and Strategy 2 (67.5%) seem to be necessary taking into account the frequency of occurrence and the reviewer's intention to make clear the topic of the book and the importance of the book for a certain field of study. The remaining strategies

(3,4,5,6) are less typical. Strategy 3, '*Indicating the intended audience'* usually appears after the reviewer makes topic generalizations (Strategy 1), but it may reappear embedded in Move 3 towards the end of the text. It recurs in Move 3 as an iterative element, especially in the closing move.

Move 2 -S*ummarizing the content of the book* - also appears to be obligatory, and it has thus been found to be present in most BRs. Among the strategies which realize this Move, Strategy 10, which presents suggestions for improvement of the book is less typical as revealed by its low frequency (18.75%) and Strategy 7 (67.5%), describing the organization of the book, Strategy 8, reporting or discussing the content of the book (100%) and Strategy 9 (83.75%) highlighting and evaluating parts of the book are the most typical. Strategy 9 is deemed an iterative element in the structure of BRs, since it occurs more than once in the texts.The most prominent position of Move 2 is the middle one, immediately after the reviewer has established the field.

Move 3, *Providing final assessment of the book,* is an obligatory move in the writing of BRs. Whenever it occurs, it marks the closing of a text and signals to the reader the reviewer's definite personal opinion about the book in order to recommend it to a specific audience. The two strategies which realize it - Strategy 11 and 12 - may not always be present in the text in that order. The omission of these strategies in some of these BRs may signal dissatisfaction on

the part of the reviewer with the book under appreciation. Thus the typical moves and the most typical strategies for BRs in this study are:

Move 1 - Establishing the Field
S1 - Making topic generalizations
and
S6 - Claiming centrality
Move 2 - Summarizing the content of the book
S7 - Describing the organization of the book
and
S8 - Reporting/discussing the content
and
S9- Evaluating parts of the book
Move 3 - Providing final assessment of the book
S11 - Recommending/disqualifying the book

Table 3.3 - Structural description for BRs

3.8. Limitations and difficulties of the analysis

Although Swales' CARS model has been widely adopted and adapted in the investigation of rhetorical organization of different genres (abstracts, dissertations, research articles) the model has limitations. One criticism leveled at Swales' model concerns the identification of 'moves' and 'steps' (Swales terminology). Because he has not developed a clear definition of these terms the work of the analyst is a very hard one. Several attempts at defining move and step have been made in the literature and here I am following Motta-Roth' s (1995) definiton due to its clarity and precision.

Another limitation concerning the model and which was noted in relation to the analysis of the selected texts was the setting of textual

boundaries between moves and strategies. This question, as mentioned in Chapter 1 and discussed throughout the text, has received little attention in genre studies and needs a deep discussion. To identify where a move or a strategy begins and where it finishes, decisions have made on the basis of linguistic evidence (form), the interpretation of the information contained in the texts (content), the knowledge the analyst has of the conventions of the genre and structural divisions (sentence/paragraph). Such criteria helped this researcher distinguish the limits for moves and strategies in the corpus.

In addition, another aspect related to textual boundaries which also accounts for difficulties in the present analysis is the embedding and recursiveness of move and strategies. It was noted that two strategies which realize the same move or different moves may occur in the same sentence, i.e., one contained within the other. In order to identify the rhetorical strategies in such cases a close analysis of the immediate context of the sentence or of the paragraph or even of the whole text was carried out, comparing examples in the corpus and identifying consistent elements in BRs.

The third difficulty of the present analysis is related to the identification of a 'function' in a given portion of text and that of labelling such a function as a 'strategy' which realizes a 'move' due to the variety of information contained in the texts. Although I have identified the reviewer's purpose in a portion of text , in the present study I faced difficulty to acommodate such information in any of

the three moves which make up the BRs analysed. This is the case in eleven texts (13.5%), in which one sentence linking the opening move to Moves 2 and 3 aims at announcing to the reader what the reviewer is going to do in the rest of the review. As the sentence does not realize one of the three moves, it was not considered a 'strategy'. But such information helps readers recognize how texts are organized and how different parts of the text are connected to each other functionally and semantically. This is one type of metadiscourse according to Vande Kopple (1985). In Tadros' (1985) terms, this metadiscoursive statement is termed 'advanced labelling', a category of prediction in which the writer announces what he is going to do in his text. Examples are:

Example 3.69

(5) **The following review will summarize** the three invited papers and four others that deal most directly with second language acquisition. [BR 15, 1-5]

Example 3.70

(11) Rather **I shall comment on some of the ways in which Krashen addresses his non-specialist audience, and then the implications** of his stance for applied linguists. [BR 56, 4-11]

Example 3.71

(3) **The review that follows offers both** a user's and a reviewer's perspective of the book. [BR 66, 1-3]

Thus the difficulties described above show that despite the model's usefulness in the study of the rhetorical organization of academic texts, it is still restricted in its account of such important issues as textual boundaries and the identification of moves and the elements that realize the moves.

3.9.- Summary of the chapter

In this chapter I have applied Swales' and Hasan's approach to the genre of BRs in Applied Linguistics. I have provided a description of the rhetorical organization of these texts, illustrating my discussion with examples from the data for this research. My analysis of BRs indicates that although there is variation in the ways these texts are organized, they have a number of shared characteristics. These are: they are critical expository texts in which evaluation is the most important element; they are assigned a 3 move-structure, which comprises the field of knowledge, summary and evaluation of the book and recommendation for readership; they contain the most typical strategies (1, 6, 7, 8 ,9, 11) and the less typical ones (2, 3, 4, 5, 12) which realize the three moves. Many of them use 'overlapping linguistic resources' in the same way, as Bhatia claims in his study of instances of promotional genres. These features allow me to state that the texts analysed are instances of the same genre. The variation are accountable for in terms of the differences in the ordering and number of moves and strategies in every text.

One typical instance of a favourable BR was analysed to show how the communicative purpose of the text is realized. Finally, I discussed the structural boundaries of BRs and the flexibility of moves and strategies in the genre of BRs. It seems that the structural description of moves presented in this chapter can be assigned to any typical instances of BRs.

In the next chapter I shall present a more detailed discussion of the use of signalling, and more precisely, the use of unspecific nouns in the BRs selected for this study, categorizing them into groups and later analysing the way such items organize these BRs.

Notes

[1] Due to the typicality and flexibility of strategies realizing the moves in the characterization of BRs, the terms 'most typical' and 'less typical' have been adopted instead of Hasan's (Halliday and Hasan, 1989) terms - 'obligatory' and 'optional' elements.

[2] See Table B-1 in Appendix B for sample analysis of applied linguistic texts.

[3] See Table B-2 in Appendix B for distribution of strategies in Moves 1, 2 and 3.

[4] For a full understanding of the abbreviations, ESP stands for 'English for Specific Purposes', SSLA stands for the journal 'Studies in Second Language Language Acquisition' and ESL stands for 'English as a Second Language'.

[5] The abbreviation IL in the example 3.19 stands for 'interianguage', which refers to a transitional stage in learning a second or foreign language. SLA stands for Second Lanfuage Acquisition.

[6] See Tadros (1985) for the description of categories of prediction appearing in academic texts.

[7] For a full account of reporting verbs see article by Thompson and Yiyun (1991).

[8] The abbreviation SLR in the example 3.37 stands for Second Language Research.

[9] A theory of clause relations is discussed in Hoey (1983) in which texts are organized into two ways: Basic Text Structure and Basic Clause Relations.

CHAPTER 4

Unspecific Nouns in Book Reviews

4.1. Introduction

Having established a schematic description of moves and strategies for the writing of BRs in Applied Linguistics, in this chapter I shall focus on the use of unspecific nouns in such texts. This chapter begins by placing U-nouns (unspecific nouns for short) within a theory of discourse organization, defining and characterizing such items (section 4.2). Next, criteria are set for identifying U-nouns in the book reviews (section 4.3). I shall then categorize U-nouns and their specifics into semantic groups and discuss the relationship between the unspecific and specific categories (sections 4.4 and 4.6). Modification in U-nouns in the data is also discussed (section 4.5). The chapter ends with a summary of the main points discussed.

4.2. Definition and characterization of U-nouns

The issue of lexical signalling is not new and is seen as part of the general discussion of discourse organization. As we have seen in Chapter 1, U-nouns as one type of lexical signal in discourse have been studied by different scholars, e.g., Halliday (1976), Francis (1986), Ivanic (1991), Winter (1977, 1979, 1982, 1992), among others, who have given to these items different labels - *general nouns, anaphoric nouns, carrier nouns*[1]- because of their function in organizing written discourse. U-nouns have

been studied within a general theory of clause relations as developed, especially, by Winter (1979, 1982, 1989, 1992) and followed by Hoey (1979, 1983), and Jordan (1984).

According to this theory, discourse is made up of semantic relations which occur not only between clauses but also between parts of clauses, complex clauses and groups of clauses (Hoey, 1993). In order to understand the meanings of two or more clauses the reader must make connections between the clauses. Winter (1977,1979,1982,1986,1992) highlights that to connect the clauses in a text, the reader must pay attention to signals, repetition and parallelism between details of the clauses. When relationships between clauses are not explicitly signalled by the writer, inferences are necessary for the understanding of their meanings (Hoey and Winter, 1986). In signalling the relations existing in a discourse, the writer leads the reader to focus his/her attention on a particular relation thus helping the reader's interpretation. According to Winter (1977, 1982, 1992) signalling items take the form of three connective vocabularies. Vocabulary 1 consists of the subordinators and Vocabulary 2 consists of the sentence connectors. Both are closed sets of grammatical items. But it is Vocabulary 3 which is of interest in this study. Vocabulary 3 consists of a set of lexical items (nouns, verbs, adjectives) having the cohesive function of connecting meanings between clauses. Winter (1982, 1992) has claimed that a group of nouns - **unspecific nouns** - belongs to a larger metalanguage vocabulary and is very important to the understanding of the meanings of a text.

The main reason for investigating the use of U-nouns in BRs is that they are acknowledged to be important signals of the structure of written text. Hoey (1993) claims that the notion of Vocabulary 3 (which, as already observed, includes U-nouns) is crucial to our understanding of how a written text signals to the reader what its structure is. Moreover, this type of lexical signal operates not only at the level of clauses and paragraphs but also at the level of larger stretches of text.

Another reason for investigating the use of U-nouns in BRs is the lack of research on their role as organizers in this type of text. Literature (Francis 1986, 1994; Winter, 1982, 1992; Ivanic, 1991) shows that the study of such items has largely been restricted to journalistic texts.

Nouns, in particular common nouns, have been generally defined as words which 'designate classes of things' (Halliday and Hasan, 1976:42). Although nouns can be regarded as belonging to the 'open' or 'content' category of words, U-nouns as developed by Winter belong to an open and closed-set in the sense that they can perform semantic and grammatical functions at the same time. They are regarded words which act 'as a halfway-house between the grammar words and lexical words of English.' (Carter and McCarthy, 1988:207).

U-nouns may be defined as a group of nouns that, by virtue of their meaning, 'require lexical realization in order to be fully understood in

discourse' (Winter, 1982, 1992:153; Francis, 1994:83). These signals need lexicaiization in their co-text in order to become lexically unique. The notion of 'lexical uniqueness' will be explained in the next paragraph of this section. Such nouns, as mentioned earlier, have the grammatical properties of open class lexis; as such, they can be modified and qualified. U-nouns are 'classifications of various meanings of their specifics' (Winter, 1992:153) but they are not specific themselves. They 'commit the writer to a particular course of action and signal the interactive structure of the text' (Carter and McCarthy, 1988:208). Nouns like **assumption, aspects, claim, focus, goal,** or **problem** are some of the U-nouns which appear in my data and whose specific meaning is made explicit in the text itself. Examples illustrating U-nouns and their textual realization are provided throughout this chapter and in Chapter 5. Their meanings as Hoey (1993) claims are 'flexible and pervasive' and, for this reason, the discourse analyst must be aware of their use as discourse signals in a text.

The key linguistic concept of the binary relation - unspecific/specific clause- is *lexical realization or lexical uniqueness (Winter, 1982,1992). Lexical realization* means that 'certain items of the clause may be lexically realized outside its sentence or clause boundary so that the clause and the adjoining clause(s) are taken as a single semantic unit for the understanding of both clauses' (Winter, 1977: 57-73). Thus a U-noun has its meaning made specific through its lexical realization, i.e., when preceding or subsequent clause(s) complete(s) the meaning of a U-noun forming an integrated meaning. In order for U-nouns to become specific, they will have

to be textually realized: when this happens they have acquired 'lexical uniqueness'. Instances of U-nouns (bold type) and their lexical realization in my data are:

Example 4.1

(1) Though slim in volume, this book pursues a formidable **goal:** It seeks to identify and define the semantic relations which ail human beings, irrespective of language, refer to in the construction of coherent discourse, and, subsequently, to examine their linguistic encoding in English. [BR 5, 1 - 1]

Example 4.2

(21) However, **this chapter** ends by baldly retailing **the allegation** that advocates of functional syllabuses have simply replaced structures with functions and ignored other components of meaning. (22) Missing here is any indication that **this allegation** has been replied to or that the dispute continues. (23) The second half of the book suffers from no **such deficiencies of balance**. (24) On the contrary, it is explicitly and very successfully eclectic. (25) It expounds an approach to L2 course design which not only is multifaceted in terms of its categories, but also draws on insights from both the objective-focussed and the process-focussed varieties of syllabus and from both fluency-oriented and accuracy-oriented methodologies. (26) This **approach** yields a set of *frameworks* based, according to the requirements of different learner-types, on discourse-categories, topics, situations or tasks. [BR 12, 6- 21/26]

The nouns 'goal', 'chapter', 'allegation', 'deficiencies of balance' and 'approach' are unspecific in the examples above in the sense that their meanings are not made explicit to the reader in the clauses in which they are inserted. It is their lexical realization that makes their meaning clear to the reader and which is textually present in the following or previous

sentence or paragraph. In example (4.1), the meaning of the U-noun 'goal' is made clear in the following clause, i.e., 'It seeks to identify and define the semantic relations...in English', whereas in example (4.2), the specification for 'chapter' is lexicalized in the previous sentence and the U-noun 'allegation' premodified by 'the' has its specific meaning in the same clause in which the U-noun appears. The meaning of the U-noun 'allegation' preceded by 'this' is lexicalized outside its clause boundary in the sentence 21 through a relative clause. In the same example, the reader attributes meaning to 'deficiencies of balance' and 'approach' by looking at the preceding co-text. The meaning of the U-nouns is thus made specific outside their clause boundaries.

4.3. - Text analysis of U-nouns

In order to carry out an accurate and reliable qualitative and quantitative analysis of U-nouns, the selected corpus was stored on a computer and the MicroConcord 1.0 software developed by Johns and Scott (1993) was used to investigate all occurrences of U-nouns and their specific meanings appearing in the BRs. The retrieval of the data allowed me to compare examples of the same item and to examine the immediate context in which the U-noun was inserted. This sotfware facilitated the task of investigating U-nouns in different BRs, in addition to counting the frequency and listing all the occurrences of a particular required item.

By looking at the frequency of U-nouns in the data, it was possible to identify potential U-nouns, i.e., the most frequent U-nouns appearing in

the BRs and also to point out those items which are candidates for U-nouns, i.e. the least frequent ones. During the analysis, all instances of U-nouns that did not have a lexicalization by a clause or a sentence were disregarded (see this criterion on section 4.4). Thus only the U-nouns whose lexicalization was realized intersententially, i.e., when the meaning is made specific by more than two clauses or sentences or in larger stretches of text, or intrasententially, i.e., the U-noun and its specific meaning are within the same clause boundary were considered in the analysis. Exophoric uses of U-nouns were disregarded.

In categorizing U-nouns, the immediate context was examined in order to identify the items which share the same semantic features. By adopting a semantic criterion, the analysis revealed that most of the U-nouns fitted into one of the five categories described in section 4.6, but there were a few which remained impossible to classify e.g. 'tradition'. These U-nouns were also disregarded in the analysis.

Winter has been criticized for having labelled such nouns as 'unspecific nouns' (Ivanic, 1991). It is not an adequate term, if we consider that any noun, except for proper nouns, is potentially unspecific. Hence, other scholars have tried to give these nouns more suitable labels like 'general nouns', 'carrier nouns', 'container nouns', 'labelling nouns'. However, such nouns are labelled 'unspecific' by Winter because they are nouns which require a specific meaning within adjoining sentences. Without their specific clauses these nouns are 'almost meaningless labels for

information' (Winter,1992). In order to identify such nouns within a text with confidence, some criteria must be met. The next section sets criteria for identifying, characterizing and categorizing U-nouns.

4.4. Criteria for Identifying Unspecific Nouns

Before discussing criteria for identifying U-nouns, it is necessary to make clear what concept of 'clause' will be adopted in the analysis of U-nouns in this study. As U-nouns are set within the Clause Relational approach, for the purpose of analysis, I am adopting Winter's notion of clause, who, in turn, follows Halliday's rank analysis where sentence is distinguished from clause by considering the whole and its parts. Thus a 'sentence consists of one or more clauses in which one of these clauses must be independent declarative clause' (Winter, 1982:19). A 'clause' is described as having the minimal structure of the sentence, at least 'the constituent function of subject and predicate, with or without adjunct, or simply predicate with or without adjunct' (Winter, 1982:23,24). These constituent functions contribute to the textual meaning of the sentence via the grammatical status of the clause. In addition, syntactic relations between the constituent elements contribute to the semantics of the clause. Winter (ibid.:27) also stresses that the clause is best seen 'as a device of lexical selection from the larger whole', i.e., sentence. What he means by such a claim is that the reader, by decoding the clause, 'must relate the words to each other in significant groupings and relate these in turn to what s/he knows about them in his/her real world in reconstructing not only the sentence but what it represents as a selection of lexical items' (Winter, ibid.:26). In the decoding process, the

reader provides meaning for the sentence from the signals it contains and from his/her own knowledge. Clauses are then 'vehicles of lexical choice' (Winter, ibid.:27) which is made within the constituent functions of subject, predicate and adjunct.

In later work, Hoey (1983) and Winter (1992:140) explicitly conflates the notion of sentence and clause in clause, so that 'Clause Relations' also means 'Sentence Relations'. Clause is viewed within a discourse structure perspective, as a communicative vehicle of selection whose chosen words may have the role of signalling backwards in its sentence or beyond its sentence to a preceding sentence, or beyond its sentence to a sentence which follows it. It is this 'lexical cohesion' perspective that will be adopted in the present analysis.

As stated previously, any noun, except proper nouns may be unspecific. But in order to identify and recognize what Winter means by U-nouns in texts, and especially in the selected corpus, some criteria were set. It is worth commenting that not all the criteria are necessary to identify U-nouns. They are:

(1) **The semantic criterion** (Ivanic, 1991) is that, in addition to their dictionary meaning, U-nouns 'carry a context-dependent meaning'. This means that U-nouns acquire transitory and variable meaning in discourse. Although they take on their meaning from context, they are not subject specific. This means that although such nouns have a specific discourse

function, they do not allow us to identify from which field of discourse they have been taken.

(2) **The anticipatory/retrospective function criterion** (Winter, 1977:57, 1992:150) tells us that U-nouns can 'anticipate the clause relation which follows or precedes their sentence'. In general when a U-noun is used in discourse it projects the reader forward by creating expectations of what is to follow in the next part of discourse. But this is not always the case. Sometimes the specific precedes the unspecific noun. Example (4.2), on page 125, is a good illustration of this point. According to Winter (1977:57) he anticipatory process is 'concerned with the organization of the immediate context to come, either within the matrix clause which has the anticipatory feature or within the immediate context of the sentences to come in its paragraph'. Anticipation is thus claimed to be 'part of the fundamental process of lexical realization' (Winter,1977:67), since it predicts the type of information for the next clauses, given the preceding anticipatory sentence. One example of this function is the following:

Example 4.3

(57) Halliday's almost total lack of bibliographical cross-reference also deprives readers of possible points of connection with work they might be familiar with. (58) At the end of the book, he provides a selective bibliography of works directly relating to the interpretation of English in a systemic-functional framework, although this is bound to be useful to students of Halliday's works, it only confirms one's sense of the sealed and self-contained nature of the enterprise.

(59) There is one **argument** that might be advanced in defence of the **insularity** I have criticised. (60) The book is based on class notes, and

> the intended readership of the book clearly includes undergraduate and postgraduate students. [BR 2, 14/15 - 57/60]

In example 4.3, the U-noun 'argument' is made lexically unique through the sentence which starts with 'The book is based on class notes, ...students', which follows the U-noun in question. The U-noun 'insularity' has its specific meaning in the previous paragraph (retrospective function), when the reviewer criticizes the lack of bibliographical cross-reference in Halliday's new book.

As part of anticipatory or retrospective processes, U-nouns operate like pronouns within and beyond sentence boundaries. The fact that these nouns can have their specific meanings in context provided in two directions makes them both anaphoric (when the specific precedes the U-noun) and cataphoric (when the opposite occurs). When a U-noun functions anaphorically, it serves the function of 'summing-up and encapsulating a stretch of discourse', i.e., what has gone before (Francis, 1986). In this case, the U-noun indicates to the reader how to interpret that stretch of discourse which precedes it (see example 4.4 below). In such contexts U-nouns can be modified by a specific determiner (the, a, this, that, these, another, etc) which refers to the preceding 'text as fact'. In these contexts, U-nouns are presented as the given information. And it is this given information that the new message is formulated.

Example 4.4

(9) Tarone focuses on strategic competence and characterizes several ways in which nonnative speakers (NNSs) use strategies differently from native speakers (NSs), including specificity of detail. (10) She continues with valuable suggestions for improving tasks intended to develop strategic competence, including more narrowly specifying intended meaning so judgements of success can be easily made. (11) Another **suggestion** which should be (but sadly is not) common sense in language teaching is that communicative tasks should include a listener who does not already know the information being conveyed and who has a real need to acquire it. [BR 15, 3 - 9/11]

In example 4.4, the U-noun 'suggestion' which is modified by 'another' has its meaning made lexically unique in the clause starting with 'that communicative tasks.....it', which follows the U-noun in focus (cataphoric). But as the U-noun is modified by 'another', the role of this determiner is both syntactic and semantic. It is syntactic in that it signals the start of the nominal group boundary in the clause, it is semantic in that it tells the reader something about the contextual semantics of the noun head, i.e., whether it has already been introduced or whether it is already known. In this particular instance, 'another' points to two directions- backwards i.e., to the preceding clauses in which some 'suggestions' are presented (given information) and forwards, i.e., to the clause that follows the U-noun 'suggestion' in order to introduce new information.

When a U-noun functions cataphorically, it has an organizing and predictive role in that it predicts to the reader the information that will come in the adjoining clauses. See example 4.5 below.

Example 4.5

(5) The book is divided into two principal **parts.** (6) Part I, covering chapters 1 and 2, consists of a truly excellent review of the literature on the role of age in language acquisition in general and second language acquisition in particular. (7) Part II, chapter 3-5, is a detailed report of the author's own empirical study (her doctoral research) of the relative performance in French of three groups of students learning that language at school in southern Ontario who underwent, respectively, *early total immersion, late immersion,* and *early immersion.* {BR 9, 2 - 5/7] [emphasis of the words 'early', 'late', 'immersion' by the author]

In example 4.5, the U-noun 'parts' which is modified by the numeral 'two' and the adjective 'principal' predicts that its specific meaning will be made lexically unique in the two sentences that folllow (sentences 6 and 7), (cataphoric). Such sentences are signalled through the repetition of the item 'part' plus the numerals I and II.

In some cases, the lexical reference of U-nouns is made explicit exophorically rather than within the text itself. In the case of BRs the reader is led to look for the specifics in the book under review or s/he is assumed to share knowledge with the reviewer/author of the book. Nevertheless, the majority of U-nouns found in my data function cataphorically and anaphorically, and are thus made lexically unique within the text itself. Exophoric unspecifics were disregarded in the analysis. In this study, I have considered only U-nouns whose meanings are lexicalized in the BRs.

(3) **The countability criterion** (Ivanic, 1991) means that most of the U-nouns are 'countable abstract nouns'. Such nouns can have both an uncountable use (with the invariable meaning) and a countable use (conveying an additional context-dependent meaning). The majority of U-nouns found in my data fits this criterion and as countable abstract nouns they appear in a plural form and signal specification by two or more clauses or members in BRs. Related to this criterion is 'the category of enumeration' (Tadros's notion of prediction, 1985), in that U-nouns occur in plural form and may be preceded, in principle, by a numeral predicting the realization of two or more discoursal acts. Their referential meaning fills out the enumeration anticipated by the writer and their specific clauses may be signalled or not by cardinal or ordinal numerals (see example 4.6). Some items which appear in the corpus are: 'aspects', 'issues', 'problems', 'approaches', 'characteristics', 'area', 'category', 'features', 'mechanisms', 'parts', 'difficulties', 'things'. For instance,

Example 4.6

(22) In addition to the content of the volume, two other **characteristics** make this book a model for edited volumes. (23)**The first** characteristic is that none of the chapters can be considered weak. .....(24)**The second** characteristic is that the papers contained in this volume come together to provide a relatively unified picture of language processing in bilingual children. [BR 42, 3 - 22/24]

(4) **The question criterion** (Winter 1977, 1992:150) means that such nouns are said 'to supplement questions and so narrow down the reply in terms of a particular clause relation'. Whenever the reader needs a more

precise specification of the information in the reply sentence, h/she can ask wh-questions about the U-nouns. If we take example (4.7) and ask the question `What is the goal of the book the writer is talking about?', the answer will be provided by the clauses which immediately follow the unspecific clause and which lexicalize the meaning of the U-noun 'goal'.

Example 4.7

(1) Though slim in volume, this book pursues a formidable **goal**: It seeks to identify and define the semantic relations which all human beings, irrespective of language, refer to in the construction of coherent discourse, and subsequently, to examine their linguistic encoding in English. [BR 5, 1 - 1]

The recognition criteria described above helped me to select U-nouns in the corpus. Due to their frequency of occurrence, they are divided into two groups: potential U-nouns and candidates for U-nouns. Potential U-nouns are those items occurring at least twice in the corpus. Candidates for U-nouns appears only once in BRs. In order to count the frequency of such items, the software MicroConcord 1.0 was used. Although the U-nouns are listed in singular form, most of them are used in plural form in the data examined.

Potential U-nouns:

The most frequent: **problem (39), chapter (36), way (31), issue (23), approach (21), fact (17), claim (16), view (16), theme (15), question (15), point (14), attempt (13), idea (13), assumption (12), discussion (12), section (11), aim (11), articles (11), area (11), goal (11), features (9), focus (9), hypothesis (9), criticism (8), example (8), reason (8), argument (7), category (7), difficulty (7), evidence (7), part (7), paper**

(7), principie (7), purpose (7), concern (6), finding (6), impression (6, message (6), perspective (6), weakness (6), conclusion (5), factor (5), suggestion (5), statement (5), strength (5), topic (5), thesis (5), aspect (4), characteristic (4), concept (4), contribution (4), position (4), proposal (4), procedure (4), role (4), task (4), theory (4), caveat (3), criterion (3), emphasis (3), implication (3), insight (3), situation (3), subtheme (3), treatment (3), assertion (2), activity (2), benefit (2), case (2), danger (2), characterization (2), disappointment (2), error (2), form (2), involvement (2), job (2), matter (2), model (2), objective (2), omission (2), term (2), stage (2), synthesis(2),

Figure 4.1. Frequency of potential U-nouns in BRs

Other nouns (frequency= 1): **anathema, allegation, allusion, basis, belief, boundary, cavil, classification, combination, component, competence, convention, controversy, construct, comprehensiveness, class, core, data, decision, description, difference, discrepancy, dichotomy, dilemma, disservice, domain, drawback, element, explanation, enquiry, exposition, foundation, framework, formula, footnote, facet, field, group, guideline, hallmark, heart, help, impression, information, investigation, item, lacuna, line, method, merit, mechanism, movement, norm, notion, nugget, need, opposition, observation, orientation, philosophy, process, piece, proposition, postulation, publication, proviso, possibility, paradigms, quibble, reference, result, research, reservation, solution, source, system, strategy, structure, surprise, slant, stance, spot, technique, thrust, tendency, trend, truth, volume, word, worry, vision, viewpoint.**

Figure 4.2. List of candidates for U-nouns

Double-head nouns (frequency=1): **areas of inquiry, cases of alternation, characterization of the maxims, classes of applications, cornerstone of ....approach, heart of the book, deficiencies of balance, discussion of problems, discussion of details, discussion of the way, forms of the TABE, forms of authoring, lack of knowledge, kind of factors, kinds of clause qualifier, line of reasoning, method of presentation, a number**

of criteria, a number of aims, a number of ways, a number of topics, a number of issues, part of his investigation, points of the text, sets of opposition, types of application, types of data, types of features, way of viewing.

Figure 4.3 - List of double-head nouns in BRs (Freq.= 1)

Besides the criteria for classification mentioned above, U-nouns may have the following characteristics:

(a) U-nouns are characteristically used metadiscursively (Winter, 1992). They are nouns which 'talk about the language and about the nature of the clause or sentence as a message in the text itself' (p.133).

(b) U-nouns characteristically have an evaluative function. Francis (1986,1994) affirms that some nominal groups can be termed `attitudinally neutral', although they may well take on positive or negative meanings in discourse depending on the lexical environment in which they are used. Others are 'attitudinally strong', indicating either a negative or a positive attitude towards preceding or subsequent propositions. In Hallidayan sense, they may signal, in an interpersonal way, the writer's positive and negative evaluation of the topic under discussion. In the example below, we can see that the noun 'disappointment' is inherently unspecific in the sense that it requires some specification but it is also attitudinally strong in that it reveals the writer's evaluation of the point being discussed.

Example 4.8

(19) The greatest **disappointment** is the way in which the book leads the reader away from instructional settings and from a hypothesis-testing stance. [BR 33, 6-19]

c) U-nouns frequently paraphrase conjunctions or connections. According to Winter (1977, 1992), this is especially noticeable with many subordinators and conjuncts. For example, U-nouns like *comparison* or *contrast* when used in context can be paraphrased directly with the items of vocabulary 2 'in comparison' and 'in contrast' respectively. When the lexical items of Vocabulary 3 paraphrase Voc. 1 and 2 a considerable change in contexts occurs, a change which is reflected in the grammatical status of the clauses of the relation. This change is possible due to both 'the underlying and interpretative semantics' (Winter, 1977:42) of the connectives themselves. Such connectives 'make explicit the underlying semantics as well as the contextual role of the clause or sentence pair, especially, if one or both members of the clause relation are given or new to the context' (Winter, ibid.:42). This means that the semantics and the grammar of the same two clause pairs change according to the semantics and the grammar of their connections (Winter, 1977:43). One example of paraphrasing in my data is that of the subordinator 'because' by the noun 'reason' or vice-versa as in the example below,

Example 4.9

(3) The main **reason** why this volume should be read and studied by those interested in CR (classroom research) is its orientation. [BR 18, 2 -3]

If we take this sentence as an answer to the question: 'Why should this volume be read and studied by those interested in CR?' the new information of the causal relation is supplied by the main clause - 'The main reason is its orientation'. So the U-noun 'reason' expresses a causal relation and this sentence may be paraphrased as "Because of its orientation, this volume should be read and studied by those interested in CR", where 'reason' (Voc. 3) is paraphrased as 'because' (Voc.1) in a Logical Sequence Relation of Cause.

However, not all Vocabulary 3 nouns can paraphrase directly or indirectly the semantics of Vocabulary 1 (subordinators) and Vocabulary 2 (conjuncts). As Winter (1977) stresses, some Vocabulary 3 nouns as well as other metalanguage nouns may fail this criterion. In relation to BRs, most of the U-nouns appearing in the texts also fail this criterion.

d) U-nouns can be syntactically modified and qualified (see section 4.4) and can take different forms of linguistic realization; that is, their specifics, in Winter's terms, can be provided either by identity or by clause. By **specifics of identity**, he means that 'the noun is named or identified by pre- or postmodifiers' (Winter,1992:134). It seems that this type of specifics is based on the meanings of words which precede or follow the U-noun. The function of specific by identity is only to identify or name the U-noun but its meaning still remains incomplete. For instance,

Example 4.10

(3) The book begins by reviewing **problems** *in investigating instructed language acquisition* (ILA), identifying a number of **areas** *of classroom research.* (4) The second chapter explores the relationship between behaviourism and ILA. (5) The next chapter reviews *naturalistic* **theories** *of language acquisition* and their relation to ILA. [BR 33, 1- 3/5]

In the above example, the noun 'problems', 'areas', and 'theories' have their linguistic realizations expressed by specific by identity. The U-nouns 'problems' and 'areas' are postmodified by prepositional phrases 'of classroom research' while the noun 'theories' is identified by the premodifier 'naturalistic' and by the postmodifier prepositional phrase 'of language acquisition'. In these instances, their meanings are not made specific in a precise way. The reader still does not know exactly what 'problems', 'areas' and 'theories' the author is discussing in the book.

By **Specifics by clause,** Winter (ibid) means that 'the noun, in addition to being identified, is specified by clause as well' (p.134). This is to say that its lexical realization can be provided by a single that-clause in apposition, i.e., clause within its own noun phrase, by that-clause or infinitive clause complementing its subject (SPC pattern)[2] or by at least two sentences which follow the sentence containing the U-noun in the text, as shown in the example below,

Example 4.11

(22) Throughout the book, Pinker relies heavily on two **mechanisms,** which serve several purposes, including accounting for how the child unlearns ungrammatical forms, on the assumption that negative evidence is not

reliably available. (23) The **first** is a uniqueness principle, which operates at various levels. (24) For example, at the level of affixation, ...//

(25) Pinker's **second,** and more questionable, mechanism is a device which (among other things) distinguishes between forms which the child has actually heard in the input and forms which the child has postulated on the basis of some rule. [BR 6, 5/6 - 22-25]

In example 4.11, the U-noun 'mechanisms' is premodified by the numeral 'two' but its meaning is made lexically unique by the two sentences that follow it as signalled through numerals 'first' and 'second' indicated in bold type. The numeral 'two' which precedes the U-noun in the plural form anticipates for the reader that two clauses will come to make its contextual meaning complete. Some nouns in my data such as *issues, forms, parts, strengths, sections,* have their meanings made specific by larger stretches of discourse.

However, in some instances, specifics by clause may occur within the same sentence in which the U-noun appears. For instance,

Example 4.12

(6) Longacre's paper is an exception in several other respects because it is more ambitious in its aims than the others and is the only paper to draw evidence from more than one language and to build upon almost 20 years of previous research in its field (e.g., Longacre, 1968, 1972, 1976, 1982). (7)It .....collection.

(8) Longacre's **argument** is that narrators around the world have a battery of syntactic (and other) devices available to them to signal the "peak" of their narratives, that is, the part of a narrative that encodes the climax or denouement of the story. [BR 3, 2-3/ 6-8]

In the example above, the U-noun 'argument' is premodified by a genitive case 'Longacre's' indicating the source of the argument but its meaning is filled out by the clause pattern SPC, where S is the subject 'Longacre's argument', P is the verb 'Be' and C is a that-clause complement which provides the specifics by clause for its subject. The specific clause is within the clause boundary.

For the purpose of the present analysis, similarly to exophoric uses of U-nouns, U-nouns which have their meanings lexicalized by specifics by identity were disregarded. I will be considering only instances of specifics by clause, that is, U-nouns which have their specific meanings made explicit both intrasententially (the U-noun and its meaning are within the same sentence) and intersententially (the meaning is made specific by one or more than two clauses or in larger stretches of discourse). Thus any instance of U-noun occurring in the excerpts of BRs and not highlighted and commented on is due to the fact it does not fit the characteristics and criteria set above.

Summing up what has been discussed so far, U-nouns are items that require lexical realization in order to complete their meaning in the text. Although any noun is a U-noun in potential, for the purpose of this analysis, the items which are regarded as U-nouns in this study have the following characteristics: (1) their meanings are context-dependent, i.e., their meanings are provided in the text itself (endophoric); (2) U-nouns operate like pronouns concerning their referential meaning. Their specific meanings

can be provided in two directions: backwards (anaphoric) and forwards (cataphoric); (3) Most of the U-nouns are countable abstract nouns which have a plural form preceded by a numeral and signal specification by two or more clauses or sentences in BRs; (4) Such items can have both evaluative and metadiscursive functions; (5) they can be modified and qualified by determiners and adjectives which signal the start of the noun phrase boundary in the clause and tell the reader something about the contextual meaning of the head noun, i.e., whether the information has already been introduced in the text or if the information is new.

The next section will consider the various types of modifiers that precede the U-nouns in order to see in what way they contribute to the 'predictive and encapsulating roles' (Francis, 1994: 84/85) of the labels in which they are used.

4.5. - Modification of Unspecific Nouns in Book Reviews

As stated previously and from the examples presented so far, one striking characteristic of U-nouns is that they can be accompanied by determiners and qualifiers. Determiners, according to Leech and Svartvik (1980:225), are 'words which specify the range of reference of a noun in various ways', e.g. by making it definite (the man), indefinite (a man), by indicating quantity (many men). Determiners always precede the noun they determine, but they have different positions relative to one another (predeterminers, postdeterminers in relation to central determiners) The most common determiners appearing in the corpus are the definite article (the), deictics

(other, another, such), demonstratives (this, that, these, those) and quantifiers (several, a number of, two, three, etc). When combined with an U-noun, such determiners 'neatly indicate not only the sort of discourse relation to be looked for but also how many discursive elements are present in the text' (Ivanic, 1991:108) in the case of quantifiers. Moreover, this combination 'allows writers to provide very precise discourse-processing signals to the readers' (Ivanic, ibid:108). Here is an illustration:

Example 4.13

(24) Russel Tomlin does use naturally occurring data and very effectively, too. (25) He hypothesizes that the subject of a sentence will encode thematic information in priority to encoding agent. (26) He then establishes a methodology for testing **this hypothesis**, taking as his data transcriptions from video-and audio-tapes of description of live ice hockey matches. (27) Of course, special cases have to be taken into account and residual problems acknowledged. (28)..../// (29) But **the hypothesis** is confirmed, at least for the limited set of data that Tomlin considers. [BR 3, 6 -24/29]

In example 4.13, the U-noun 'hypothesis' is first determined by 'this' which encapsulates the information in the previous sentence. In sentence 29, the same U-noun is determined by the definite article 'the' which signals that the information is already known in the text. Both determiners point to the direction where the information can be found: backwards, i.e., in sentence 25. Here is an illustration of another determiner:

Example 4.14

(16) **Another factor** that adds to the ponderousness of the book is the extensive use of footnotes (about 15 per chapter), often referring the reader to the literature. [BR 10, 5 - 6]

In this example, the determiner 'another' has the role of pointing forwards to the referential meaning of the noun 'factor' besides referring back and implying that the reviewer has already discussed other factors in the text. The next excerpt illustration the use of an indefinite article:

Example 4.15

(19) **An example** of a gap of a rather different kind is to be found in the chapter dealing with speech act theory and the evolution of "functional" syllabus (Chapter 3). [BR 12, 6 -19] Non-eval.

In example 4.15, the U-noun 'example of a gap' is preceded by the determiner 'an' (indefinite article) which serves to signal that the specification for the U-noun is being introduced for the first time in the context of utterance and that such specification follows the U-noun.

Another common type of determiner preceding U-nouns in plural form in BRs is the numeral which predicts the realization of two or more discourse acts. Its referential meaning makes explicit the enumeration anticipated by the writer and its specific clauses may be signalled or not by cardinal or ordinal numerals. E.g.,

Example 4.16

(22) In addition to the content of the volume, **two other characteristics** make this book a model for edited volumes. (23) **The first characteristic** is that none of the chapters can be considered weak. (24) Each provides a unique and important contribution to the overall issue of language processing in bilingual children. (25) **The second characteristic** is that the papers contained in this volume come together to provide a relatively

unified picture of language processing in bilingual children. [BR 42, 3-22/25] Eval.

Example 4.17

(2) The operations in question can be said to fall into **two broad categories**, **those** that account for interpropositional coherence, **and those** that account for intrapropositional coherence. [BR 5, 1- 2] Non-eval.

Example 4.18

(9) *The Open Door* is divided into **seven chapters.** (10) **Chapter 1** gives a clear coherent introduction to the project, stating its objectives, ...(11) **Chapter 2** offers definitions of bilingualism and bilingual education. (12)...../// (15) **Chapter 3,** ...provides detailed information about the societal context for the project..../// [BR 13, 3 - 9/28] Non-eval.

In the examples above the U-nouns 'characteristics', 'categories' and 'chapters' are metadiscursive items and in this case enumerable nouns because the items are premodified by the numeral 'two' and 'seven', predicting the realization of two characteristics of the book (4.16), two categories of operations (4.17) and the characterization of seven chapters of the book (4.18). Their predictions are confirmed by the use of 'the first characteristic', 'the second characteristic' (4.16), 'those' (4.17) and Chapter 1; 2; 3; 4; 5; 6 and the word 'concluding' signalling Chapter 7 in example 4.18.

Although enumeration is a potential characteristic of U-nouns, not all U-nouns can be considered enumerable nouns. For instance, nouns like

'information', 'knowledge', 'disappointment' which are used in the corpus as single head nouns premodified by 'this', or 'such' are not enumerables because they are not capable of being premodified by a numeral and as a consequence they can not predict the realization of two or more discourse items, unless they occur in double-head nouns, in which case they are complements of 'types', 'pieces', 'classes', 'categories', 'aspects', as in 'two pieces of information', 'two different types of knowledge'.

The examples discussed in this section demonstrate that the role of determiners is to help the reader to find where the specific meaning of the U-noun is located in the text, whether backwards or forwards. Figure 4.4 below summarizes the most common determiners preceding U-nouns in the BRs analysed.

DIRECTION OF INFORMATION	DETERMINERS
BACKWARDS	the, this, these, such
FORWARDS	a,an, other, another, numeral (one,two,etc), quantifiers (some, many, several, few,etc), possessive (his, her, Koike's claim)

Figure 4.4. Determiners appearing before U-nouns in the corpus

In some instances (twelve occurrences in the whole data, 1.6%), the U-noun is not premodified by a determiner nor a qualifier, but it needs lexicalization in order to make sense in the text. In such cases, the specifics is provided in the sentence that follows the U-noun. E.g.

Example 4. 19

(34) Even to those like myself who largely accept a systemic-functional view of grammar, **this method of presentation** poses **problems**. (35) For example, I have always followed Sinclair (1972) in distinguishing *complement* and *object* in the analyses of clauses. (36) Halliday, on the other hand, has never made **such a distinction**. [BR 2, 10 - 34/36]

In this example, 'this method of presentation' and 'such a distinction' are premodified by determiners which refer to their specifics backwards. Despite the fact that the U-noun 'problems' is not premodified by any determiner, it points forwards to its specifics clause, i.e., sentences 35 and 36.

U-nouns may also be accompanied by one or more modifiers, which have an attributive and qualifying function. According to Francis (1994:95), modifiers may have ideational, interpersonal and textual meaning[3]. Modifiers can restrict the range of reference of U-nouns. Francis (1986) states that modifiers can add meaning to the head noun 'by classifiying it or defining it, making its participant role more explicit' (p.95). These have an ideational function such as in the example below and represent in the corpus 11.8% of occurrences among the modified U-nouns[4]. Here is an illustration:

Example 4.20

(15) Introspection is often thought of as a type of qualitative research, but as Grotjahn convincingly argues, this need not be so; it can be used in both qualitative, exploratory research and in quantitative hypothesis-testing research.

(16) This **theoretical framework** is stated explicitly in the opening articles of the book. (17) They constitute the most substantial...// [BR 51, 3-4, 15/17] Non-eval.

In this example, 'theoretical' has ideational meaning in the sense that it adds information about the U-noun 'framework' by classifying it as theoretical. The combination of the determiner plus modifier with the U-noun indicates that the information is recoverable from the preceding paragraph where the 'theoretical framework' is described as related to 'qualitative, exploratory research' and 'quantitative hypothesis-testing research'.

The same applies to the modifier 'philosophical' in the example below: it adds information to the head noun 'orientation' by classifying it.

Example 4.21

(7) The task which the authors set themselves is to show us what we as language teachers have to gain from adopting a broad view of the language learning process. (8) Their **philosophical orientation** is towards an experiential view of learning in which the learner "learns by doing." [BR 70, 3 - 7/8] Eval.

Some modifiers seem to add little meaning to the U-noun, but they are still regarded as ideational modifiers. Some instances of these modifiers in the data are: *basic, central, explicit, essential, fundamental, general, implicit.* For instance;

Example 4.22

(21) Chapter 2, Intelligence as Semiosis, proposes a semiotic, or representational system which integrates linguistic, kinesic (gestural), and sensory motor systems. (22) Intelligence and language have primary roles in this system. (23) Intelligence is posited as the capacity for semiosis, and language is the only component having enough independence and abstraction to permit the development of a semiotic capacity.

(24) The **central theme** of the semiotic hypothesis is that facts from our world of experiences are pragmatically mapped by intelligence onto representations manifested as texts. (25) An information processing approach involving sensory short- and long-term memories is also suggested to account for pragmatic mapping. [BR 77, 8-9, 21/25]

In the example above, the modifier 'central' does not appear to add much information to the head noun 'theme'. Here the modifier and noun are predictable collocates, where the function of the modifier is to add emphasis to 'theme' by focusing on the way we understand the word.

U-nouns can also be modified by adjectives which encode interpersonal meaning (seventy one instances, 8.8% of occurrences). They usually play an evaluative role. They introduce the writer's comment or attitude towards a preceding stretch of text or they are part of the given information. They signal a form of personal involvement on the part of the writer when commenting and evaluating the content of the book to the reader. The modifier may carry part or all of the attitudinal meaning which the writer wishes to convey. The following examples make this clear:

Example 4.23

(23) Moreover, when the book moves beyond general methodology and into the specific field of SLR, the advice given is not equally sound in all cases. (24) **A very disturbing problem** indeed is the repeated emphasis on the complexity of the field of SLR (for example, on pp. 22, 131 and 223), which may easily be misread as an encouragement to study unmanageably large numbers of variables at the same time... [BR 61, 10 - 23/24] Eval.

Example 4.24

(16) While pointing out the shortcomings of quasi-experimental reasearch and statistical research, van Lier says the issue is not which is better, but the need for "an open-mindedness about different ways for arriving at understanding, without assumptions of differential scientific value" (p. 12). (17) This is **an important point** and, if heeded by classroom researchers, would substantially advance our knowledge of how we learn and teach second languages. [BR 18, 6 - 16/17] Eval.

In the two examples above 'important' and 'disturbing' are evaluative modifiers and express the writer's assessment of the head nouns 'problem', which is attitudinally strong, and 'point', which is attitudinally neutral. In the first example, the adjective which is also postmodified by 'indeed' spells out a negative assessment while in the second, the adjective 'important' signals a positive evaluation of the content discussed in the book under review. Another point to be stressed is that the modifier 'important' and 'disturbing' have prospective meaning: they carry the discourse forward.

Francis (1994) notes that the textual modifiers are important in that they contribute to the organization of discourse; 'they help to order

messages' and 'signal the relationships between parts of the text' (p.98). Textual modifiers include post-deictics like 'another', 'other', 'further', 'similar', 'different', and numeratives like 'second' and 'third'. The modifier 'another' is the most common in the data, introducing new information in the text. Consider this example,

Example 4.24

(9) Tarone focuses on strategic competence and..../// (10) She continues with valuable suggestions for improving tasks intended to develop strategic competence, including more narrowly specifying intended meaning so judgements of success can be easily made. (11) **Another suggestion** which should be (but sadly is not) common sense in language teaching is that communicative tasks should include a listener who does not already know the information being conveyed and who has a real need to acquire it. [BR 15, 3 - 9/11] Non-eval.

In this example 'suggestion' is presented as a label which encapsulates Tarone's 'valuable suggestions for improving tasks intended to develop strategic competence' on the preceding sentence. Being premodified by 'another', the U-noun refers forward to a new suggestion of the same sort. The head noun alone is retrospective, but the nominal group is predictive. All instances of 'another' plus head noun occurring in the corpus have their lexical realization pointing forwards and occurring within the same sentence in which the U-noun is inserted. In this particular instance, the specification is provided by the clause pattern SPC, where S is the subject 'another suggestion', P is the verb 'be' and C is the that-clause starting with 'that communicative tasks should include...' The subject is postmodified by a relative clause that evaluates the U-noun 'suggestion'.

Another typical case of textual modification in the data is the occurrence of U-nouns preceded by a numerative, as discussed previously in relation to the notion of 'enumeration' signalling to the reader the quantity and sequence of information to be looked for in the text. Here is another example:

Example 4.25

(22)The approach interacts with other current in at least **two interesting ways.** (23)Firstly and most obviously, it is incompatible with an acquisition/learning distinction such as has been posited by Krashen (1981); this is discussed in Chapter 2 (pp. 21-30). (24)Secondly and more interestingly, Rutherford argues that his position redefines the relationship between language learning and language skills. [BR 72, 7 - 22/24] Eval.

In some instances U-nouns can be premodified by more than one item, each single item separately carrying textual, ideational and interpersonal meanings. The example below illustrates that the textual modifier 'another' prospects that the writer will report on another study mentioned in the new book. The modifiers 'noteworthy' and 'empirical' are, in this context, interpersonal and ideational respectively since they introduce a positive comment on the head noun and highlight the head noun 'study' by classifying it.

Example 4.26

(10) Flashner's definitions of tense and aspect are reasonably clear, her use of statistics is straightforward, and her discussion of the discourse functions of learner's verb forms is persuasive. (11) Her study.... // (12)....//

(13) **Another noteworthy empirical study** is Harley's analysis of the writing of English learners of French who inordinately relied on prepositions to express directional notions that native speakers more often signalled through lexical verbs. [BR 26, 3 - 10/13] Eval.

It is worth noting that of these different types of modifiers, BRs are rich in textual ones (79.3%), usually in initial position in the clause. These modifiers are used before the head noun alone, e.g., 'this way', 'another suggestion', 'such a claim', or before a qualifying word e.g., 'two interesting ways', 'their philosophical orientation', 'this selective emphasis', 'the major point'. These modifiers are very significant because by signalling transitions between sections in the texts they organize and sequence the arguments in the BRs indicating to the reader where to locate information in the text, whether prospectively or retrospectively (as will be further developed in Chapter 5).

So far I have been concerned with the way U-nouns are modified and how this modification contributes to the meaning of U-nouns. The next section attempts to categorize U-nouns.

4.6.- A Tentative Categorization of Unspecific Nouns in Book Reviews

4.6.1- Introduction

As there are many kinds of U-nouns expressing different meanings, I shall attempt to group them into semantic categories according to the meanings they convey in the contexts in which they are inserted. The typology I develop in this work is grounded partly on Austin and Searle' (1976) study

on speech acts[5], and partly on Francis's (1986, 1994) study of anaphoric nouns in argumentative texts, whose work is based on semantic criteria. In later work, Francis (1994) used the term 'labels' for this sort of noun taking into account their prospective and retrospective functions. Francis grouped her 'anaphoric nouns' into five classes, namely, 'illocutionary nouns', 'mental process nouns', 'text nouns', 'language activity nouns' and 'ownerless nouns'.

Besides drawing on Francis' work, one of the categories I have adopted is based on the work of Gil (1991) who classified 'enumerables' as one type of unspecific plural noun into two broad groups: 'system nouns' and 'technical nouns' and divided these into several subcategories. Tadros (1985), who categorizes 'prediction' in written text into six categories also has influenced my classification of U-nouns. So my classification comprises six categories of U-nouns whose labels are: **illocutionary nouns, mental process nouns, text nouns, sub-technical nouns, relational nouns** and **evaluative nouns**[6]. It should be stressed that what distinguishes this work from Francis' is that her analyses does not encompass instances of labels and their specifics occurring within the same sentence boundary (intrasentential) while the present work deals with both intra and intersentential instances of U-nouns.

Intrasentential instances of U-nouns are being taken into account in this work due to the great number of occurrences of U-nouns and their

meanings within the same sentence boundary. In addition, such occurrences have not been explored in the studies already conducted on U-nouns as mentioned in this study.

The reason for categorizing U-nouns in this work is to show the readers that in a piece of discourse words may exist which share the same family resemblance, i.e., a group of nouns may share semantic features which will allow them to be grouped into a category or class, although as Francis (1986:9) claims 'semantic features which form the basis for identifying a class may not be shared by all the members of that class, and some members may also share certain features which are typical of other classes.' This leads us to expect that the boundaries between some of the semantic divisions to be presented in the next section are fuzzy. Nevertheless, for each category there is a unifying concept which allows the items to be put in the same group. Another reason for categorizing U-nouns is to offer a picture of the different types of U-nouns occurring in BRs and how they relate to the moves and strategies outlined in Chapter 3 (which will further developed in Chapter 5).

Given that BRs have an evaluative expository nature, a lot of attitudinal language is expected to be found in these texts. So U-nouns and their specifics may occur in two groups of propositions **evaluative** and **non-evaluative**[7] . By **non-evaluative propositions** I mean those which contain an unspecific item which does not signal any explicit assessment by the writer and is not attached to any premodifier or commenting adjective.

Evaluative propositions contain a noun or adjective that signals the writer's assessment or interpretation of parts of the book or the whole book. However, as pointed out earlier, any category of U-noun may be evaluative or non-evaluative depending on the context into which the noun is inserted. For ease of reference, the examples of U-nouns will continued to be typed in bold face. The source of each example will be indicated between brackets.

4.6.2.- The Classification of U-nouns

The first category of U-nouns is labelled **illocutionary nouns,** following Francis (1986, 1994). This label is taken from 'speech act theory' coined by the linguistic philosopher Austin (1962) and developed by another philosopher Searle (1976) who maintained that, 'when using language, we not only make propositional statements about objects, entities, states of affairs and so on, but also fulfil functions such as 'requesting', 'apologizing', 'denying', 'warning', 'promising'. In uttering any sentence, a speaker could be seen to have performed some act which is labelled 'illocutionary act', and which is associated with functions we express in the language. Thus **illocutionary nouns** in Francis' (1994:190) terms are 'nominalizations of verbal processes'; 'they usually express acts of communication'. They typically have cognate illocutionary verbs. They do not necessarily refer to the original illocutionary force of speech acts (the functional intention of the author in the utterance) but rather 'they reflect the way in which the writer chooses to interpret that force' (p.90). These nouns, in addition to expressing acts of communication, label the writer's strategies for organizing

his or her propositions in the text. This means that the writer's selection of an illocutionary noun may indicate to the reader what his/her intention is, what function is being expressed, 'what line of thought is being developed in a particular portion of the text' (Francis,1986:12). The following illocutionary nouns were found in the data:

allegation, argument, assertion, claim, classification, contribution, complaint, conclusion, criticism, description, discussion, distinction, emphasis, explanation, information, justification, omission, observation, point, postulation, proposition, proposal, plea, suggestion, statement, treatment.

Here are some examples in context:

Example 4.27

(26) Pinker's second, and more questionable, mechanism is a device which (among other things) distinguishes between forms which the child has actually heard in the input and forms which the child has postulated on the basis of some rule. (27) In the case where the child has postulated a form on the basis of a rule, this form is tagged with a ?, which means that it is a tentative entry and has to be checked against input. (28) If the input confirms the postulation, it is accepted into the grammar, and the ? is dropped. (29) This idea seems to contradict Pinker's (1982) **claim** that language acquisition cannot be a form of hypothesis testing. [BR 6, 6 - 26/29] Eval.

Example 4.28

(27) For reading, Nation claims that a knowledge of 3.000 headwords is needed in order to read unsimplified texts. (28) **His proposal** is to learn vocabulary both by direct study and by reading. [BR 69, 8- 27/28] Non-eval.

The two examples above illustrate the use of illocutionary nouns *'claim'* and *'proposal'* (cataphoric use) as labelling the reviewer's line of thought in a particular portion of text. The illocutionary acts of 'claiming' and 'proposing' nominalized by the U-nouns 'claim' and 'proposal' in the examples above reflect the way the reviewer chooses to interpret the illocutionary force. These nouns are instances of verbal behaviour, which in Searle's (1976) taxonomy correspond to 'representative' acts. These U-nouns can be seen as results or paraphrases of acts performed by the reviewer in saying something, the act being identified by the explicit performative.

Within this category, a group of nouns are associated with verbal activity or verbal communication although they do not have cognate illocutionary verbs; instead they may have cognate verbs. For the purpose of analysis, the difference between 'cognate illocutionary verbs' and 'cognate verbs' is that the former refer semantically to illocutionary acts and can be used performatively (e.g., classification, definition) whereas the latter mean that the U-noun is derived from a cognate verb, but that this verb may not refer to an illocutionary act; instead the U-noun may express verbal communication (e.g., discussion, example, exposition). The following nouns were found in the data.

allusion, (cases of) alternation, controversy, discrepancy, dichotomy, discussion, distinction, example, exposition, formula, implication, message, procedure, philosophy, result, reference, strategy, subtheme, tendency, (line of) reasoning, theme, way (of viewing).

The next examples illustrate the use of 'message' as an instance of language communication. In this example, the U-noun is used in subject position in the clause in which they occur and in non-evaluative propositions.

Example 4.29

(5) **The central message** of the book is that language learning is an educational endeavor and that educational principles and values lie at the heart of what makes language classrooms work. (6) It therefore sets itself apart from those works in which **the** (usually **implicit**) **message** is that learning a language is so different from learning anything else, that the language educators have little to learn from the educational mainstream. [BR 70, 2 - 5/6] Non-eval.

The second category of U-nouns is labelled **mental process nouns** which 'refer to the results of cognitive states and processes' (Francis, ibid:92). Francis states that 'when such nouns are used as head nouns, their referents have been expressed verbally, but such expression is not a necessary part of their meaning' (p.92). Although not all of them have cognate verbs, they are said to be 'nominalizations of mental process verbs of the type that are used to project ideas' (think/believe). Some are 'purely cognitive nouns' like *idea, assumption, belief, reason,* etc. Others can 'refer

either to the cognitive result or to the process', e.g. *research.* Others may 'describe or interpret the human processing of thoughts and experiences' like *investigation* and *finding.* Some of the U-nouns I have found in my data also refer to organized bodies of ideas as a result of the process of describing and interpreting a particular formulated theory e.g., *theory, method, approach, perspective.* Included in this group are:

approach, assumption, attempt, belief, comprehensiveness, domain, evidence, finding, hypothesis, idea, impression, insight, investigation, knowledge, method, notion, perspective, position, principle, process, research, reason, study, theory, thesis, view, viewpoint, vision.

In examples 4.30 and 4.31 below, the U-nouns *'assumption'* and *'view'* which are pure instances of mental process nouns are used in evaluative and non-evaluative propositions respectively and both refer to aspects of cognitive states arrived at as a result of processing of 'assuming' and 'viewing'.

Example 4.30

(12) In particular, we might ultimately require "the computer to be able to interact with the learner in a way that simulates natural language use" (p.12). (13) This **assumption** fails to do justice to the many uses of "Artificial Intelligence" that constitute some of the best of the "State of the Art" in CALL (Higgins, 1986). [BR 79, 4-12/13] Eval.

Example 4.31

(7) The book promotes the **view** that the social and cultural contexts in which English is learned and used determine many aspects of the

communication process and should therefore play a critical role in curriculum and materials development. [BR 35, 2- 7] Non-eval.

The third category of U-nouns is labelled **Text nouns.** These refer to 'the formal textual structure of discourse' (Francis, ibid:93). Such nouns, in general, label stretches of discourses. Included in this group are:

article, chapter, footnote, paper, part, passage, question (orthographically signalled), section, term, volume, word.

Text nouns have two main functions in BRs: (1) that of referring to the structure of the text linking the label like 'part', 'article', 'chapter' to its specific content and (2) that of integrating the already given information to the new information being introduced by the reviewer in the text. Most text nouns are used in evaluative propositions like examples 4.32, and 4.33, in which the reviewer employs the U-noun to evaluate the preceding or subsequent clauses/information.

Example 4.32

(21)There are chapters on design and use of a syllabus and on materials evaluation, both built around useful checklists. (22) There are also chapters on materials design and on methodology, which showcase the author's well-known talent for creating innovative teaching materials. //...../// (24) For readers unfamiliar with Hutchinson and Water's work, these **chapters** should be a special treat. [BR 14, 6 - 21/ 24] Eval.

Example 4.33

(53) There is, in fact, only one article that considers L2 acquisition. (54) Gilette gives the results of an introspective study of two successful language learners. (55) This **article** is more of a research report than a discussion of methodological procedures, however. [BR 51, 7 - 53/55] Eval.

The fourth category of U-nouns is labelled **Sub-technical nouns.** These are items that, 'if not metadiscursive, are highly discursive in that their interpretation always depends on immediate context'. (Francis, 1986:17). For Francis, these nouns 'are not associated with a particular writer or source'. They are labels for the language that has developed in the text itself created by the reviewer in the course of presenting his/her own propositions. For example, *aspect, feature, problem, fact, factor,* etc demand the existence in the text of things that can be regarded as aspect, feature, problem, fact, factor. The reviewer can not say 'her issue', 'her fact', because these items are not made by any specific person or group of people (Francis, ibid.:17). The following head nouns are found in the data:

activity, aspect, area, case, category, characteristic, component, fact, factor, feature, form, group, issue, item, matter, piece, problem, question, role, stage, source, system, topic, truth.

The next examples illustrate the use of *'issue'* and *'problem'* in non-evaluative propositions and show that such items are metadiscursive markers since their referents are to be found in the immediate discourse context. Both U-nouns are used as subject of the clause in which they

appear and their lexical realization is expressed in noun predicative clauses introduced by the verb to be.

Example 4.34

(16) The major **issue** is that of the adaptation of the guidelines to the assessment of proficiency in languages for which the generic guidelines may not be totally appropriate. [BR 29, 4 - 16] Non-eval.

Example 4.35

(4) D. Osherson, M. Stob and S. Weinstein, in "Learning Theory and Natural Language", discuss Formal Learning theory and its contribution to a theory of comparative grammar. (5) A potential **problem** they explore is determining whether a given collection of languages is `natural' (i.e. accessible to all children). [BR 25, 3 - 4/5] Non-Eval.

The fifth category of U-nouns fits Gil's (1991) **Relational Noun Category.** These nouns lexicalize language relations such as purpose, reason, and time. The data include the following relational nouns:

aim, concern, goal, job, objective, purpose.

They are used in BRs to indicate the purpose of the book being appreciated. Such nouns can also be categorized as mental process nouns since they also refer to cognitive states or processes. It must be said that most of the occurrences of U-nouns in this group in the data are in non-evaluative propositions. Usually, they occur in subject position in the clause and are

realized by SPC clauses pattern (predicative) occurring in the same sentence in which they are inserted as illustrated by the examples below.

Example 4.36

(1) Auer's book focuses on the interpretation of the meaning of the use of German and Italian by 20 Italians migrant children in Germany. (2) The explicit **aim** of the book is to develop a model for the analysis of bilingual conversation in general and not to analyse the linguistic situation of Italian migrant children in Germany" (p.91). [BR 4, 1 - 1/2] Non-eval.

Example 4.37

(3) **The purpose** of the book as defined by the authors is the following: to introduce the process of carrying out research in second language acquisition and bilingualism. (BR 61, 1 - 3] Non-eval.

In example 4.36, the U-noun 'aim' appears in a SPC clause pattern, where S is 'the explicit aim', P is the verb 'be' and C is the infinitive clause 'to develop a model for ....'. In example 4.37, the U-noun 'purpose' is again the subject of the sentence, P is the verb 'be' and C is the infinitive clause "to introduce.....bilingualism', which makes explicit the purpose of the book.

The sixth category is that of **Evaluative nouns.** I define these nouns as items which make explicit the writer's evaluation of the discourse itself, having an interpersonal meaning. Such nouns signal by themselves the writer's evaluation of the propositions which they encapsulate. They can be modified by an adjective which gives weight to the U-noun. According to

Francis (1986:49), these nouns are '**attitudinally strong**', i.e., nouns which by virtue of their conceptual meaning 'indicate positive or negative evaluation of the propositions they label'. They are inherently evaluative and may signal the writer's attitude, opinion or view towards the new book. Included in this group are:

anathema, benefit, cavil, caveat, criticism, difficulty, disappointment, disservice, drawback, lacuna, merit, nugget, problem, quibble, slant, strength, thrust, weakness, worry.

In examples 4.38 and 4.39, 'disappointment' and 'problem' are instances of attitudinally strong U-nouns, which are emphasized by the modifiers 'greatest' and 'disturbing'.

Example 4.38

(19) The greatest **disappointment** is the way the book leads the reader away from instructional settings and from a hypothesis-testing stance. [BR 33, 6-19] Eval.

Example 4.39

(23) Moreover, when the book moves beyond general methodology and into the specific field of SLR, the advice given is not equally sound in all cases. (24) A very disturbing **problem** indeed is the repeated emphasis on the complexity of the field of SLR (for example, on pp. 22, 131 and 223), which may easily be misread as an encouragement to study unmanageably large numbers of variables at the same time - a most persistent and widespread methodological misconception in SLR circles. [BR 61, 11-23/24] Eval.

Considering evaluation as an striking feature in the organization of BRs, as already discussed in Chapter 3, non-evaluative nouns like 'area', 'point', 'insight', 'source', 'spot', 'way', which belong to other categories already discussed in this section, may be used to express evaluation of the book or content of the book when used in context and modified by qualifiers. Depending on the qualifier which precedes such nouns, these may take a positive or negative meaning. E.g.,

Example 4.40

(22) The writing style of the book might be faulted due to the sometimes long and complex sentences, the overuse of British idioms that might put off a few readers who do not live on the 'emerald isle', and the occasional infelicities of the copy editor. (23) But these are **minor points** in light of the comprehensive and thoughtful research synthesis which Singleton has presented to the language community at large. [BR 75, 7- 22/23] Eval.

In example 4.40, the U-noun 'points' which belongs to illocutionary noun category takes a positive meaning towards the author due to the preceding modifier in the text devaluing the significance of the criticisms just made about the book.

Most of the occurrences of such nouns in the data illustrate their use in subject position in the clause in which they are inserted and their lexical uniqueness are realized through SPC clauses (predicative).

As pointed out earlier in this chapter, there is some overlap between categories. Some U-nouns may belong to more than one category and it is

very difficult to set the boundaries between them. Thus any noun belonging to any category may belong to the 'evaluative category' in that it may be preceded by a qualifying word which indicates whether the evaluation is positive or negative. Notwithstanding, the basic distinction set up here remains useful for the purpose of this work, which is to investigate what types of U-nouns occur in BRs and how they relate, as a group of items sharing family resemblance, to their lexical realization and to the genre of BRs.

The next section will attempt to categorize the specifics for U-nouns and relate them to the categories of U-nouns described above.

4.7. - The Categorization of the Specifics of U-nouns

As U-nouns require lexical realisation or lexical uniqueness in order to have their meaning completed and due to the lack of research concerning this topic, it is my intention to look at different types of lexical realization and try to group them into semantic categories. To achieve such a goal, I have examined the nature of the information which precedes or follows U-nouns in order to identify a semantic framework for the BRs investigated here. In categorizing the specifics, two of the labels I use in this study are taken from Sutherland's (1985) work on descriptive discourse, namely **content** and **evaluation** and four of them are added by this researcher namely **topic, purpose relation, enumeration,** and **discourse self-reference**[8] , which will be introduced below. One way of understanding the lexical realisation of U-

noun is to see it as an answer to a question. Thus Question-Answer will be adopted in this study as the method of analysis suggested by Winter (1977, 1982, 1992) to elicit information and make explicit the semantic relations between Unspecifics/Specifics. For ease of reference, the U-noun is underlined and its specifics is typed in bold face and appears between brackets in the examples used to illustrate the different categories.

The first category of specifics I have labelled **Topic Specifics**. It identifies the topic, the subject-matter or the informational nature of the U-noun. This kind of specifics is elicited through the question "What is the subject/topic of X?", where X means the head noun in the unspecific clause. Forty eight instances (7.4%) of topic specifics in the BRs I analysed fit into this category. The specifics is realized through clauses of the type SPC where P is a reporting verb (see list of verbs in Chapter 3) and C is a noun clause or through clauses of the type S BE C where S is the noun (subject position) and C is the predication. Consider the examples,

Example 4.41

(15) The third chapter (Thompson, Thompson and Hiple) deals with the application of proficiency guidelines for those languages that have been found to be less commonly taught in the United States. (16) The major issue is **[that of the adaptation of the guidelines to the assessment of proficiency in languages for which the generic guidelines may not be totally appropriate.]** [BR 29, 4 -15/16] Non-eval.

Example 4.42

(26) The basis of the Reading program was a set of texts representative of various academic disciplines and organized in terms of 'rhetorical type,' 'discourse topic', and 'discourse position'. (27) The approach was **[syllabus-based, and assumed that characteristic sequences of communicative events can be identified.]** [BR 52, 5 - 26/27] Non-eval.

These examples clearly illustrate that the meanings of 'issue' and 'approach' are made specific by SPC clause pattern. In example 4.41, the sub-technical U-noun 'issue' is premodified by a qualifier which gives weight to the U-noun plus a determiner and its specifics spell out the topic of the head-noun. If we ask the question 'What kind of issue is the reviewer talking about? The answer is the specific clause 'that of adaptation of the guidelines....appropriate' which makes the U-noun 'issue' lexically unique. In example 4.42, the cognitive mental process noun 'approach' also occurs in subject position, where P is verb to be in the past tense and C is the predicate (its specifics) which spells out the topic of the U-noun completing the meaning of 'approach'. Both examples of specifics occur in non-evaluative propositions and within the same sentence in which the U-nouns are inserted.

One characteristic of this category of specifics is that it is lexically unique for U-nouns like 'issue', 'approach', 'thesis', 'theme', which belong to the categories of sub-technical, illocutionary and mental process nouns respectively. They often appear after verb to be functioning as predicative.

The second category of specifics of U-nouns describes or specifies the intended use, the goal, the aim, the focus, the concern of the book under review. It makes explicit a purpose relation in the text. For this reason, it is labelled **Purpose Relation Specifics** (forty instances, 6.1%). It is elicited through the question 'What's the purpose/aim of X?', where X means 'the book under review' in the data. It is usually realized through a linguistic construction of the type S BE C where S is the U-noun in subject position and C is the infinitive clause complement. All specifications ocurring in this category lexicalize the U-nouns in the relational group, namely 'aim', 'purpose', 'objective', 'concern', 'goal', which are used in non-evaluative propositions. Consider the examples,

Example 4.43

(3) The main concern of the book is [**to describe and deal with what has been referred to as the AEI guidelines- A composite of three sets of guidelines from ACTFL, the Educational Testing Service (ETS) and the Inter-agency Language Roundtable (ILR).**][9] [BR 29, 1-3] Non-eval.

Example 4.44

(1) The aim of this book, which is addressed to translators, interpreters, teachers, students, and others working in the field of languages in contact is [**to 'relate an integrated account of discourse processes to the practical concerns of the translator.**'] [BR 54, 1-1] Non-eval.

It is clear from these examples that what the reviewer does in the specific realizations of these U-nouns is to make explicit the 'concern' and the 'aim' of the new book. In both cases the U-nouns are the subject of the

clause and their specifics the infinitive clauses complementing the verb 'be'. In example 4.44, the lexical realization of the U-noun is interrupted by a relative clause, in which the reviewer points out to whom the book is addressed.

The third category of specifics is labelled **Content Specifics** (three hundred and nine instances representing 47.7%). This specific completes the meaning of 'text U-nouns'. This is an abstract notion of content, as proposed by Sutherland (1985): the writer describes what a given book contains and reports on its organization. Such information is elicited through the question 'What does X contain?' or 'How is X organized?'. The X here stands for 'the book', 'the text', 'the volume', etc. The answer provides the specifics for the U-noun and it is generally signalled through subsequent clauses which complete the meaning of 'section', 'part', 'chapter', etc. Such clauses as in examples 4.45 and 4.46 below are independent clauses of the type SPC where P is a reporting verb of the type 'be', 'provide', 'follow up', 'consist' and may be used in non-evaluative and evaluative propositions making clear the meaning of 'section' and 'parts'. As the U-nouns in the examples are premodified by a numeral 'three' and 'two', they predict the realization of multiple specifics:

Example 4.45

(1) Interactive Language Teaching consists of fifteen articles grouped into three major sections. (2) **[In the first part, Rivers and Kramsch provide a general theory and description of interactive language teaching.** (3)

The second and third sections follow up with practical classroom applications.] [BR 11, 1 -1/3] Non-eval.

Example 4.46

(5) The book is divided into two principal parts. (6) [**Part I, covering chapters 1 and 2, consists of a truly excellent review of the literature on the role of age in language acquisition in general and ...//** (7) **Part II, chapters 3-5, is a detailed report of the author's own empirical study (her doctoral research) of the relative performance in French of three groups of....//**] [BR 9, 2 - 5/7] Eval.

The fourth category of specifics is labelled **Discourse Self-Reference Specifics** (one hundred and fourteen instances, 17.6% in the corpus): it provides specification for U-nouns such as 'example', 'illustration', 'distinction', 'classification', 'suggestion', 'information', 'characterization', which belong to the categories of sub-technical, illocutionary and mental process nouns. If the U-noun is 'classification', there is an implicit commitment on the part of the reviewer to classify things or has already done it in the text. In order to elicit the information i.e., the specifics, the reader may ask 'What X is the writer talking about?', where X means the U-noun under focus (example, evidence, illustration, definition, etc.). Such specifics provide the act named by the U-noun. In most of the cases, the specifics are realized through SPC clauses as in the example below whose U-noun 'example', which belongs to the category of illocutionary nouns demands the specification of an example of 'a strategy of grammatical acquisition' in Koike's theory.

Example 4.47

(13) In Koike's claims regarding "six simple strategies" that exist based on speech act theory, he finds that "his children used expressives very often and representatives and directives uncommonly" (p.55). (14) The semantics are analysed using case grammar and communicative strategies. (15) An example of a strategy of grammatical acquisition is **[imitation of formulaic expressions "using association and intuition" (p. 101).]** [BR 1, 5-13/15] Non-eval.

Example 4.48

(17) In the end, Davis capitulates: "To be a native speaker means not being a nonnative speaker. (18) Even if I cannot define a native speaker **[I can define a nonnative speaker as someone who is not regarded by him/herself or by native speakers as a native speaker" (p. 167).]** (19) As exasperating and circular as this characterization may be, it underscores the knottiness of the problem. [BR 46, 4 - 17/19] Eval.

In example 4.48, the specifics for the illocutionary U-noun 'characterization' are the clauses which define the nonnative speaker previously to the occurrence of the U-nouns and which is expressed through a relative clause.

The fifth category is labelled **Evaluative Specifics** (sixty six instances representing 10.2% of the corpus): this type of specifics completes the meaning not only of evaluative nouns but also of nouns belonging to other categories. Such specifics express the reviewer's assessment, opinion, or present her/his personal comment on the book or parts of it. The wh-question which elicits the specific is 'What is the reviewer's opinion/view of X?' where X means 'the book under review'. Such

specifics is often realized through the SPC clause pattern. Generally, the U-noun is premodified by a qualifying word which gives it further weight. Consider the following examples,

Example 4.49

(10) I also found that the results obtained by the investigation of SLP in relation to Portuguese students' family background variables, the learners patterns of language use, and their language attitudes uninformative, perhaps because, as Bourhis indicated in his discussion paper, there was a lack of clear theoretical framework. (11) A more general lacuna in the whole project was **[the failure to live up to its title - there being no real investigation of how SLP develops, as only one small study had a longitudinal element.]**[10] [BR 32, 3- 10/11] Eval.

Example 4.50

(26) One of the greatest strengths of this book lies in **[the many excellent practice exercises and research suggestions that appear in every chapter.** (27) **They provide a good balance among introspection techniques, original data collection, and examination of published research.]** [BR 43, 5 - 26/27] Eval.

These examples show that, through the specifics, the reviewer expresses his/her evaluation of certain aspects of the book emphasizing the importance of such topics or associated drawbacks. In both examples, the U-nouns are inherently evaluative and they signal whether the reviewer's specific evaluation will be positive or negative. In example 4.49, the U-noun 'lacuna' is a negative word and its specifics provide a negative assessment signalled by the items 'failure' and 'no real investigation' while in example

4.50, 'strengths' is a positive word predicting to the reader what to expect in the clauses realizing the specifics of this U-noun.

In addition to the categories of specifics, as already seen before, a potential characteristic of most of U-nouns is 'enumeration'. As most of them may be premodified by a numeral, the U-noun predicts that their referents are always the specification of the U-noun in the subsequent clauses fulfilling the enumeration anticipated by the writer (Tadros 1985). We can label this kind of specifics as **Enumeration Specifics** (seventy instances, 10.8% of the corpus). It can be said that enumeration specifics may lexicalize any of the categories of U-nouns. For instance,

Example 4.51

(1) This book sets itself two targets: **[(1) to establish a connection between work in cognitive psychology and in second language acquisition (SLA) research and to explore possible outcomes of such a synthesis for foreign language (FL) teaching and (2) to re-establish learning in SL/TL teaching circles, where acquisition has tended of late to usurp pride of place and "deliberate cognitive processing" has been under-emphasized.]** [BR 74, 1 - 1] Non-eval.

In the example above the U-noun 'targets', which belong to the category of relational nouns, appears in plural form and is preceded by numeral 'two' indicating to the reader what sort of specifics and how many discoursal elements to look for in the text. In some cases the specific clauses are signalled by numerals or small letters in parenthesis or by enumeratives like 'first', 'second', 'third' etc. In other instances there is no

signal indicating quantity and sequence of information (see ex. 4.45 and 4.46).

One important point of the analysis is the way U-nouns relate to the different categories of specifics. The analysis of the eighty BRs has shown that some of the U-noun categories may predict their specifics will be realized by means of a clause or sentences which describe or express information that is inherently related to the label/meaning of the U-noun. The specifics provide information which is expected by the reader to complete the meaning of the U-noun. The unspecific categories which illustrate this point are **relational U-nouns** (aim, purpose, concern, target), **evaluative U-nouns** (disappointment, lacuna, weakness) and U-nouns preceded by a numeral indicating **enumeration** (e.g., two characteristics). Such categories anticipate for the reader that the specific clauses which complete its meaning is the specification of a purpose, the writer's evaluation of the U-noun and the fulfilment of an enumeration respectively. The point I wish to make here is that the relation between unspecific/specific proves to be straightforward for some of the U-noun categories whose U-nouns are used with a specific function in a portion of the BRs. This means that if the reviewer desires to express an enumeration, for instance, s/he uses a U-noun in plural form preceded by a numeral and then fulfils the enumeration through two or more specific sentences (see ex. 4.51)

The category of **Discourse Self-reference Specifics** (one hundred and fourteen instances, 17.6%) lexicalizes the meaning of some illocutionary nouns like 'classification', 'definition', 'illustration', 'distinction', etc, and mental process nouns like 'investigation', 'finding', 'view', etc. These nouns in Tadros' (1985, 1994:73) study on prediction correspond to the advance labels by means of which 'the writer labels and thereby commits himself to perform a discourse act'. Thus, if the reviewer employs the U-noun 'classification; and 'conclusion' as in example 4.52 and 4.53 below the reader expects the reviewer to provide the 'classification' and 'conclusion' in the text.

Example 4.52

(12) Much of this book is very useful. (13) One weakness, however, is the author's use of several apparently arbitrary classifications: [**Behaviourism is excluded from the chapter on naturalistic learning, although behavoiurism is a model for natural learning; in chapter 3, studies of learner language are categorized as "error analysis", "performance analysis", and "form-function analysis", although all are really a type of performance analysis;**..../*/*] [BR 33, 4 - 12/13] Non-eval.

Example 4.53

(21) The volume concludes with two chapters dealing with semantic relations holding within propositions, that is, between the semantic predicate of a proposition and its arguments. (22) The first provides a classificatory system, exemplifying it with its encodings in English. (23) The second turns to possibilities of predicate modification and amplification, such as tense, negation, aspect, and mode, again as available in English. (24) Though at times tedious and clearly not imbued with the same methodological weight as the earlier chapters, the topic is of great importance because it indicates how the encoding of one proposition is

linked to the encoding of other propositions. (25) Again, the conclusion is **[that coherence in discourse cannot be handled adequately with a continued division into sentence grammar and text grammar.]** [BR 5, 6 - 21/25] Non-eval.

What the examples above show is that the specifics for the illocutionary U-nouns 'classification' and 'conclusion' are descriptions or realizations of what the U-nouns under focus imply, i.e., to provide in example 4.51 the arbitrary classifications of theories of second language learning made by the author in the book and in example 4.52 to express the conclusion about coherence and semantic relations in discourse.

Due to the fact that a BR is a critical expository text, evaluation occurs in most of the lexical realizations of U-nouns. As the reviewer is aware of his/her role, s/he evaluates the book or parts of it. In the corpus I have found nouns that, although not being qualified or modified, have their specifics occurring in an evaluative proposition. Good instances are the examples below, whose U-nouns belong to the categories of illocutionary and sub-technical nouns but whose specific meanings express the reviewer's evaluation of the content of part of the book.

Example 4.54

(25) In spite of the problematic aspects of the volume, there are sections of potential value for the SLA researcher doing lexical analysis. (26) **[For example, the author notes that "dead metaphors" (e.g. "They tried to sweeten the pill") cause fewer problems for foreign language learners than do idioms (e.g., "You're barking up the wrong tree") (p. 44)].** (27)

This claim would be worth verifying through empirical research, such as that of Irujo (1986). [BR 10, 8 - 25/27] Eval.

Example 4.55

(3) The volume's title reflects the fact [**that language attrition is a common but heretofore little-studied phenomenon: appropriately, many of the contributions speak to the issue of developing a more rigorous research methodology**.] [BR 17, 1 - 2] Eval.

In dealing with the evaluative specifics we might note that in most of the cases such specifics evaluate nouns belonging to the categories of illocutionary, mental, sub-tecnical, text and evaluative nouns. The meaning described in the specific clause is the conceptual and inherent meaning anticipated or encapsulated by the U-noun (see example 4.54). In example 4.54, two U-nouns occur: 'sections' and 'claim'. The first has its specifics introduced by the adjunct 'for example' illustrating the sections of the new book regarded by the reviewer as of potential value. The second instance of U-noun, 'claim', is preceded by 'this' which encapsulates the previous sentences and whose meaning is a positive evaluation of parts of the book. In example 4.55, the U-noun 'phenomenon' is disregarded in the analysis because its specifics are not provided in the text in the form of clause. In the same example, the U-noun 'fact' has its specifics provided by a relative clause in apposition within its own noun phrase structure evaluating the title of the volume.

4.8. - Summary of the chapter

I started this chapter by discussing the functions of U-nouns and by placing them within the clause relational approach. In addition to their cohesive function, i.e., of connecting meanings between clauses, U-nouns were also shown to guide the reader's interpretation of a portion of discourse. They signal to the reader what the structure of the BR is, what part of discourse is encapsulated and what part is anticipated. As signals U-nouns 'lie somewhere on a continuum between open and closed-set items' (Winter,1977:2), that is, they resemble other nouns when they are modified and qualified but 'they also resemble pronouns in that some part of their meaning- the specifics - has to be recovered or inferred from the context in which they are inserted' (Ivanic, 1991:112). Although U-nouns behave like pronouns regarding their referential function, they are regarded more informative signposts than pronouns. The analysis also demonstrates that their lexical realization is an important discourse feature in the binary relation unspecifics/specifics, because it is the lexical realization which provides the sense of the U-nouns.

Due to the fact that U-nouns serve to establish certain semantic functions in the connection of clauses or sentences in the writing of BRs, it was possible to categorize U-nouns in six groups according to the meanings they express in the clauses they are inserted in and according to their relation with adjoining clauses. They are: *illocutionary, mental process, text, sub-technical, relational and evaluative nouns.* The specifics which complete

the meaning of U-nouns were also categorized in six groups, namely, *topic, purpose relation, content, discourse self-reference, evaluative and enumeration specifics*. Such a classification is proposed as an initial attempt to understand the semantic relations between U-nouns and their specific clauses as well as to see how groups of nouns belonging to the same semantic category behave in relation to their specifics and how the specific clauses complete the meaning anticipated by the U-noun.

As shown in the analysis there is no constant one-to-one relation between types of U-nouns and specifics. However, the relation between U-nouns and their specifics reveals, mainly, two things: 1) a group of U-nouns may anticipate, predict or encapsulate the information that will occur in the preceding or subsequent specific clauses; 2) a group of U-nouns may have as their specifics the reviewer's evaluation of the item under focus. Within this perspective, this classification, based on the semantics of U-nouns, offers insight into the meanings established by the U-nouns and their specifics in BRs and into the perception of the relations existing in a portion of text.

The next chapter discusses the organizational function of U-nouns in the writing of BRs.

Notes

[1] The different labels for the same class of words, i.e., nouns are cited in Winter (1992).

[2] SPC means that a single sentence is syntactically composed of a subjet, predicate and complement.

[3] Francis (1994) classifies the modifiers according to Halliday's three macrofunctions of language, which are related to field, tenor and mode.

[4] See Tables C- 4, C-5, C-6 and C-7 in Appendix C for the distribution of modifiers for U-nouns in BRs.

[5] Speech act theory as developed by Austin and Searle (1976) focus on the basic belief that language is used to perform actions, i.e., on how meaning and action are related to language.

[6] See Table C- 3 in Appendix C for the frequency of categories of U-nouns.

[7] Proposition means 'a single statement about some entity or event' (Nunan, 1993). A sentence may contain a single proposition or several propositions.

[6] See Table C-8 in Appendix C for the frequency of Specific Categories for U-nouns.

[9] ACTFL in the example 4.43 stands for the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.

[10] SLP in the example 4.49 is the abbreviation for Second Language Proficiency.

Chapter 5

The Organizational Function of Unspecific Nouns in Book Reviews

5.1.- Introduction

After having grouped U-nouns and their specifics into semantic categories, it is now time to investigate the organizational function of such items in BRs. So I begin this investigation by looking at the relationship between U-nouns and the 'moves' of the genre of BRs described in Chapter 3 (section 5.3). In order to start examining this relationship a sample selected from the corpus will be analysed (section 5.2). Then I shall discuss the relationship between the specific categories and the moves/strategies (section 5.4). Finally, I shall relate the different types of modifiers preceding U-nouns to the moves/strategies realizing BRs (section 5.5).

5.2- U-noun categories and the move-type analysis in a BR sample

As discussed in Chapter 4, based on semantic features, six categories of U-nouns were established, namely, *illocutionary, mental, sub-technical, relational, text,* and *evaluative nouns*. As already pointed out, certain items may belong to more than one category. However, in spite of this fuzziness, the classification of U-nouns into semantic categories may help to describe relations between

categories of unspecifics and their specifics and how these U-nouns relate to the 'moves' and 'strategies' outlined in Chapter 3.

Returning to the move-type analysis for the genre of BRs in Applied Linguistics, three moves are clearly present in their organization - 'Establishing the field', 'Summarizing the content of the book' and 'Providing final assessment of the book'. Each move, which has an obligatory status, may be realized by several strategies (most typical, less typical and iterative ones). I shall now examine a sample to show how U-nouns function as organizational signals and how they relate to this specific genre.

The text which will be analysed is a typical sample of a BR in the field of Applied Linguistics. It will be analysed in terms of moves comprising the main structural elements, namely 1) 'Establishing the field' realized by Strategy 4 - 'Indicating the origin of the book'; 2) 'Summarizing the content of the book', realized by Strategies 7, 8, and 9 - 'Describing the organization of the book', 'Reporting the content of each part of the book' and 'Evaluating parts of the book' respectively, and finally 3) 'Providing final assessment of the book', realized by Strategy 11 - 'Recommending/disqualifying the book' providing a general and positive evaluation of the book, and of its author in the concluding paragraph revealing that the reviewer is positive towards the book.

The structural elements making up the semantic content of the BR below are to some extent signalled by U-nouns which contribute to the linguistic realization of the organizational structure of the BR. U-nouns here signal the change and link of topic of the text; they also signal the encapsulation of the preceding discourse or make reference to a subsequent portion of discourse. Some U-nouns express, as we have already seen, the reviewer's attitude towards the content and organization of the book. In the analysis that follows, the chosen book review was published by **SSLA Journal** (Studies in Second Language Acquisition), Vol. 14, N.2, in 1992, and reviewed by John Swales from the University of Michigan. The sentences are numbered and the U-nouns appearing in the text are in bold type to facilitate reference.

ASPECTS OF LANGUAGE TEACHING. *H. G.* Widdowson. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990. Pp. Xiii + 213. $ 12.95.

(1) *Aspects of Language Teaching* (ALT) stands somewhere between the Widdowsonian traditions of collected papers (e.g., *Explorations in Applied Linguistics 2,*1984) and succinct monographs (e.g., *Learning Purpose and Language Use,* 1983). (2) While ALT's origins may lie in individual presentations, Widdowson has made a considerable effort to shape these products into a coherent whole. (3) **This strategy** is a qualified success. (4) For the most part, Widdowson's argument builds smoothly toward increased complexity without undue repetition, except for an over-iterated stance that structural and communicative approaches need to be seen as complementary rather than competitive. (5) However, the last two chapters (10 and 11) are in fact simpler than the preceding ones and thus seem anticlimactic.

(6) ALT is divided into three **parts.** (7) Part 1 examines the theory and practice of language teaching as a principled activity, framed within the laudable mission of promoting the professional status of language teachers. (8)To realize **this aim,** Widdowson conceives of language teaching as "a kind of operational research which works out solutions to its own local problems" (p. 7). (9) Teachers are thus enjoined to use class experiences to evaluate hypothetical principles and suggestions drawn from SLA, linguistic description, and so forth. (10) While it is clear that encouraging teachers to be informed, self-reflective, and proactive is intrinsically beneficial, it is much less clear how Widdowson expects **such activities** to lead to an improved status for language teaching. (11) Indeed, it is a pity that Widdowson stops short of considering what teachers are supposed to do with their central evaluative role, that is, what activities they might engage in as advocates, mentors, co-authors, and the like.

(12) Readers of SSLA are likely to find **certain elements** in Part 1 somewhat controversial, especially when Widdowson discusses research. (13) Not all, for example, are likely to concur with Widdowson's description of research as a range of activities varying "from armchair theorizing to the detailed accumulation and analysis of data, from metaphysical speculation to psychometric measurement" (p. 43). (14) Nor will everybody agree that "the value of empirical research ultimately depends on the quality of conceptual analysis that defines the objects of enquiry" (p. 25).

(15) In Part 2, Widdowson discusses aspects of language. (16) Chapter 7 is the most impressive of these three chapters and offers a rich discussion of a number of topics (symbolic and indexical meaning, schemata, interaction, contrivance in the classroom) under the rubric of "The Negotiation of Meaning." (17) Part 3 moves the discussion onto teaching aspects. (18) The highlight here- and the book as a whole- is the ninth chapter, which deals with the concept of syllabus, its place, purpose, and role, and its relationship to acquisition, methodology, and task. (19) Many, I believe, will find the ideas in **this chapter** important, interesting, and provocative.

(20) As **the previous comments** intimate, I find ALT a rather uneven book. (21) It is also surprisingly detached from **certain aspects** of language teaching that one might have expected to find, especially given Widdowson's interest in the connections and disconnections between the classroom and the world outside it. (22) For **example**, there is no mention of the English as a second language/foreign language variable, nor has Widdowson anything to say about the implications of being a native speaker or nonnative speaker teacher of the target language.

(23) ALT retains **the established hallmarks** of Widdowson's work: the limpid style, the breadth of reading, the use of dichotomies, the flair for sustained argument, and a distrust of data and a delight in speculation. (24) In **these matters** Widdowson of the 1990s remains very much the Widdowson of the 1980s, even when the last decade has seen rapid expansion of work in second language acquisition, ethnography, and discourse analysis. (25) As **a result**, we can today see him more clearly for what he really is: our leading *philosopher* of language teaching.

REFERENCES

Widdowson, H.G. (1983). *Learning purpose and language use.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Widdowson, H. G. (1984). *Explorations in Applied Linguisitcs 2.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

For the purpose of analysis, it is necessary to repeat that in this study I shall only examine U-nouns that have as linguistic realization a clause or a sentence in the BR. The instances of U-nouns in bold type appearing in the sample fit this criterion. Other nouns also regarded as unspecific appear in the text like 'traditions', 'products', 'chapters', 'mission', 'problem', 'topic', 'idea',

'aspect', which are premodified by a determiner, but they are disregarded in the analysis because their specific meanings are realized by specifics of identity, i.e., through a postmodifying prepositional phrase, a nominal group, or numbers coming in parentheses which identify the U-noun but they do not provide their specific meanings by means of a clause or a sentence.

As a type of critical expository discourse, BRs are organized around the textual pattern **Situation-Evaluation** (Hoey, 1983). As shown in Chapter 3, BRs consist of three parts (introduction, reporting/description and ending) which are realized by moves and strategies. In most of the instances, such moves and strategies are signalled by the writer through both the use of U-nouns and other types of linguistic items. A characteristic way in which U-nouns organize the genre of BRs is by connecting clauses and by classifying their identificatory specifics. This clause connecting function, as shown in the examples in the previous chapter, is realized through specifics by clause, both intersententially and intrasententially. The sample on pages 186-187, as a typical instance of BR, is organized around the 'Situation-Evaluation' pattern. 'Situation' corresponds partly to Moves 1 and 2 and "Evaluation' correlates with evaluative strategies present in Move 1 (Strat. 2), Move 2 (Strat. 9) and Move 3.

Situation and Evaluation, according to Hoey (1983) and Winter (1992:142), are the basic message structure of texts. Situation means what the

writer knows, i.e., it represents, in the case of BRs, what the reviewer knows about the book while Evaluation means what the reviewer thinks about what s/he knows, how s/he interprets what s/he knows. The second member of this pair is the key element in the message and it can predict a basis or justification for its interpretation.

The following picture summarizes the 'moves' and 'strategies' used in the above BR to realize the communicative purpose of the genre.

Move 1 - Establishing the field
S4 - Informing the reader about the origin of the book (sentences.1/2)
Move 2 - Summarizing the content of the book
S7 - Describing the organization of the book (s. 6)
S8 - Reporting/discussing the content (ss.7/18)
S9 - Evaluating parts of the book (ss. 2, 3, 4,13,16,18,19, 21 (positive), 5, 10, 11, 12, 14, 20, 22 (negative))
Move 3 - Providing final assessment of the book
S11 - Recommending/disqualifying the book (ss. 23/25)

Figure 5.1. - Description of moves/strategies in the BR sample

In the introductory paragraph, Move 1, 'Establishing the field', is achieved through Strategy 4 - 'Informing the reader about the origin of the book' (sentences 1/2) in which the reviewer makes clear how the new book emerged: It is a product of Widdowson's individual presentations. Here this strategy is expressed by items like 'origins', 'collected papers', 'succinct monographs', 'individual presentations'. Besides speculating the origin of the book, the reviewer in Sentence 2 praises the author as a person who 'has

made a considerable effort to shape his books into a coherent whole'. From sentences 3-5, the reviewer 'evaluates the book' (Strategy 9, Move 2) by highlighting the new book as a 'qualified success' despite the fact that the last two chapters of the book are simpler and seem anticlimactic. This strategy is partly expressed by the U-noun **strategy** (illocutionary noun) preceded by the demonstrative 'this', occurring in subject position in the middle of the paragraph. The U-noun 'strategy' refers to the preceding stretch of discourse comprising the information given in sentence 2, which, in turn, is linked to sentence 1 by means of lexical cohesion (ALT, individual presentations, Widdowson). **Strategy** here is to be interpreted as being the effort Widdowson has made to put together individual presentations into a coherent whole and which is evaluated by the reviewer as 'a qualified success.' The proposition in which the U-noun occurs is an evaluative one and it is a link between the preceding portion of discourse and the rest of the paragraph. The rest of the paragraph provides 'Basis' (Hoey, 1983; Hoey & Winter, 1986)[1] for the U-noun 'strategy' to be evaluated as a 'qualified success' and expresses a matching relation of incompatibility in relation to the last two chapters of the book (they 'are simpler....and seem anticlimactic').

Move 2 - 'Summarizing the content of the book' corresponds to the descriptive and reporting section of the review and it is achieved by three rhetorical strategies: Strategy 7, 'Describing the organization of the book', Strategy 8, 'Reporting on the content of the book; and Strategy 9 'Evaluating

parts of the book'. Strategy 7 is signalled by the sub-technical noun **parts** in plural form premodified by the numeral 'three'. The effect of the use of U-noun 'parts' in this context is to move the discourse forward. It acts as an instruction to search for information of a particular type. The nominal group is a cohesive cataphoric signal, like advance labels, as proposed by Francis (1994), predicting that the reviewer will talk about what the three parts of the book are. And this commitment is fulfilled over a larger stretch of discourse (sentences 7-18). The indicators of the fulfillment are *Part 1 examines..., In Part 2....,* and *Part 3 moves*....which correspond to Strategy 8, is not signalled by a particular U-noun, but it is realized through the three specific clauses mentioned above, which complete the meaning of U-noun 'parts'. As a pro-form, this U-noun performs a textual function in which the topic is changed from the origin of the book to the content of the book and which is interwoven with the reviewer's appraisal of the book (Strategy 9, Move 2).

In sentence 8, the use of the U-noun **aim** also encapsulates the immediately preceding stretch of discourse. It interacts with 'parts' to signal the organization of the text (Strategy 7). 'Aim' is to be interpreted as Part 1 of the book whose information is given in sentence 7 and which is the first part of Strategy 8 - 'Reporting the content of the book'. As an organizational signal, it faces backward and forward: backward to give a metadiscursive label to its lexical realization and forward to tell the reader something about the aim, i.e.,

how the author thinks it is realized. This signal is an evidence of informativity in the text[2] and thus contributes to the maintenance of the topic.

Strategy 9 - 'Evaluating parts of the book' - of Move 2, is realized through the sentences in which the reviewer evaluates both the parts and chapters of the book. Alternately, by employing positive or negative words, the reviewer comments on strengths and flaws of the book. The flaws of the book are pointed out in sentences 5, 10-12, 14, 20, 22, (e.g., *it is much less clear, it is a pity..., stops short of considering, Nor will everybody agree that..., controversial, uneven book, surprising detached from..., no mention of the English as a second...).* The positive evaluation is signalled by sentences 2-4, 16, 18, 19, 21 (e.g., *qualified success, build smooothly toward..., the most impressive, the highlight, important, interesting and provocative).*

In evaluating the content of the book, the reviewer uses both evaluative expressions such as 'controversial', 'not all are likely to concur...', 'nor will everybody agree that ...' and the U-noun 'activities' (sub-technical noun) premodified by 'such', which refers to the previous information contained in sentence 9 and the U-noun 'elements' (sub-techincal noun) premodified by 'certain' (sentence 12), which points to the information in the sentences (13 and 14) that follow the U-noun, predicting the occurrence of the 'elements' and evaluating them.

In Move 2, the use of the U-noun **chapter** (a 'text noun') has an encapsulating function. It is a metadiscursive label modified by 'this' which refers to a smaller stretch of discourse - sentences 16 and 17 corresponding to Part 3 of the new book and in which the reviewer introduces the content of Part 3. Although 'chapter' is not modified by a qualifier, it is used in an evaluative proposition expressing the reviewer's positive attitude towards the chapter.

In the same move, the U-noun **comments** (s. 20) (illocutionary noun) has a similar organizational function to that of 'strategy' with respect to the encapsulation of a larger stretch of discourse. Here the U-noun plus the modifier 'previous' form a cohesive anaphoric item which refers to the comments made by the reviewer about Chapter 7 in sentences 17 and 18. It is the modifier which provides direction regarding where the reader should locate the already given information in the text. The whole nominal group functions as a linking signal between paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 besides keeping the continuity of topic, i.e, the writer's evaluation of the new book.

Finally, Move 3 - 'Providing final assessment of the book' - is achieved by one strategy only in the concluding paragraph being expressed through positive words which indicate that the reviewer is generally favourable towards the book. In assessing the book, the reviewer uses the U-nouns **hallmarks** (s. 23), (evaluative noun), and **matters** (sentence 24), (sub-tecnical noun) which have an encapsulating function and **result** (s. 25), (illocutionary noun) which

has a prospective function, although 'matters' and 'result' are not premodified by a qualifier. As metadiscursive signals, they label the preceding and subsequent information, which represents the reviewer's positive evaluation of the book. It faces both backward and forward directions: backward to provide metadiscursively label to the preceding stretch of discourse (sentence 24) and forwards to inform the reader the reviewer's stance towards the book and its author. The U-noun 'matters' is both a cohesive informative signal as well a linking evaluative device.

It seems that the use of certain evaluative U-nouns are a way reviewers signal 'mediation' or 'situation management'[3] (Francis, 1986:46) 'to convince the reader of the logic of a particular line of argument.' Given that book reviews are essentially critical and evaluative, the reviewers tend to add something new to the reporting of ideas, i.e., they need to provide their attitude, opinion, comment on the propositional content being presented. This accounts for the choice of U-nouns to signal evaluation, to link and to maintain the flow of ideas, as well as to change topics in the text.

5.3 - Relationships between U-nouns and moves/strategies

Other nouns besides the ones analysed in the sample in the previous section, are used to link moves and strategies. In the first move - 'Establishing the field' - U-nouns belonging mainly to illocutionary, mental, sub-technical and relational nouns link one strategy to another and integrate information

formulated in the sentence in which the U-noun is inserted. Two strategies are important for convey meaning within Move 1: Strategy 1, 'Making topic generalizations', and Strategy 2, 'Claiming centrality'.

In expressing topic generalizations, the reviewer gives an idea of what the book is about. In conveying such meaning, s/he employs U-nouns such as 'claim', 'orientation', (illocutionary), 'message', 'theme' (a subgroup of illocutionary) 'impression', 'knowledge', 'study', 'principle', 'assumption', 'approach', 'insight', 'thesis', 'idea' (mental), 'category', 'issue', 'way', 'topic', 'data', 'sources' (sub-technical), and 'question' (text noun). Such nouns, as already stated, are usually premodified by a determiner and an adjective which prospect the reader forward or retrospect information in the text by integrating two strategies in the same move. Move 1 alignes with the writer's line of argument in a way that leads the reader to follow the direction which the writer wishes to take in order to achieve his/her argumentative goal. The U-nouns mentioned above have a role in linking Strategy 1 to the other strategies realizing Move 1. Consider the example,

Example 5.1

(1) Both the author (in the Preface) and the publisher (in the jacket) describe this work as a textbook for "serious" students of child language acquisition, but it may have even greater value to professionals as a compendium of major studies in the field. (2) **The focus** is the acquisition of phonology, morphology, syntax and lexical semantics by children from birth to age 4 years. [BR 27, 1 - 1/2]

In the example above, two strategies are used to realize Move 1. These are: Strategy 3 'Indicating the intended audience' (s.1), and Strategy 1 'Making topic generalizations' (s. 2). The U-noun 'focus' (relational noun) is used to link these two strategies. It is premodified by the article 'the' prompting the reader to look for information forward in the text. These strategies are connected to each other not only by the U-noun 'focus' but also by the repeated items which convey meaning of 'Establishing the field'.

With respect to the behaviour of U-nouns in Move 1, the analysis reveals that most of the U-nouns (66%) appearing in the corpus anticipate the type of information in subsequent clauses. The two major strategies appearing in this move are: Strategy 1 'Making topic generalizations' (66.25%) and Strategy 2 'Claiming centrality' (67.5%). As already mentioned in Chapter 3, the most frequent strategies of Move 1 are those in which the reviewer gives to the reader an idea of the topic and also an appraisal of the new book or of its author or highlights the central importance of the book in a field of knowledge. Strategy 1 is realized by U-nouns belonging to different categories: illocutionary, mental, and sub-technical nouns. Of these, mental U-nouns prevail indicating the results of cognitive states or referring to organized bodies of ideas (e.g., *approach, belief, insight, operation, idea, knowledge, theory, thesis, principle, concept*). Sub-technical nouns (e.g., *fact, way, issue, area, question, category*) may also occur in Strategy 1 conveying the idea of 'partition', 'hierarchy', in the text.

Most of the U-nouns have their lexical referents appearing cataphorically, i.e., the U-noun anticipates the subsequent clauses and these may appear within the same sentence in which the U-noun is inserted. The significant number of occurrences of U-nouns pointing to cataphoric reference (66.6%) suggests that U-nouns and their lexical reference are systematically used in this position.

The second most important strategy of Move 1 - Strategy 2, 'Claiming centrality' (67.5% of occurrences in the whole corpus in this move), which highlights the central importance of the new book, is also signalled by U-nouns which have the function of calling the reader's attention to the new book. This strategy is signalled by text nouns like 'volume', 'collection of articles', 'anthology', and illocutionary nouns like 'contribution' and 'work'.

Although Strategy 5, 'Stating the aim of the book', is not the most frequent of all strategies making up Move 1, it is one which is partly realized by U-nouns which have a double function: they link the strategies and also introduce changes or shifts within the topic the reviewer is dealing with. It was noted that this strategy is usually signalled by relational U-nouns like, 'concern', 'aim', 'objective', 'purpose'. 'Aim' and 'goal' are the preferred items to express this strategy. Such nouns may occur in expressions like 'the overall *aim* of the book...', 'the main *concern* of the book is....', 'this book pursues a formidable *goal*:....', 'the *purpose* of the book as defined by the authors is the following...',

which in most cases occur in subject position and are premodified by the definite reference item and sometimes an adjective. They are always cataphoric and their specifics are made lexically unique in an infinitive clause within the same sentence of the U-noun. What we find here with respect to this strategy is that the U-nouns which partly realize it belong to the same group of U-nouns and seem to be inherently related to the function of identifying 'the aim of the book'.

Move 2 - 'Summarizing the content of the book' - is achieved by up to four rhetorical strategies. Strategy 7 - 'Describing the organization of the book' is partly realized by text U-nouns 'monograph', 'volume', 'book', 'text', referring to the book itself under appreciation. However, as these nouns do not have a referential meaning lexicalized in the review, i.e., their meanings are not context-dependent, they are disregarded in the analysis. In addition, other nouns like 'chapter', 'section', 'article', 'part' are also important as part of the realization of Strategy 7, because they have its meaning lexicalized in the text. Strategy 7 is linked to Strategy 8, 'Reporting the content', through U-nouns 'part', 'chapter', 'article', 'paper', 'section' (text nouns) premodified by a numeral and sometimes a qualifier like 'major', 'main', 'principal'. For instance,

Example 5.2

(3) The **volume** is divided into **ten chapters.** (4) *The first* three examine some of the general issues that tend to arise in any treatment of transfer - a concept which, one notes. Odlin defines broadly (p.27) as "the influence resulting from similarities and differences between the target language and any other

language that has been previously (and perhaps imperfectly) acquired'. (5) *Chapter 1* ('Introduction') notes the significance of the everyday recognition and mimicry of foreign accents for popular assumptions about language transfer; whilst acknowledging that transfer does not explain everything, the chapter refers to the growing body of evidence of the prevalence of cross-linguistic influence and underlines the relevance of such research findings for both theoretical and applied linguistics.

(9) *The next four chapters* relate the transfer phenomenon to different linguistic subsystems. (10) *Chapter 4* ('Discourse') reviews a number of cross-cultural speech act and conversational style studies and also looks at research into cultural differences in relation to the notion of coherence. (11) *Chapter 5* ('Semantics') discusses research focusing on the Whorfian hypothesis, case theory, and the various dimensions of lexical transfer.

(14) *Each of the final three chapters* has a very particular **theme.** (15) *Chapter 8* ('Non-structural factors in transfer') examines various kinds of extralinguistic circumstances and constraints that may have an influence on the amount and quality of....(16) *Chapter 9* ('looking back and looking forward') attempts ..../// [BR 55, 2/4 - 3/16]

In the above example, the U-noun 'chapters' (text noun), premodified by the numeral 'ten' besides introducing new topic and new move, links Strategies 7 and 8 indicating how many chapters the book is organized into and anticipating the information which follows in the subsequent clauses, i.e., a report on/ a summary of the content of each chapter. Such information is presented in three parts and distributed into three long paragraphs. Each chapter is signalled by the noun 'chapter' followed by a number which identifies sequence, e.g., 'The first three examine...', 'The next four chapters relate the ...', and 'Each of the final three chapters has a ...'. Within each part, the reviewer reports the content of each chapter. It must be highlighted that

Strategy 9 is signalled not only by text nouns but also by other categories of U-nouns like illocutionary and sub-technical nouns whose main function is that of reporting the content of the new book.

The U-noun 'theme' (a subgroup of illocutionary noun) premodified by a determiner, an adverb and an adjective 'a very particular' anticipates or predicts to the reader, in the example above, the content of the final three chapters of the book, i.e., Chapters 8, 9, and 10. This U-noun links the paragraph which talks about the final three chapters of the book to the previous paragraph in that they report book content, i.e., there is an implicit idea that the book reviews also report on the theme of Chapters 1 to 7. The premodifier 'a very particular' highlights the topic of the final three chapters of the book prompting the reader to search for the particular theme of the three chapters in subsequent clauses.

Evaluative U-nouns are used to express Strategy 9, 'Evaluating parts of the book'. Such nouns link Strategies 7 and 8 in that the reviewer comments on positive and negative aspects of the new book. This strategy is signalled by positive U-nouns like 'strengths' (three occurrences), premodified by their, other, the greatest, 'benefits' (one occurrence), premodified by the several, 'merit' (one occurrence) premodified by the greatest, 'insights' (one occurrence) premodified by valuable. Other categories of U-nouns are also used to express positive evaluation like 'area', 'idea, 'claim', 'study', 'section', 'example', 'way' (two occurrences each), 'source' (one occurrence), 'point' (three occurrences),

'discussion' (four occurrences), when premodified by adjectives like 'strong', 'greatest', 'important', 'good', 'interesting', 'essential', 'useful', 'valuable', 'sensible', 'fresh', 'noteworthy'. Evaluative specific clauses also realize Strategy 9, but this will be further discussed in section 5.4.

This strategy is also signalled by negative U-nouns like 'problem' (twenty three occurrences), 'criticism' (seven occurrences), 'weakness' (five occurrences), 'difficulty' (four occurrences), 'omission' , 'caveats', 'reservation', disappointment' (two occurrences each), 'drawback', 'lacuna', 'discrepancy' (one occurrence each) which may be premodified by a determiner (a, the, this, such, other, another, one, a few, some, several) and an adjective (basic, serious, potential, difficult, particular, major, obvious, possible, disturbing, significant). U-nouns belonging to other categories like illocutionary nouns (e.g. 'complaint', 'statement', 'claim' (two occurrences each), 'point' (three occurrences)) and sub-technical nouns (e.g., 'spots', 'aspects' (one occurrence)), when premodified by an appropriate adjective (crucial, minor, problematic, weak) also realize Strategy 9. Negative items occur more frequently (sixty seven) than positive ones (eleven) revealing the tendency the reviewer has to highlight the problems more than the strengths of the book. To illustrate the point, let us consider the following example,

Example 5.3

(16) While pointing out shortcomings of quasi-experimental research and statistical research, van Lier says the issue is not which is better, but the need for "an open-mindedness about different ways for arriving at understanding, without assumptions of differential scientific value" (p. 12). (17) This is an important point and, if heeded by classroom researchers, would substantially advance our knowledge of how we learn and teach second languages.

(18) *The Classroom and the Language Learner is* not without its **problems.** (19) While it is valuable for its advocacy of an ethnographic orientation to CR, there is a question of its audience. (20) I expect that classroom researchers would be interested in it, but beyond that, I have my doubts. (21) Van Lier writes as if second language teachers might be readers: but this is unrealistic. (22) The book is about research, not teaching. (23) There are teachers who are interested in research as a topic, but the majority are more interested in teaching and in the results of research if they have pedagogical importance.

(24) Another **problem** is that the book provides an overabundance of exceptionally detailed points. (25) Chapters 5, 6, and 7, which are concerned with classroom interaction, participation, and repair, contain far more information than is warranted for the goals of the book. (26) It is easy to get distracted and forget that the main **focus** is the classroom.

(27) The volume, which is part of the Longman Series in Applied Linguistics and Language Study, is well written and researched, with appropriate references and a useful index. (28) The usual annoying and bothersome typographical errors (e.g., it for its, p. 69) are at a minimum. (29) There were two serious bibliographical **errors**, however. (30) On page 19, there is a citation from what is given as Boggs, 1972, but is actually Dumont, 1972; both are in the same collection of articles. (31) Also, van Lier refers to Long et al. (P.66), but no such reference appears in the bibliography. [BR 18, 6/9 - 16/31]

In this four paragraph example, it is apparent that the main function of Strategy 9 is to provide an appraisal of the new book, even though evaluation can spread throughout the text (Move 1 - Strategy 2 and Move 3 - Strategy 11). There are instances of negative U-nouns in this excerpt. In sentences 18 and 23, the U-nouns 'problems' and 'problem' introduce the reviewer's negative evaluation of the book, which are made lexically unique through the sentences 19, 20, 24 and, 25 respectively. Another negative U-noun evaluating the book is the item 'errors' in sentence 28, premodified by the adjective 'bibliographical', which is made lexically unique in sentences 29 and 30 which indicate the nature of errors.

According to Jordan (1984:80), 'most effective evaluation combines assessment with basis', i.e., for the assessment part, there is at least a reasonable basis which is supported by a piece of evidence provided. Jordan points out that 'for many evaluations the greatest effect is achieved when the writer provides in a text a thoughtful assessment of what is being evaluated together with evidence as a basis for the assessment.' Thus many instances of evaluative U-nouns appearing in the corpus have a basis justifying the reviewer's evaluation of part of the book.

Such evaluation, as already shown in previous paragraphs in this section, can be signalled by U-nouns as well as by other evaluative lexical items listed on page 101, Chapter 3. In example 5.3, the reviewer points out

negative aspects of the book in focus, through the lexical items, 'problems', 'problem' and 'errors', but his assessment is supported by a reasonable basis provided in sentences 19, 20, 21, and 22 for the first U-noun 'problems'. The basis for the second instance of U-noun 'problem' lies in sentences 24, 25 and 26 while the basis for 'errors' are the details about citation in sentences 28, 29 30 and 31.

In the light of this discussion, the point to be made with respect to evaluation is that negative and positive evaluation represents the reviewer's point of view of the new book but it is always based on the information and perspective presented in the book as well as on the reviewer's background experience and knowledge. The choice of positive and negative items reflect such experience and knowledge and is evidence of her/his personal judgement.

One typical strategy the reviewer uses to introduce evaluation in Move 2 and in Move 3 in the BRs is that of matching relations (Winter, 1977, 1982, 1986; Hoey, 1979, 1983) (see Chapter 3 in this thesis) especially, matching by contrast, in which the reviewer may start with a positive clause in order to introduce a negative evaluation or vice-versa. Example 5.4 is an instance of positive evaluation and recommendation in spite of the problems pointed out by the reviewer. The items 'valuable service', 'important book', 'well-written articles' are indicators of positive evaluation. The items 'uneven in quality', 'not

all papers...relevant', 'not all written with the careful attention', 'disappointed', 'little attention', are signals of the negative evaluation which is summarized by the U-noun 'caveats' which encapsulates what has gone before. The conjunct 'but' signals a relation of matching of contrast between the 'caveats' presented previously and the positive evaluation and recommendation.

Example 5.4

(84) This book, then, provides a valuable service in helping to legitimize introspection in L2 research. (85) It is an important book for that **reason**. (86) It contains a number of well-written articles that expound both the theory and practice of introspective research. (87) As is often the case with a collection of papers, it is uneven in quality. (88) Not all the papers are relevant to the general aim of the book and not all are written with the careful attention to the explicit use of terminology which any readership deserves. (89) I am little disappointed that so little attention has been paid to the role of introspection in studying *acquisition* as opposed to *use*. (90) But despite these **caveats**, the book is a welcome addition to the growing number of L2 publications and should be read by anyone interested in the methodology of L2 research. [BR 51, 12 -84/90]

When this strategy of evaluation occurs in Move 3 of the BR, an assessment of the book as a whole is provided in order to recommend it or not for readership. U-nouns like 'weakness' occurred three times; 'caveats', 'danger', issue', 'message', 'omission', 'point', 'reason', 'theme', 'problem', occurred twice, and 'conclusion', 'characteristics', 'domain', 'features', 'goal', 'impression', 'judgement', 'matters', 'objective', 'proviso', 'question', 'reservation'

'nuggets', 'strength', 'needs' occurred only once, premodified by a determiner and an adjective ('ancillary', 'essential', 'important', 'great', 'minor', 'principal') in the last paragraph linking the final evaluation of the book to the rest of the BR.

As discussed in this section, it is worth noting that although not all the strategies which realize the three moves are partly expressed by U-nouns, which play a significant part in the organization of BRs. Three strategies - Strategy 5 'Stating the aim of the book' (Move 1), Strategy 7 'Describing the organization of the book' and Strategy 9 'Evaluating parts of the book' (Move 2) are partly realized by a special group of U-nouns - 'relational', 'text' and 'evaluative' respectively, fulfilling the function of lexicalizing the aim and evaluating the book. The remaining strategies are partly realized by U-nouns belonging to different categories like illocutionary, mental, text, and sub-technical or by other types of lexical items which are not regarded as U-nouns.

So far we have seen the relationship between U-noun categories and move-type analysis for BRs. In the following section, the relationship between specific categories and moves for BRs will be discussed.

5.4. - Specific categories and move-type analysis

As argued in Chapter 4, section 4.5, six specific categories for U-nouns were identified in the BRs, namely, *topic, purpose relation, content, discourse self-reference, evaluative* and *enumeration.* These labels were based on the

information conveyed by the writer which preceded or followed the U-noun and which completed the meaning of U-nouns by means of specific clauses.

Returning to the move type-analysis for BRs, we can associate the categories of specifics with the moves/strategies previously established. The category of *topic* can be found in Move 1 - 'Establishing the field', especially completing the meaning of U-nouns in Strategy 1, 'Making topic generalizations'. Used in this environment, it identifies the topic or subject matter of U-nouns like 'approach', 'assumption', 'idea', 'thesis', 'theme', 'knowledge', 'principle' (mental process nouns), 'claim', 'emphasis', 'message', 'orientation' (illocutionary nouns), 'category', 'fact', 'issue', 'question', (sub-technical nouns) and 'anathema' (evaluative). This type of specifics represents 7.4% of occurrence in the whole corpus (forty eighty instances). Consider the examples below,

Example 5.5

(3) Although Auer focuses on code-switching, or language alternation, his model could be applied to any interaction involving the use of more than one language variety. (4) The general principle at issue is **[the way in which such variation or alternation functions to create meaning at the local level within interpersonal interaction.]** [BR 4, 2 - 3/4]

Example 5.6

(1) This volume from the series Studies on Language Acquisition contains contributions to a 1986 Language Loss Symposium bringing together scholars

from Europe, Israel, and the United States to discuss aims and results of ongoing research. (2) The volume's title reflects the fact **[that language attrition is a common but heretofore little-studied phenomenon:]** appropriately, many of the contributions speak to the issue **[of developing a more rigorous research methodology.]** [BR 17, 1 - 1/2]

In example 5.5 the SPC clause, in which P is verb 'be', links the nominal group 'the general principle at issue' discussed in the new book and specifies its topic or subject matter. In example 5.6 the relative clause introduced by 'that' and the non-finite clause beginning with the preposition 'of' and the verb 'developing' complete the meaning of the U-nouns 'fact' and 'issue' lexicalizing the topic of the book and establishing its field of knowledge.

The specifics category labelled *purpose relation* also contributes directly to Move 1 - Strategy 5 'Stating the aim' in that this type of specifics completes the meaning of U-nouns like 'aim', 'goal', 'purpose', 'objective', 'concern' and specifies the aim of the new book either through SPC clauses, where P is verb 'be', non-finite clauses or infinitive clauses after a colon. Such specifics represent 6.1% of realization of U-nouns in Move 1 (forty instances) in all the reviews. For example,

Example 5.7

(1) Though slim in volume, this book pursues a formidable goal: **[it seeks to identify and define the semantic relations which all human beings, irrespective of language, refer to in the construction of coherent**

discourse, and subsequently, to examine their linguistic encoding in English.] [BR 5, 1 -1]

The category of specifics labelled *content* (47.7% of realization in Move 2, (309 instances)), which specifies the content of a book, and the category of specifics labelled *discourse self-reference (17.6%* of realization in the whole corpus in Move 2, (114 instances)), whose specific clauses realize the meaning of sub-technical nouns in the BRs, are found in the reporting section realizing Move 2 - Strategies 7 and 8 . In such strategies the reviewer describes the organization and reports on every section or part of the book. The specific clauses occurring in the BRs and realising Strategy 7 (these represent 11.6% of occurrence in Move 2) complete the meaning of U-nouns like 'articles', 'chapters', 'papers', 'parts', 'sections' (textual nouns). Besides these, other U-nouns of different types (76.6% of occurrences in Move 2, Strategy 8) also occur in the reporting section associated with the specific category of *content.* The examples below (5.8. and 5.9) illustrate instances of specific clauses of 'content' and 'discourse self-reference', respectively, which complete the meaning of the U-nouns 'parts', 'articles' (textual nouns), 'impression' (illocutionary noun) in example 5.8 and 'example' (sub-tecnical noun) in example 5.9.

Example 5.8

(1) This volume is divided into four parts, each with between 2 and 5 separate articles, for a total of 15 articles. (2) As the editors indicate in their preface, all

of the authors are associated in one way or another with the Center for Language Education and Research (CLEAR) at the University of California at Los Angeles. (3) [**As such, one would expect a certain orientation toward programs and issues of immediate interest to CLEAR.**]. (4) This impression is reinforced by the fact [**that 11 of the 17 (co)authors are attached to two or even three articles.**] (5) Most of the articles in the volume, however, deal with a sufficiently diverse aspect of language learning and teaching to find a ready audience in the profession at large.

(6) Part 1, entitled "Political and Historical Perspectives", contains two articles. (7) [**The first, by Tucker, sets the stage in terms of national needs for foreign language learning, at least since the 1979 report of the President's Commission.**] (8) [**The second, by Thompson, Christian, Stansfield, and Rhodes, is a fine overview of the history of foreign language teaching in the United States from pre-world War II era to the present.**]

(9) Parts 2 and 3 are concerned with immersion programs. (10) Part 2 deals with research perspective of immersion, while Part 3 deals with immersion education. (11) The bulk of the articles in the volume deal with topics related to immersion.

(12) The articles in Part 4 treat *content-based instruction* from four quite different perspectives: second (including English as a second language) versus foreign language situations (Crandalll & Tucker), elementary school language programs (Curtain & Martinez), native speakers learning their native language (Shannon), and bilingual education (Fairchild & Padilla).

(13) Curiously, the very last article, the one by Fairchild and Padilla, is in reality a summary of the entire volume but is not labeled as such. (14) Its title, 'Innovations in Foreign Language Education Contributions from Bilingual Education', reveals one problematic aspect of the volume, namely the confusion between foreign language and second language, between English speakers learning primarily Spanish in the United States and non-English speakers attempting to learn English..../// [BR 39, 1/5 - 1/14]

Example 5.9

(13) In Koike's claims regarding "six simple strategies" that exist based on speech act theory, he finds that his "children used expressives very often and representatives and directives uncommonly" (p.55). (14) The semantics are analyzed using case grammar and communicative strategies. (15) An example of a strategy of grammatical acquisition is **[imitation of formulaic expressions "using association and imitation" (p. 101).]** [BR 1, 5 - 13/15]

The category of specifics labelled *evaluative* (10.2% of realization in Moves 2 and 3 in relation to the whole corpus (66 instances)) can be found in any of the moves but it occurs with more frequency in Move 2 and Move 3, whose function is to evaluate the new book in order to recommend it or not for readership. The specific clauses which complete the meaning of evaluative U-nouns express the reviewer's assessment, opinion, personal comment on the book or parts of it already introduced by the U-noun. As already stated in Chapter 4, the specific clauses are realized by SPC clauses functioning as predicate. Consider the examples,

Example 5.10

(20) The greatest merit of the book is **[that it discusses general scientific methodology, and statistical considerations that should ideally be with one when designing and carrying out a research project in any discipline, without ever losing track of the particular interests of those engaged in SLR.]** (21) As a result, such considerations are made much more transparent and, what is more, their direct and fundamental relevance for any SLR project is made clear. [BR 61, 8 --20/21]

Example 5.11

(42) **[But the book (English for Specific Purpose) is troubling in that it ignores the large body of SLA theory and research developed in the 1980s that addresses many of its basic assumptions: even theorists like Widdowson and Sinclair, who have long built bridges between ESP and SLA, are given short shrift.]** (43) This omission by the renowned ESP educators suggests that these two subfields of applied linguistics are not as closely aligned as they could be or indeed, given their potential for mutual benefit, as they should be. [BR 14, 10- 42/43]

There is a difference between positive and negative specifics. Examining the examples above, one can see that the specific clauses which complete the evaluative U-nouns 'merit', 'omission', 'weakness' are positive/negative clauses referring to positive or negative U-noun. Positive specifics are signalled by the words 'ideally', 'without losing track', 'interests', (example 5.10), while negative specifics are signalled by 'troubling', 'ignores', 'short shrift' and 'heavily' (example 5.11). These examples reveal that positive and negative values are not restricted to the U-nouns. The clauses realizing the specifics of U-nouns also contain positive and negative items expressing the writer's opinion of part of the book.

Finally, it should be mentioned that U-nouns can occur, in any of the moves or strategies, premodified by an exact or inexact number (enumeration) predicting how many specific clauses will fulfil the enumeration anticipated by the writer. Sometimes, one of the specifics is realized in more than one clause, e.g. Ex. 5.13. In most of the cases (10.8% of realization of enumeration;

seventy instances) the specific clauses are signalled by numbers, letters in alphabetical order or deictic words like 'one', 'other', 'another'. The examples below illustrate the point.

Example 5.12

(16) Chapter 4 "summarize(s) some of the major findings in terms of three principles governing IL (Interlanguage) development: **[(1) ILs vary systematically; (2) ILS exhibit common accuracy orders and developmental sequences; and (3) ILs are influenced by the learner's L1 [first language]" (p.81).** (17) Clear explanations of free and systematic variation precede an examination of studies that have resulted in differing accounts for the cause(s) of variation.] [BR 48, 5 - 16/17]

Example 5.13

(10) In a section on informal instruction, there are three papers. (11) **[One is an inconclusive study of the effects of three hours of instruction on WH-question acquisition among thirteen children aged 11 to 15.]** (12) Here, some evidence turns up to support the 'non-interface' between acquisition and learning, ...// (13) **[Another asks if naturalistic acquisition can take place in the classroom by looking at thirty-nine adults (L1=English) learning three word-order rules in German.]** (14) **[The third is a summary article on practice reprinted from the AILA Review.]** [BR 64, 4 - 10/14]

In the examples above, the specific clauses signalled by numbers and deictic words respectively lexicalize the content of each paper comprising the book, thus fulfilling the enumeration.

One of the claims that is made in this work is that modifiers in most cases are essential items to convey meaning and to reinforce a negative or

positive aspect of the new book. Taking this for granted, I shall now describe different types of modification occurring in BRs associating them with the three moves/strategies already discussed in Chapter 3.

5.5. Relationships between U-noun modifiers and moves in BRs

The results of the analysis revealed that most U-noun modifiers carry part or all of the meaning which the reviewer wishes to convey. Depending on the type of modifier, whether a determiner or an adjective, it may have an ideational, interpersonal and textual meaning as already discussed in Chapter 4, section 4.4. In this section I examine how these different types of modifiers are associated with the three moves in BRs.

One type of modifier which combines with U-nouns is that of *textual modifiers*, i.e., determiners, (see Chapter 4, section 4.4), which contribute directly to the organizational role of U-nouns. They 'help to order messages with respect to each other' and 'signal relationships between different parts of the text ' (Francis, 1994), in the case of the BRs. Textual modifiers occur before U-nouns in every strategy realizing the moves and they may encapsulate previous information in the text or they may introduce new information in the nominal group. Consider the following examples:

Example 5.13

(19) **An example** of a gap of a rather different kind is to be found in the chapter dealing with speech act theory and the evolution of "functional' syllabuses (Chapter 3). (20) In a textbook aimed at the uninformed, it is surely axiomatic that, whenever the author broaches an area of controversy, she or he is duty bound to reflect in as complete a manner as possible the range of arguments deployed on either side of the dispute. (21) However, **this chapter** ends by baldly retailing **the allegation** that advocates of functional syllabuses have simply replaced structures with functions and ignored other components of meaning. (22) Missing here is any indication that **this allegation** has been replied to or that the dispute continues. [BR 12, 6 - 19/22]

Example 5. 14

(13) **Another reservation** concerning books of this genre is the omission of classroom-based research. (14) With the exception of the discussion of Widdowson's theory, research on the actual application of any of the theories, curricula, or materials in any context was ignored. [BR 35, 3- 13/14]

In example 5.13, the U-noun 'example' is premodified by the indefinite article 'an' prospecting in this context, that the information dealing with an example of a gap will be presented in the subsequent stretch of text. This determiner, together with 'example of a gap' introduces a negative evaluation of the content. The U-noun 'chapter' in sentence 21 encapsulates 'Chapter 3' which deals with speech act theory and the evolution of 'functional syllabus'. It is premodified by 'this' referring to the previous information and accompanies negative evaluation of different parts of the BR. The U-noun 'allegation'

appears twice in the same paragraph. In the first occurrence it is premodified by 'the' prospecting the information which is postmodified by a relative clause introduced by 'that'. The second occurrence of 'allegation' is premodified by 'this' encapsulating the previous information presented in sentence 21. The U-nouns and their modifiers in this particular example link the argument through anaphoric and cataphoric references in Strategy 9 'Evaluating parts of the book' which realizes Move 2.

In example 5.14, the U-noun 'reservation' is premodified by the textual modifier 'another' partly signals Strategy 9 of Move 2, where the reviewer points out one weakness of the book. In this instance 'another' is prospective: while 'reservation' is presented as given, 'another' is presented as new and refers forward to another reservation. The head noun 'reservation' is retrospective but the nominal group as a whole 'another reservation' is prospective. It is semantically cataphoric.

The analysis revealed that the percentage of occurrence of textual modifiers (79.3%) preceding U-nouns in the BRs is higher than ideational (11.8%) and interpersonal (8.8%) modifiers. Textual modifiers can precede the U-noun alone or it can precede ideational and interpersonal modifiers.

However, U-nouns appearing in the BR can also be premodified by adjectives which carry an ideational meaning (e.g. 'theoretical', 'empirical',

'philosophical', 'pedagogical', 'qualitative') which can restrict their range of reference and at the same time can add information about the U-noun by defining it or classifying it. Even though the role of modification is to add information to the head noun, it has to be compatible with and recoverable from, the preceding or following portion of text. Gil (1991:25) labels this type of ideational modifier as 'definers'/'limiters'[4], because they have the role of defining and limiting and they contribute semantically to complete the meaning of the U-noun. They usually signal the relationship between strategies that realize Move 2 - 'Summarizing content of the book'. For instance,

Example 5.15

(12) Framing the book are an introduction and conclusion that map out **various theoretical considerations**. (13) Ochs briefly explains several paradigms of discourse theory (from Searle's Speech-Act Theory to Derrida's Deconstructionism) before explaining her own eclectic view of language socialization: "grammatical competence is bound to context of situation, which in turn is socially and culturally organized" (p. 37). (14) A child's attempt to achieve language and social competence, therefore, involves dealing with "grammatical, discourse, sociocultural, and general cognitive structures" (p.17). [BR 24, 4 -12/14]

In the example above the adjective 'theoretical' is used as an ideational modifier preceding the U-noun 'considerations'. This modifier adds information to the head noun by classifying it and refers to the package of information which follows the nominal group. This nominal group partly signals Move 2, in

which the reviewer reports the content of the book, in particular, the introduction and the conclusion.

The next example illustrates the use of the modifier 'central' premodifying the U-noun 'issue', which besides restricting its range of reference, it adds little information to the U-noun. The function of 'central' here is to highlight one important aspect of the book. Gil (ibid.) names this type of ideational modifier (e.g., 'central', 'basic', 'essential', 'main', 'fundamental', 'explicit', 'general', 'principal', 'particular', 'current', 'individual') as 'highlighters'. The fact that the U-noun is premodified by the indefinite article 'a' predicts to the reader that new information is forthcoming completing the meaning of 'issue'. This nominal group has the function of linking and sequencing Strategies 8 and 9, Move 2, that of 'Reporting the content' and 'Evaluating parts of the book'.

Example 5.16

(23) **A central issue** in this volume is Ellis's notion that interlanguage variability is the key to understanding SLA, with free variation at its base. (24) Ellis contends the nonsystematic variability which comes of the learner's set of "competing rules" leads to free variation and affords the researcher insight into the acquisition process as the nonnative speaker seeks to resolve **these issues**. (25) Ellis sees the sorting out of form-function relationships as leading to systematic variation and as sociolinguistically driven...../// [BR 47, 5 - 23/25]

As BRs are critical expository texts, Move 2 (Strategy 9) and Move 3, which refer to the reviewer's assessment of good and bad points in the book, are signalled by interpersonal modifiers. These play an evaluative role introducing the reviewer's comments on specific portions of text. The most frequent modifiers found in the BRs are: 'arbitrary', 'formidable', 'important', 'interesting', 'strongest', 'reasonable', 'rigorous', 'sensible', 'noteworthy', 'greatest', 'vital', 'serious', 'weak', 'negative', 'major', 'minor', 'illuminating', 'significant', 'valuable', 'possible', 'difficult'.

In the example below, the U-noun 'areas' is premodified by a positive evaluative modifier 'important' and the determiner 'these' encapsulating the themes discussed in the previous sentences. The nominal group 'these important areas' leaves no doubt as to the reviewer's opinion on the areas s/he is reporting on. Again this evaluative modifier partly signals Move 2 and sets up a relationship between Strategy 8 which reports on the content of the chapters of the book under focus and Strategy 9, by evaluating important areas of the content which deserve attention.

Example 5.17

(53) In a final, short chapter entitled "Summing Up", Preston reviews what he feels were the themes he advanced throughout the text. (54) As such, these themes comprise as assortment of claims, generalizations, assertions, and topics. (55) Once again he emphasizes that sociolinguistics is central to general linguistic theory and that sociolinguistic analysis yields information not just on linguistic features but also on individual and interactional properties of

language learners and language learning. (56) He emphasizes the importance of context in understanding linguistic phenomena, and reconciles competing views of Labov and Bickerton on the role of linguistic versus social elements in variation and language change. (57) Although readers will find themselves acknowledging that **these important areas** were indeed addressed, they may find it necessary to go back and review pertinent sections of the text at this point to make sure they have digested them. [BR 28, 15 - 53/57]

So far in this section, we have seen examples in which the modifier and the head of U-noun function as a single cohesive unit, e.g. 'a central issue', 'these important areas', 'these issues', 'various theoretical considerations'. However, there are cases in which the U-noun does not function as a single cohesive unit: the U-noun is the complement of the determiners 'this', 'these', e.g., 'this is an important area', 'this is an important point', 'these are minor points'. For instance,

Example 5.18

(16) While pointing out the shortcomings of quasi-experimental research and statistical research , van Lier says the issue is not which is better, but the need for "an open-mindedness about different ways for arriving at understanding, without assumptions of differential scientific value" (p.12). (17) **This** is **an important point** and, if heeded by classroom researchers, would substantially advance our knowledge of how we learn and teach second languages. [BR 18, 6- 16/17]

Example 5.19

(22) The writing style of the book might be faulted due to the sometimes long and complex sentences, the overuse of British idioms that might put off a few

> readers who do not live on the "emerald isle," and the occasional infelicities of the copy editor. (23) But **these** are **minor points** in light of the comprehensive and thoughtful research synthesis which Singleton has presented to the language community at large. [BR 75, 7 - 22/23]

In the above examples, the U-nouns 'point' and 'points' are premodified by the adjectives 'important' and 'minor' and by the determiners 'this/these', which are retrospective and encapsulate the previous information introducing the reviewer's view of the topic discussed. However, in a different way from those nominal groups which function as a single cohesive unit, these instances function as complement of the determiners 'this/these'. In this case, the head is presented as given while the modifiers are presented as new and sometimes carry prospective meaning.

Summing up the discussion so far, we have seen that of the types of modifiers appearing in the BRs, textual modifiers are the most frequent ones signalling transitions between moves and strategies as shown above. They are very useful as discourse organizers. First, they establish a link between moves/strategies by encapsulating a portion of text appearing before or after the U-noun (an/the/this/these/such/another). Second, they may sequence ideas contained in the book in the reporting strategy (Strategy 8). Here, the numeratives like 'first' and 'second', 'one', 'two', 'three', and so forth, in particular, sequence information quite explicitly. According to Francis (1994:99)

these modifiers have a 'metalinguistic function', i.e., 'they may sequence the points in an argument or events in the world'. Gil (ibid.) labels this type of textual modifiers as 'sequential markers'.

It is worth highlighting that out of seventy one occurrences of interpersonal modifiers (8.8%), fourteen instances (1.7%) are premodified by comparatives 'more' or superlatives 'the most'/'the adjective+est'. Such comparatives may have both retrospective and prospective functions besides signalling evaluation. Consider the following example,

Example 5.20

(66) The evaluation of introspective methods is addressed directly by a number of contributors. (67) Cohen argues that their validity is restricted to 'that project of *learning strategies* that the learner is conscious of including how learners attend to language input, how learners arrive at spoken utterances, how readers process a text, how writers generate a text and how vocabulary is learned initially and restricted subsequently' (p.84). (68) Within this restricted domain, then, introspective reports can provide valuable data. (69) That they may not represent complete accounts of even the conscious part of the process is not a valid criticism, as, arguably, no single method is able to achieve this. (70) **A more serious criticism** is that the subjects' verbalizations are often inconsistent with their actual behaviour (cf. Kring p.163; Haastrup p. 202; Poulisse et al, p. 216). (71) This is less easily dismissed, as Haastrup's account of a thinking aloud study of lexical inferencing demonstrates. [BR 51, 10- 66/71]

In the example above, the U-noun 'criticism' prospects the reviewer's opinion of the introspective methods as being different from the criticism presented in the previous sentence (s.69). His criticism is considered a 'more serious' one compared to that presented in sentence 69. His evaluation is supported by references to several authors. Here we need to look at the nominal group as a whole, because while the head of the U-noun is retrospective, the modifiers have a prospective function. In addition, what organizes this portion of text is a direct contrasting relation between two types of criticism signalling Move 2, Strategy 9, 'Evaluating parts of the book'.

Another point to be mentioned is that although Winter (1977) does not make clear that the modifiers play a crucial role in conveying meaning to the U-noun, he recognizes that signalling is a product of the whole nominal group when he points out (p. 23) that 'Voc. 3 items can be premodified or post-modified like any open system item and take on some of the semantics of the open system items which modify them'. To take such a position is to recognize that modifiers do not only add meanings but also they are crucial signals in themselves. As already seen in the examples, some U-nouns are attitudinally neutral and it is the modifiers which express the attitudinal meaning of the nominal group.

In this section, I have highlighted the relationships between U-noun modifiers and the moves/strategies realizing BRs. We have seen that

ideational modifiers play the role of adding information to the U-nouns as well as of restricting their range of reference. They usually signal the relationship between strategies which realize Move 1 - 'Establishing the field'. However, ideational modifiers are not constrained to this particular move. They may also occur in Move 2 - 'Summarizing the content of the book' in which the reviewer describes and reports the content of chapters, articles, papers, etc. Move 2 (Strategy 9) and Move 3 which express the reviewer's final evaluation of the book are signalled by interpersonal modifiers. These play an evaluative role introducing the reviewer's comments on specific portions of text. But it is the textual modifiers which contribute to the organization of BRs and which signal relationships between different parts of the reviews. Textual modifiers appear in BRs linking moves/strategies through encapsulation and anticipation.

5.6. - Summary of the chapter

In this chapter an attempt was made to bridge Chapters 3 and 4 in order to show the relationship between U-noun categories and the move-type analysis for BRs starting with the analysis of a book review sample. The analysis showed how U-nouns, as cohesive devices, function as organizational and attitudinal signals helping the writer to guide the reader through the specific strategies which realize the moves in BRs. Then, the relationship between specific categories of U-nouns and the moves/strategies was also discussed. Finally, the role of modifiers as adding information to the U-nouns and contributing to the realization of moves was discussed. Of the several types of

modifiers, as has already been stated, textual modifiers are the most frequent and significant items appearing in the BRs. They signal transitions between moves and strategies. As discourse organizers, they sequence the points in an argument in the reviews by establishing a link between moves or between strategies and by encapsulating a portion of text occurring before or after U-nouns.

The next chapter summarizes the main points discussed in relation to U-nouns and the genre of BRs. It also discusses the implications of the findings for the teaching of writing and presents suggestions for further research.

Notes

[1] According to Hoey (1983) and Hoey & Winter (1986), an evaluation can be accompanied by 'Basis' which is the writer's justification and evidence supporting his/her evaluation of an argument in the text.

[2] 'Informativity' is one of the seven standards of textuality formulated by de Beaugrande and Dressier (1981), which are principles that must be met in order for any text to be communicative. The other standards are: coherence, cohesion, intentionality, acceptability, situationality, intertextuality.

[3] Francis (1986:42) affirms that there is a great deal of 'mediation'and hence 'situation management' in argumentative texts in order 'to promote acceptance of the beliefs and goals of the writer'.

[4] For more information on modifiers, see Gil's (1991) unpublished dissertation on enumerables. See also Francis' (1993) article on 'labelling discourse: an aspect of nominal group lexical cohesion'.

Chapter 6

Conclusions, Implications and Suggestions for Further Research

6.1. Introduction

As previously stated, the main aim in this study was twofold: 1) to investigate the rhetorical organization of academic BRs, and 2) to examine the use of U-nouns, as cohesive devices, in the overall organization of these texts. For that purpose, an investigation of exemplars of eighty BRs in the field of Applied Linguistics was conducted through a qualitative and a quantitative analysis of the corpus. A combination of these techniques provided insight on the relation of rhetorical staging in texts to linguistic signals. In this chapter I provide a summary of what has been discussed in the chapters of this thesis and extend the discussion of the theoretical points that have been covered in this study. I shall begin by commenting on genre studies and Swales' approach to genre (Chapter 2), and the move-type analysis applied to BRs (Chapter 3). The results of the analysis of U-nouns carried out in Chapters 4 and 5 are also commented on and the main conclusions relating to these chapters listed (section 6.2.). Then I discuss the theoretical implications of the main findings of this study to the development of students' writing skills (section 6.3.). The chapter ends with suggestions for future research related to genre studies and U-nouns.

6.2. Final Remarks on Chapters 2, 3, 4 and 5.

In Chapter 1, the basic hypotheses and questions for this study were presented before the investigation was conducted. Then a survey of the literature on Genre Analysis was provided in Chapter 2 showing different conceptions of the term and concentrating on the work of Swales - 'the move-type analysis'. I attempted to show that the BR is an instance of a genre according to his definition of the term. I felt the need to define the words *move* and *strategies* in order to have a more reliable analysis of the texts. Such concepts were extremely useful in the identification of moves and strategies which comprise the overall organization of the BRs.

For the purpose of searching for the systematic text features of academic BRs in Chapter 3, the eighty exemplars of BRs were examined in detail for their content, their rhetorical moves and strategies, and the linguistic clues for each of these rhetorical elements. A detailed qualitative analysis accounted for the systematicity of information in the corpus defining the rhetorical elements which make up BRs. The main conclusion of Chapter 3 was that BRs have a specific rhetorical organization which comprises three compulsory 'moves', each one realized by several 'strategies', which may have a most typical or a less typical status according to their frequency of occurrence in these texts. While 'moves' may have a fixed order, 'strategies' were found to have a less fixed order or sequence in the text. The analysis revealed that there is a degree of freedom in the sequencing of the 'strategies' which justifies the occurrence of Strategy 11-

'Recommending/disqualifying the book' - in the first position of the introductory paragraph instead of the ending paragraph in two instances of the BRs letting the reader know in advance the reviewer's stance concerning the book under review.

As a result of the consistency of information in the examples of BRs, a schematic description of the genre was attempted in the form of a model. The proposed model comprehends twelve rhetorical strategies which combine to produce three rhetorical moves, in which Moves 1 and 3, usually correspond to the first and last paragraphs respectively and Move 2 corresponds the development part of the BR. The twelve rhetorical strategies represent the rhetorical movement in the BRs. They start with making topic generalizations (Strategy 1), the importance of the book (Strategy 2), audience (Strategy 3), the origin of the book (Strategy 4), aim (Strategy 5), previous publications (Strategy 6). Then specific information on book organization is provided (Strategy 7), chapter content (Strategy 8), evaluation of the book (Strategy 9) and suggestions (Strategy 10). Finally, closing the BR are an overall recommedation of the book (Strategy 11) and recommendation for further research (Strategy 12). Thus the results of the present study show that the rhetorical movement in examples of BRs goes from a global view of the book in the beginning, to more detailed description, reporting and evaluation in the middle part, and then back to a global view at the end even when possible shortcomings are indicated in the development of the text.

With regard to linguistic clues, the results also show that rhetorical moves and strategies are expressed through patterns of linguistic signals associated with each move and with the strategies which realize the moves. The results also reveal that U-nouns are important cohesive devices in the overall organization of BRs. The analysis has shown that such discourse-signalling devices function as encapsulation markers recovering information from text and also as prospective markers leading the reader to search for information in portions of text which will come. Thus 'moves' and 'strategies' are linguistically signalled through U-nouns as well as through other grammatical items appearing in clauses or sentences of BRs. Such occurrences suggest that it is possible to identify the limits of 'moves' and 'strategies' through physical (paragraph/sentences) or linguistic indicators only, although it has been claimed by Paltridge (1994) that structural division in texts has to be done in terms of cognitive boundaries accounting for **convention, appropriacy** and **content**. In this study, the most typical moves/strategies for BRs were identified based on the form and functional criteria, i.e., 'moves' and 'strategies' are grammatical and content-based.

I drew attention to the fact that the writing of BRs is organized within the textual pattern of Situation-Evaluation (Hoey, 1983, Hoey & Winter, 1986) (see Chapter 5, section 5.3) in which Situation corresponds to the establishing of the field and reporting the content of the book (Moves 1 and 2) and Evaluation corresponds to assessment of the good and bad points of the book and recommendation of it or otherwise for his/her readership (Move 1 (Strategy 2), Move 2 (Strategy 9), and Move 3). However, the

relationship between these elements in BRs is not linear, but circular and embedded. In most of the cases in my data, the BR alternates Situation with Evaluation until the author finishes with the whole assessment of the book under review. Sometimes a BR starts with Evaluation followed by Situation and changes the pattern into Situation followed by Evaluation. This pattern reveals that the reviewer's stance towards the book in advance.

As discussed in this thesis (Chapter 3), evaluation is present in the three typical moves and it is the most striking feature in the structure of BRs. It is both 'personal and institutionalized' because the writer relates the content of the text to the socially-created value-system of the discipline as well as of the area of knowledge readers are engaged to and thus 'creating a shared point of view between reader/writer' (Hunston, 1994:191). Evaluation tells the reader 'what the writer thinks' (Winter, 1982:9), what his/her opinion is about the book h/she is reviewing. Evaluation has an organizational function in the text and its function is partly expressed by the U-nouns, especially evaluative ones such as *drawback, problem, complaint, difficulty, disappointment, strength, merit,* as well as by other socially-valued lexis such as *unfortunately, significant, important, interestingly, deserves, benefit, well-written, admirably, unhelpful, dense chapter, imprecise, confuse, lack, negligently undocumented,* (see complete list on Chapter 3, p. 101). Hunston (1989) contends that evaluation is a result of the combination of the ideational, interpersonal and textual functions. If so, then every choice of lexical and grammatical item made by the writer is evaluative because it reflects what the writer thinks. My analysis has revealed that evaluation, to a

certain extent, is also a result of these three functions. It is part of the interpersonal function (Halliday, 1985a) in that the reviewer's attitude influences the choice of evaluative language. At the same time, it is also part of the ideational and textual functions influencing the choice of content and linking words. These three forms of evaluation function interactively, organizing the text 'retrospectively and cumulatively', adding meaning to what has gone before, 'giving it a value in terms of goodness or badness or of significance' (evaluation of value/relevance, in Hunston's terms, 1989)[1], or signalling that something new is to follow. This issue has been demonstrated through the examples presented in Chapters 3, 4 and 5.

In Chapter 4, I identified the U-nouns occurring in BRs, grouping them into semantic categories according to their family resemblance offering a picture of different types of U-nouns. I also examined the specific clauses which complete the meaning of U-nouns grouping them into semantic categories. Such a classification was proposed for several reasons: firstly, to try to help the readers understand the semantic relations between U-nouns and their specific clauses. Secondly, to investigate how groups of U-nouns belonging to the same semantic category behave in relation to their specifics and how the specific clauses complete the meaning anticipated by the U-noun. Thirdly it was proposed with a view to examining how different types of U-nouns relate to the 'moves' and 'strategies' outlined in Chapter 3. As metadiscursive signals, U-nouns are important items in the organization of BRs. This organizational role of U-nouns seems to work at various levels in the text, from sentence to larger stretches of discourse. The analysis of

such items demonstrated that U-nouns have a referential function in the textual organization of the information of BRs in two ways: retrospectively (anaphorically) or prospectively (cataphorically) i.e., part of their meaning - the specific - has to be recovered or inferred in the context in which they are inserted by looking at the previous clauses or sentences or by prospecting the information which will come in subsequent clauses. The U-nouns may also have their specific meaning outside the text, i.e., exophoric specifics, but these were not considered in the analysis of the corpus.

One conclusion to be reached here is that the binary relation unspecifics/specifics is an important discourse feature because it is the specifics which provide the sense of U-nouns and it is the U-nouns which provide the context within which their specifics are to be interpreted. Emphasis was given to the role of modifiers as adding meaning to U-nouns. Such modifiers may 'encode ideational, interpersonal and textual meaning' (Francis, 1986), but as BRs are essentially evaluative, the textual and interpersonal modifiers together represent 88.1% of the total number of occurrences while ideational ones represent 11.8%. The analysis also showed that evaluation occurs in most of the lexical realization of U- nouns because the role of the reviewer is to say how good or bad the book is.

Chapter 5 attempted to integrate the analyses developed in Chapters 3 and 4 by examining the retrospective and prospective roles of U-nouns and their specifics associated with the 'moves' which organize the writing of BRs. I showed how U-nouns contribute to connect the 'moves' and

'strategies', how they create expectations as to what is coming, how they recover 'moves' and 'strategies' anaphorically and how they point to them prospectively in a sample selected from the corpus. Once again, special attention was paid to the different types of modifiers relating them to the different 'moves' and 'strategies' which realize the moves.

Throughout these chapters, I highlighted the importance of U-nouns as cohesive devices and how they contribute to the coherence of discourse. As Francis (1986:38) states, the importance of the occurrence of U-nouns in written text is that they

> help to provide the reader with a clearly marked route through an argument by indicating where the major divisions fall, where smaller stages begin and end, what value is placed upon certain chunks within the argument as a whole, and how the whole fabric is woven together to form a coherent discourse.

6.3. - Implications for the teaching of writing

The analysis of the writing of BRs and the role of U-nouns as an important phenomenon in the organization and production of texts has led me to reflect about the teaching of writing in our university institutions. As already mentioned in the introduction of this work, BRs have been neglected in our university writing programs as well as in the vast literature of genre analysis. In the cases when they appear in composition manuals, BRs are studied at a level of rhetorical generality that is only partly helpful to the

students. A typical example of this point is the book published by Day (1993:130-4), which only provides brief advice on how to write BRs.

On the other hand, I also noted that students have little knowledge base of text organization and text conventions (genre analysis) which include the use of specialized lexis, methods of argumentation, knowledge of how to present subjective opinion and so forth. Swales (1990) and other scholars have shown that the study of textual norms of the target discourse community can help non-native academic writers overcome troubles with the text.

I feel a strong pedagogical justification for suggesting the teaching of BRs as one type of academic text in writing courses at the university, especially for students at advanced level who in their majority face up the problem of writing BRs and have difficulty with the organization and signalling of such texts. Another argument for the inclusion of BRs in writing programs could be that the proportion of scholarly journals that publish research articles and BRs together not only in English but also in other languages throughout the world, including Portuguese, is remarkably high in some areas of knowledge. Moreover, it is widely recognized that new books are being constantly published and that the reviewer's intention is to convince readers that s/he has to read the book and has enough experience and knowledge in the field to deserve credibility. Such assessments respond to the common public goal of academic community members in the form of published BRs. Thus the genre functions as a mechanism which

provides both information and feedback to community members about new books. Perhaps for lacking time to read the book, for ensuring that the book one reads is of poor quality or desiring an advance evaluation of the new publication, professionals and students of specific academic areas read BRs to keep informed and up-to-date with newly published texts in the field.

One alternative way we can assist students to discover and learn about text conventions, and specifically, about BR organization is to apply the analysis proposed by Swales (1990) - 'move-type analysis' - discussed in Chapter 3. Clearly when students read the text they need to develop their formal schemata (Carrell, 1987) which are built from 'experience with the text'. Teachers can make students aware of Swales' model by providing 'guided reading tasks that focus on textual aspects, stimulating them to analyse texts and get insights into compositional skills' (Kusel, 1992:460). Attention should be paid to the communicative functions of the text, because such functions could help students develop what Swales (1990:213) calls 'rhetorical consciousness'[2]. If academic writers are aware that BRs as a genre type are organized into a certain number of 'moves' or 'functions' including evaluation, of course 'this knowledge will help them produce compositions of good quality and should enable them to address their own readership better' (Kusel, ibid:460). On the other hand, if teachers provide knowledge of text organization and composition, students will develop 'expectations about the structuring of text, from the lexical to the rhetorical levels' (Kusel, ibid:460), contributing to their perception of the coherence of the text.

Within this perspective, ESP and EFL students can be oriented through text analysis to perceive the overall rhetorical purpose or the communicative function of BRs. Then they may carry out an investigation to discover the elements that comprise the rhetorical structure of BRs (moves) - i.e., the need to establish in the eyes of discourse community the field of knowledge of the book under review including its significance, aim and intended audience; the need to report how the book is organized and to report the content of each part; the need to evaluate the good/bad points of the book and, finally to recommend it or not for readership. Emphasis can also be given to the specialized lexis which expresses these elements. Kusel (ibid) suggests that students can 'benefit from such an orientation if they are able to determine the local conventions governing the selection and ordering of the rhetorical moves when writing their BR articles as well as when analysing other related genres' (p. 462). Kusel has evidenced that claims of this kind are also made by Hopkins and Dudley-Evans (1988) and Swales (1990) for certain research genres such as the research paper. This approach can be complemented by Hasan's GSP (generic structure potential) observing the obligatory and optional elements occurring in the text.

Theoretical implications for ESP teaching are also discussed in Motta-Roth's (1995) study on academic BRs. She has emphasized the usefulness of a move-analytical approach to ESP reading and writing in international students' university education. Such an approach helps students to get control of text structure and style, i.e., 'systematic

information on how one academic genre, the BR, is realized in English in terms of content and form (rhetorical moves and linguistic signals in each move), function (i.e., description, reporting and evaluation) and context (i.e., disciplinary cultures)' (p.385) in addition to 'offering a social perspective on academic genre, makes them aware of the social functions of different text types and their use within their discourse communities' (Hyon, 1994 apud Motta-Roth, ibid:284). She also claims that Genre Analysis working with ESP seems to be in 'better position to offer students a more holistic view of academic writing.' (p.287).

With regard to EFL teaching and examining the needs of Brazilian academic writers in English, one possible alternative to understand text organization, argued by Motta-Roth (ibid:287) is to have 'genre analysts develop research that can contribute to a better understanding of the repertoire of academic genres in English'. This includes an understanding by non-native teachers and students of the ways texts are systematized as well as of their contexts in order to develop appropriate writing skills that will allow them to effectively participate in specific scientific communities.

Students should be alerted to the way BRs are linguistically expressed, to the way meanings are constructed in the text. They should be aware of the need to pay attention to signalling in the text. According to Winter and Hoey (1986:127), signals are important items that 'connect clauses and establish meanings indicating the organisation of discourses'. Signals when used properly in the text facilitate the reader's perception of

the ideas and help him/her follow the writer's argument. When they are used inappropriately they mislead readers into expecting one relation or pattern when the writer produces another, or sometimes the writers fail to make clear the relations between parts of a text (undersignalling); both cases may lead to incomprehension (see Winter & Hoey, 1986; Silva, 1995). Writing courses should emphasize that the students should select the right clue to signal a relation in the text.

My investigation has shown that BRs are rich in one type of metadiscursive signalling: **unspecific nouns**, which, among other things, connect clauses, sentences or parts of text to one another contributing to the production and processing of information. Attention should be paid to U-nouns as items which can develop students' cognitive strategies for both processing information and organizing ideas in a text. The use of U-nouns of different types and categories as organizing items of the text may lead students to look for specific information both retrospectively and prospectively in the text.

It would be interesting for teachers to develop awareness of the organizational role played by U-nouns, showing that they are also used to introduce a new topic or argument, to evaluate, to express the writer's own feelings towards a topic or perspective developed in the text. This consciousness should help improve text comprehension.

Another important point, which is discussed by Ghadessy (1984), is that of cohesion which I apply to U-nouns. He suggests that we can help students 'develop a clearer understanding of the semantic concept of cohesion by providing exercises which focus on ideas tied together by the cohesive devices used in English' (p.217). One instance of such devices could be U-nouns and their anaphoric and cataphoric references in the text. The analysis of U-nouns in BRs gives us insights into the way the writer organizes her/his text and how s/he wants her/his readers to perceive such organization. The use of U-nouns let the reader construct meanings, including evaluative ones, through clause relations, signalling and repetition. U-nouns as signals of evaluation, mainly of value and relevance, should be highlighted in the writing classrooms showing their crucial role as an information organizer.

In my investigation of U-nouns, I observed that one way to recognize the connectedness of discourse claimed by Winter (1982, 1986) is through relations between clauses or sentences signalled by U-nouns. These constitute an obvious device of cohesion used by writers to help create coherence in text. The choice of such items and their modifiers provides a 'high degree of predictability of co-occurrence' (McCarthy & Carter, 1994). Thus when a reviewer chooses *this approach, these problems, another point, such assumption*, to link clauses or a portion of text, what s/he is doing is predicting the occurrence of information which will complete the meaning of such items. The choice of such U-nouns may be related to several factors: including the subject matter and the genre of BRs,

although in this work BRs were not compared to other genres to confirm such a claim.

It is also important to mention that the textual approach advocated by Winter highlights that text production and text comprehension are cognitive processes which take into account the writer's choices of lexis in the construction of sentences as well as the reader's strategies in the recovering of the relations established by the writer. In this sense, such an approach accounts for the interactional aspect involved in text production and comprehension, which could be more completely explored in classroom practices.

BRs and texts in general are the result of the various syntactic and semantic choices the writer makes in using language. One of them is to use U-nouns. As I demonstrated throughout this study, U-nouns are important text-structuring signals which organize and evaluate messages in BRs.

6.4. - Suggestions for further research

Although my main interest in this thesis was to examine the role of U-nouns in the genre of BRs, and considering that this study on U-nouns in BRs as a genre has been little explored, the analysis demonstrated that many other linguistic aspects concerning U-nouns and genre could and should be looked at in the future.

U-nouns are a wide and fertile area for research. I have shown that a special feature of such items is to capture not only a concept, but also an action, a process, an event, a portion of on-going discourse and it is this feature which makes these items particularly interesting in academic discourse. Thus it would be interesting to do further research on how learners interpret and use these words in texts as well as the extent to which they encounter them in texts used in the classroom, since not all types of text will make the same use of them and considering that such items affect both comprehension and production of texts.

Another related line of research would be to observe the role of U-nouns in other types of discourse since the investigation done in this thesis and in other studies carried out by Winter, Francis, Ivanic suggest that they play an important role in text-structuring and in the construction of meanings.

Further work could also be carried out to investigate U-nouns and the environments where they occur by examining a bank of texts of different genres using the MicroConcord by Scott and Johns (1993) or Wordsmith by Scott (1996). Such project would help to identify the most frequent items and the syntactic and semantic contexts in which these words are used. Although in my analysis I have observed some of the contexts in which U-nouns occur in BRs, many aspects could still be explored by looking closely at the syntactic patterns of U-nouns .

Another area which deserves attention is the use of U-nouns in oral texts such as conversations, interviews, etc. It would be interesting to compare the way U-nouns are used in such texts with the way these items are used in written texts.

A wide investigation could also look at the organizational role of U-nouns both in Portuguese and in English in order to compare the ways such items are used to structure similar texts in the two languages.

I have categorized U-nouns into six groups providing a picture of different types of U-nouns occurring in BRs. It would be interesting to look at the occurrence of these items within other academic genres to see whether the choice and function of U-nouns is conditioned by the genre which they appear or by the subject matter being discussed by the writer.

Besides these suggestions, important future research relates to the theme of text organization. It is necessary to examine other academic genres to see which 'moves' and 'strategies' are likeliest to occur in such texts and their recursion in order to establish a framework for these types of texts. This will help ESP and EFL students master communicative skills in English.

Another topic related to genre which deserves attention for further research has to do with the examination of evaluation in BRs showing the differences between favourable and unfavourable articles in terms of pattern

of organization and signalling. Although I have mentioned this topic in this work (see Chapter 3), such issue deserves fuller investigation.

Although this study is limited I hope it has added valuable insights into knowledge bank of the field of Text Analysis and as a consequence to a general theory of text production. This study seems to be the fullest so far of the functioning of U-nouns confirming the validity of Winter's concept of such terms. The contribution of this work to textual studies lies in showing that U-nouns are significant cohesive devices in the organization of an academic genre, the BR, contributing to the coherence of such text type.

Notes

[1] Huston (1989) has conducted a research on evaluation in research articles in which evaluation is seen from three perspectives: status, value and significance and these are related to Halliday's macrofunctions of language: ideational, interpersonal and textual.

[2] For Swales (1990:213), 'rhetorical consciousness' is pedagogically valuable to sensitize students to 'rhetorical effects' when reading and writing texts and to 'the rhetorical structures which tend to recur in genre-specific texts'. Such consciousness help readers to percieve blocks of information that comprise a text and their hierarchical relationships.

References

ADAMS SMITH, D. E. 1987. Variation in Field-Related Genres. **ELR Journal- Genre Analysis and ESP.** Vol. 1, 10-32. The University of Birmingham.

ARAÚJO, A. D. 1994. Interaction in Written Discourse. In Vilson J. Leffa (ed.) **Autonomy in Language Learning**. Porto Alegre: Editora da Universidade/UFRGS: 196 - 203.

ARAÚJO, A. D. (Forthcoming, 1996). Genre Analysis: An Investigation of the Writing of Book Reviews. **Expressão**, 3 (1) Teresina: Editora da Universidade/UFPI.

AUSTIN, J. L. 1962 [1972]. **How to do Things with Words**. Oxford: Oxford University Press; repr. Cambridge, MA:Harvard University Press.

BAZERMAN, C. 1988. **Shaping written knowledge.** Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.

BARTHES, R. 1977. Introduction to the Structural Analysis of Narrative. **Image Music Text.** 79-124, Great Britain:Fontana Press.

BERKENKOTTER, C & HUCKIN, T. N. 1995. Chapter 1- Rethinking Genre from a Sociocognitive Perspective. **Genre Knowledge in Disciplinary Communication.** 1-25 Hillsdale, N. Jersey: LEA Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

BHATIA, Vijay K. 1983. **An applied discourse analysis of English legislative writing.** Birmingham, UK: The University of Aston Language Studies Unit.

BHATIA, Vijay K. 1993. **Analysing Genre - Language Use in Professional Settings.** London: Longman.

BROWN, G & YULE, G. 1983. **Discourse Analysis.** Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

CARRELL, P. L. & EISTERHOLD, J. C. 1983. Schema theory and ESL reading pedagogy. **TESOL Quarterly,** 17 (4): 553-73.

CARRELL, P. L. 1985. Facilitating ESL reading by teaching text structure. **TESOL Quarterly,** 19 (4): 727-52.

CARRELL, P. L. 1987. Content and formal schemata in ESL reading. **TESOL QUARTERLY** 21: 461-82.

CARTER, R. 1987. **Vocabulary: Applied Linguistics Perspectives.** London: Allen & Unwin.

CARTER, R & McCARTHY, M. 1988. **Vocabulary and Language Teaching**. London: Longman.

CHRISTIE, F. (ed.) 1984. **Language Studies: Children Writing Reader.** Geelong, Victoria: Deakin University Press.

CHRISTIE, F. 1986. Writing in schools: generic structures as ways of meaning. In Couture B. (ed.) **Functional Approaches in Writing Research Perspectives.** London: Frances Pinter, pp. 221-39.

CONNOR, Ulla. 1987. Research Frontiers in Writing Analysis. **TESOL Quarteriy.** Vol. 21 (4) 677-696. USA.

Collins COBUILD English Language Dictionary, 1990.

COOPER, M. 1982. Aspects of the structure of written academic discourse and implications for the design of reading programmes. **Proceedings of the 3rd. European Symposium on LSP, Pragmatics and LSP.** Jordan Hoedt et al (ed.) 403-433. Copenhagen: Erhversokonomisk Forlag S/I.

COULTHARD, R. M. 1985. **An Introduction to Discourse Analysis.** 2nd. ed. London:Longman.

COULTHARD, R. M. 1994. On analysing and evaluating written text. In R. M. Coulthard (ed.) **Advances in Written Text Analysis.** 1-11 London:Routledge.

COUTURE, B (ed.) 1986. **Functional Approaches to Writing Research Perspectives.** Norwood, NJ:Ablex.

CRISMORE, A. 1989. **Talking with Readers- Metadiscourse as Rhetorical Act.** Vol. 17. American University Studies. New York:Peter Lang.

CRISMORE, A. 1990. Metadiscourse and Discourse Processes-Interaction and Issues. **Discourse Processes.** N. 13, 191-205.

CROMBIE, W. 1985. **Discourse and Language Learning: A Relational Approach to Syllabus Design.** Oxford:Oxford University Press.

CROOKES, G. 1986. Towards a validated analysis of scientific text structure. **Applied Linguistics.** 7:57-70.

CUNHA, W. M. 1992. The Textual Structure of the Genre "Negotiation of Correction of Oral Production" in EFL Classes. **The ESPecialist.** Vol. 12, N. 1/2, 59-82 São Paulo: EDUC.

DAY, R. 1993. **How to Write and Publish a Scientific Paper.** 3rd edition. USA: Cambridge University Press.

DE BEAUGRANDE, R. & DRESSLER, W. 1981. **Introduction to text linguistics.** London: Longman.

DUDLEY-EVANS, Tony. 1986. Genre Analysis: An Investigation of the Introduction and Discussion Sections of MSc Dissertations. **Talking about Text** (ed) by Malcolm Coulthard. ELR Discourse Analysis Monograph. N. 13, 128-145, Birmingham: University of Birmingham.

DUDLEY-EVANS, T. 1994. Genre Analysis: an approach to text analysis for ESP. **Advances in Written Text Analysis.** M. Coulthard (ed.) 219-228 London: Routledge.

FERREIRA, L. M. A. & CARVALHO, M.B. 1994. Genre Analysis: a comparative study of the discourse structure of abstracts in English and in Portuguese. In Vilson J. Leffa (ed.) **Autonomy in Language Learning.** 176-182 Porto Alegre: Editora da UFRGS.

FRANCIS, Gill. 1986. **Anaphoric Nouns**. Discourse Analysis Monograph. N. 11. Birmingham: University of Birmingham.

FRANCIS, Gill. (1994). Labelling discourse: an aspect on nominal-group lexical cohesion. In **Advances in Written Text Analysis.** Malcolm Coulthard (ed). 83-101. London:Routledge.

FREEDMAN, A. & MEDWAY, P. 1994. New Views of Genre and Their Implications for Education. **Learning and Teaching Genre.** 1-22 Portmouth, NH: Heinemann.

FREITAS, Alice Cunha de. 1992. Considerations about the lexical aspect of a "genre". **The ESPecialist.** Vol. 12, N. 1/2, 145-160. São Paulo: EDUC.

FREIRE, Maximina M. 1992. Giving Instructions- an attempt at identifying a genre. **The ESPecialist.** Vol. 12, N. 1/2 01-18. São Paulo: EDUC.

GHADESSY, M. 1983. Information Structure in Letters to the Editor. **IRAL.** Vol. XXI/1, 46-56.

GHADESSY, M. 1984. Going Beyond the Sentence: Implications of Discourse Analysis for the Teaching of the Writing Skill. **IRAL.** Vol. XXII/3, 213-218.

GIL, Glória. 1991. **Enumerables: A Pragmatic Study of Unspecific Nouns in Written Text.** Unpublished Master Dissertation. UFSC.

HALLIDAY, M.A.K. & HASAN, R. 1976. **Cohesion in English.** London: Longman.

HALLIDAY, M. A.K. 1978. **Language as Social Semiotic.** London: Edward Arnold.

HALLIDAY, M.A.K. 1985a. **An Introduction to Functional Grammar.** London:Edward Arnold.

HALLIDAY, M.A.K. & HASAN, R. 1989. **Language, context and text: aspects of language in a social-semiotic perspective.** 2nd. ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

HASAN, R. 1978. Text in the Systemic-Functional Model. **Current Trends in Textlinguistics,** Wolfgang Dressler (ed.) Vol 2, 228-246. New York:Walter de Gruyter.

HASAN, R. 1984. The Nursery Tale as a Genre. **Nottingham Linguistic Circular.** N. 13, 71-102.

HATCH, Evelyn. 1992. **Discourse and Language Education.** Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

HEWINGS, A. & Henderson, W. 1987. A Link between Genre and Schemata: A Case study of Economics Text. **ELR Journal - Genre Analysis and ESP.** Vol. 1 156-175. The University of Birmingham.

HILL, S. , Betty F. Soppelsa, Gregory K. West. 1982. Teaching ESL students to read and write experimental-research papers. **TESOL Quarterly.** 16 (3): 333-47.

HOEY, Michael. 1979. **Signalling in Discourse.** ELR Discourse Analysis Monograph N.6 Birmingham: University of Birmingham.

HOEY, Michael. 1983. **On the Surface of Discourse.** London: George Allen & Unwin.

HOEY, Michael. 1986. Overlapping Patterns of Discourse Organization and Their Implications for Clause Relational Analysis of Problem-Solution Texts. In Cooper, Charles & Greenbaum, Sidney (eds) **Studying Writing- Linguistic Approaches.** Vol. 1 187-214 Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications.

HOEY, Michael & WINTER, E. 1986. Clause Relations and the writer's communicative task. In **Functional Approaches to Writing-Research Perspectives.** Barbara Couture (ed). 120-141 USA: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

HOEY, Michael. 1988. The Interaction of Discourse and Lexis: A Stylistic Analysis of `Virtue' by George Herbert. **Styles of Discourse.** Nikolas Coupland (ed). 138-162 Croom Helm: USA.

HOEY, Michael. 1991. **Patterns in Lexis of Text.** Oxford:Oxford University Press.

HOEY, Michael. 1993. A Common Signal in Discourse: How the word Reason is used in texts. In **Techniques of Description- Spoken and Written Discourse.** Sinclair, J. Hoey, Michael & Fox, Gwyneth (eds). London: Routledge.

HOEY, Michael. 1994. Signalling in discourse: a functional analysis of a common discourse pattern in written and spoken English. **Advances in Written Text Analysis.** Malcolm Coulthard (ed) 26 - 45 London: Routledge.

HOPKINS, A, & DUDLEY-EVANS, T. 1988. A genre-based investigation of the discussion sections in articles and dissertations. **English for Specific Purposes** 7:113-22.

HYLAND, K. 1992. Genre Analysis: Just Another Fad? **English Teaching Forum.** Vol. 30. n.2. 14-17. USA.

HUNSTON, S. 1989. **Evaluation in Experimental Research Articles.** Ph.D dissertation. University of Birmingham.

HUNSTON, S. 1994. Evaluation and organization in a sample of written academic discourse. In R.M. Coulthard (ed.) **Advances in Written Text Analysis**. 195-218 London: Routledge.

IVANIC, Roz. 1991. Nouns in Search of a Context: A Study of nouns with both Open-and -Closed System Characteristics. **IRAL.** Vol. XXIX/2 pp. 93-114.

JAMIESON, Kathleen M. 1975. Antecedent genre as rhetorical constraint. **Quarterly Journal of Speech,** 61: 405-15.

JOHNS, A. M. & Dudley-Evans, Tony. 1993. English for Specific Purposes: International in Scope, Specific in Purpose. In Sandra Silberstein (ed.). **State of the Art Tesol Essays.** 115-132 Highland, Garamond, Pantagraph Printing, Bloomington, Illinois, USA.

JORDAN, M. P. 1984. **Rhetoric of Everyday English Texts.** London: Allen & Unwin.

KRESS, G. 1985. **Linguistic Processes in Sociocultural Practice.** Oxford:Oxford University Press.

KRESS, G. 1993. Genre as Social Process. In Bill Cope and Mary Kalantzis (eds.). **The Powers of Literacy.** 22-37 London: Palmer Press.

KUSEL, Paul A. 1992. Rhetorical Approaches to the Study and Composition of Academic Essays. **System.** Vol. 20. N.4. 457-469 Great Britain.

KROLL, Barbara (ed.). 1990. **Second language writing: research insights for the classroom.** Cambridge: CUP.

LABOV, W. 1972. **Language in the Inner City.** Philadelphia: Pennsylvania University Press.

LEECH, G. & SVARTVIK, J. 1980 . **A Communicative Grammar of English.** London: Longman Group Ltd.

LINDEMANN, Erika. 1982. **A rhetoric for writing teachers.** New York: Oxford University Press.

McCARTHY, M. 1991. **Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers.** Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McCARTHY, M. & CARTER, R. 1994. Dividing the world of discourse. **Language as Discourse - Perspective for Language Teaching.** C. N. Candlin (ed.) 1-53 London: Longman.

MAURANEN, Anna. 1993. Contrastive ESP Rhetoric: Metatext in Finnish-English Economics Texts. **English for Specific Purposes.** Vol. 12 n.1. 3-22 New York: Pergamon Press.

MARSHALL, Stewart. 1991. A Genre-based Approach to the teaching of Report Writing. In **English for Specific Purposes.** Vol. 10. 3-13. New York: Pergamon Press.

MARTIN, J. R. & ROTHERY, J. 1981. Writing project reports: 1980 and 1981. **Working Papers in Linguistics** 1/2 Sydney:University of Sydney.

MARTIN, J. R. 1984b. Language, register and genre. In Christie F. (ed.) **Language Studies: Children Writing Reader.** 21-9. Geelong, Victoria, Deakin University Press.

MARTIN, J. R. 1986. **Factual Writing: Exploring and Challenging Reality.** Geelong, Victoria, Deakin University Press.

MARTIN, J. R. 1992. **English Text: System and Structure.** Philadelphia/Amsterdam:John Benjamins Publishing Company.

MEURER, J. L. (1996). Aspects of a Model of Writing: Translations as Text Production. In **The Knowledges of the Translator: From Literary Interpretation to Machine Classification.** ed. by Malcolm Coulthard and P. A. Odber de Baubeta. Great Britain: The Edwin Mellen Press, pp. 67-90.

MILLER, Carolyn R. 1984. Genre as Social Action. **Quarterly Journal of Speech.** 70. 151-167.

MOTTA-ROTH, Désirée. 1995. **Rhetorical Features and Disciplinary Cultures: A Genre-based Study of Academic Book Reviews in Linguistics, Chemistry, and Economics.** Unpublished PHD Thesis. Florianópolis, Brazil:Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina.

PALTRIDGE, B. 1993. Writing up Research: A Systemic Functional Perspective. **System.** Vol. 21, N.2. 175-192. Great Britain: Pergamon Press Ltd.

PALTRIDGE, B. 1994. Genre Analysis and the Identification of Textual Boundaries. **Applied Linguistics.** Vol. 15/3 288-299 Oxford:Oxford University Press.

PALTRIDGE, B. 1995. Working with Genre: A pragmatic perspective. **Journal of Pragmatics,** 24. 393-406.

RAMOS, R. de C. G. 1992. A functional approach to business communication:a case study. **The ESPecialist,** São Paulo, Brazil:EDUC Vol. 12, 1/2, 161-178.

SALAGER- MEYER, F. et al. 1989. Principal Component Analysis and Medical English Discourse: An Investigation into Genre Analysis. **System.** Vol. 17 N.1 21-34 Great Britain: Pergamon Press.

SALAGER-MEYER, F. 1990. Discoursal flaws in Medical English abstracts: A genre analysis per research - and text-type. **TEXT**, 10 (4): 365-84.

SANTOS, Mauro B. 1995. **Academic abstracts: a genre analysis.** Unpublished Master Dissertation. Brazil: Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina.

SELINKER, L., Lackstrom, J. and Trimble, L. 1972. Grammar and technical English, **English Teaching Forum**, Sept-Oct. 3-14.

SELINKER, L., Lackstrom, J. and Trimble, I. 1973. Technical rhetorical principles and grammatical choice, **TESOL Quarterly** 7, 2.

SELINKER, L., R. M. Trimble and L. Trimble. 1976. Presuppositional rhetorical information in EST discourse. **TESOL Quarterly** 10:281-90.

SCHRYER, Catherine F. 1993. Records as Genre. **Written Communication**, Vol. 10 No. 2, 200-234. USA:Sage Publications, Inc.

SCOTT, Mike & Johns, Tim. 1988. **Oxford English Software: Microconcord 1.0.** Oxford: Oxford University Press.

SCOTT, Mike. 1996. **Wordsmith Software.** Oxford: Oxford University Press.

SEARLE, J. R. 1976. A Classification of Illocutionary Acts. **Language in Society**, 5, 1: 1-23.

ST JOHN, Maggie Jo. 1990. Thoughts on genre-based writing and reading courses. **The ESPecialist.** Vol. 10. N.2. 167-179. São Paulo: EDUC.

SILVA, P. L. da. 1995. **Rhetorical Ineptness in Text Written by Linguists.** Unpublished Master Dissertation. Florianópolis, Brazil: Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina.

SILVA, S. A. da. 1992. Um estudo da entrevista baseado na análise de genres linguísticos. **The ESPecialist.** Vol. 12. N.1/2. 121-143. São Paulo:EDUC.

SINCLAIR, J. M. 1981. Planes of Discourse., in RWZI, SNA (ed.) **The Twofold Voice: Essays in Honour of Ramesh Mohan,** Salzburg:Universitat Salzburg.

SINCLAIR, J. M. & BRAZIL, D. 1982. **Teacher Talk.** Oxford:Oxford University Press.

SINCLAIR, J. M. 1993. Written Discourse Structure. **Techniques of Description Spoken and Written Discourse**. J. M. Sinclair, M. Hoey, and G. Fox (eds.) Routledge: London 6-31.

STENFFENSEN, Margaret. 1986. Register, Cohesion and Cross-cultural Reading Comprehension. **Applied Linguistics.** Vol. 7, N. 1 71-85.

SUTHERLAND, S. M. 1985. **A Description of Description: A Study of Information Patterning in Descriptive Discourse and Its Implications for the EFL Classroom.** Master of Arts Thesis. University of Birmingham.

SWALES, J. M. 1984. Research into the Structure of Introductions to Journal Articles and its Application to the Teaching of Academic Writing. **Common Ground: Shared Interests in ESP and Communication Studies.** ELT Documents 117. 77-86 USA: Pergamon Press.

SWALES, J. M. 1985. **A genre-based approach to language across the curriculum.** Paper delivered at 1985 RELC Conference, Singapore.

SWALES, J. M. 1986. Citation analysis and discourse analysis. **Applied Linguistics,** 7(1): 39- 56.

SWALES, J. M. 1987. Utilising the literatures in teaching the research paper. **TESOL Quarterly**, 21 (1): 41-68.

SWALES, J. M. 1990a. **Genre Analysis: English in academic and research settings.** Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

SWALES, J. M. 1990b. Nonnative speaker graduate engineering students and their introductions: global coherence and local manegement. In U. Connor & A. M. Johns (eds.), **Coherence in Writing: research and pedagogical perspectives.** 187-208. Washington, DC: TESOL.

SWALES, J. M. 1992. **Re-thinking Genre: Another Look at Discourse Community Effects.** Mimeo paper presented in a Re-thinking Genre Colloquium, at the Carleton University, Ottawa, 1-21.

SWALES, J. M. 1993a. Genre and engagement. **Revue Beige de Philologie et D'Historie**, 71: 687-698.

TADROS, Angela. 1985. **Prediction in Text.** ELR Discourse Analysis Monograph. N.10. 1-67 University of Birmingham.

TANNEN, D. (Ed.) 1984. **Coherence in Spoken and Written Discourse.** Norwood, New Jersey:Ablex Publishing Corporation.

TARONE, E.; Dwyer,S.; Gillette, S. & V. Icke. 1981. On the use of the passive in two astrophysics journal papers. **ESP Journal,** 1: 123-40.

THOMPSON, Geoff & YIYUN, YE. 1991. Evaluation in the Reporting Verbs used in Academic Papers. **Applied Linguistics.** Vol. 12/4 367-382 Oxford: Oxford University Press.

TRIMBLE, L. 1985. **English for Science and Technology.** Cambridge: Cambride University Press.

TODOROV, Tzvetan. 1991. The origin of genres. **Genres in Discourse.** Catherine Porter (Transl.) 2nd. ed.13-26 Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

VAN DIJK, Teun & Kintsch, W. 1983. **Strategies of discourse comprehension.** London: Academic Press.

VANDE KOPPLE, W.J. 1985. Some exploratory discourse on metadiscourse. **College Composition and Communication** 36/1:82-93 USA.

VENTOLA, E. 1984. Orientation to social semiotics in foreign language teaching. **Applied Linguistics,** 5 / 3, 275-86.

VENTOLA, E. 1987. **The Structure of Social Interaction - A Systemic Approach to the Semiotics of Service Encounters.** London:Frances Pinter Publishers.

WIDDOWSON, H. G. 1979. **Explorations in Applied Linguistics.** Oxford: Oxford University Press.

WINTER, E. 1977. A Clause-relational approach to English texts: a study of some predictive lexical items in written discourse. **Instructional Science.** Vol. 6. N. 1 1-92.

WINTER, E. 1979. Replacement as a fundamental function of the sentence in context. **Forum Linguisticum,** 4, 2: 95-133.

WINTER, E, 1982. **Towards** a **Contextual Grammar of English.** London & New York: George Allen & Unwin.

WINTER, E. 1986. Clause Relations as Information Structure: two basic text structures in English. **Talking about Text.** M. Coulthard (ed), ELR Discourse Analysis Monograph. N.13. 88-108, Birmingham: University of Birmingham.

WINTER, E. 1989. **On Unspecific/Specific as Fundamental Organizer of Written Texts.** Mimeo talk. The University of Birmingham.

WINTER, E. 1992. The Notion of Unspecific versus Specific as one Way of Analysing the information of a Fund-Raising Letter. In William C. Mann & Sandra A. Thompson (eds). **Discourse Descriptions: Diverse Analyses of A Fund-Raising Text.** John Benjamins. Amsterdam.

APPENDIX A

Appendix A

This appendix contains the book reviews referred to in the main text. For ease of reference the articles were numbered, abbreviated as BR and indicated between brackets. The book reviews examined were the following:

BR TITLE/AUTHOR/SOURCE/ REVIEWER

1 **ACQUISITION OF GRAMMATICAL STRUCTURES AND RELEVANT VERBAL STRATEGIES IN A SECOND LANGUAGE.** *Ikuo Koike.* Tokyo: Taishukan. 1983. Pp. xxv+ 497. $66.00.
Source: SSLA, Vol. 10, N.1. 1988. Cambridge University Press.
Reviewer: **Don R. McCreary** - University of Georgia.

2 **AN INTRODUCTION TO FUNCTIONAL GRAMMAR.** *Michael A. K. Halliday. London: Edward Arnold, 1985. Pp. 384.*
Source: SSLA, Vol. 10, N.1, February 1988, 84-87. Cambridge University Press.
Reviewer: **Michael P. Hoey** - University of Birmingham.

3 **BEYOND THE SENTENCE: DISCOURSE AND SENTENTIAL FORM.** *Jessica R. Wirth (Ed.) Ann Arbor: Karoma.*
Source: SSLA, Vol. 10, N.1 February 1988 Pp. 87-89 Cambridge University Press.
Reviewer: **M. P. Hoey** -University of Birmingham.

4. **BILINGUAL CONVERSATION.** *J. C. P. Auer.* Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1984. Pp. 116.
Source: SSLA, Vol. 10, N.1 February 1988. Pp. 90-91, Cambridge University Press.
Reviewer: **Monica Heller**- Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

5. **PROCESS AND RELATION IN DISCOURSE AND LANGUAGE LEARNING.** *Winifred Crombie.* Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1985. Pp. xvii+ 150.
Source: SSLA, Vol. 10 N.1 February 1988. Pp. 107-108. Cambridge University Press.
Reviewer: **Heidi Hyrnes** - Georgetown University.

6. **LANGUAGE LEARNABILITY AND LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT.** *Steven Pinken.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. 1984. Pp. xi+ 435.
Source: SSLA, Vol. 10, N. 1 February 1988 Pp. 102-104. Cambridge University Press.
Reviewer: **Lydia White** - McGill University.

7. **COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE APPROACHES TO LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT: RESEARCH AND APPLICATION.** *Charlene Rivera (Ed.).* Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters 1984. Pp. xvi+150. L 34,00 cloth $ 13.50 paper.
Source: SSLA, Vol. 10, N.2 June 1988 Pp. 263-264, Cambridge University Press.
Reviewer: **Sandra J. Savignon** - University of Illinois Urbana- Champaign.

8. **TESTING SPOKEN LANGUAGE: A HANDBOOK OF ORAL TESTING TECHNIQUES.** *NicUnderHill.* Cambridge University Press. 1987. Pp. vii+ 117 $ 8.95.
Source:SSLA, Vol. 10 N.2 June 1988 pp. 265-167. Cambridge University Press.
Reviewer: **James P. Lantolf** - University of Delaware.

9. **AGE IN SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION.** *Birgit Harley.* Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters. 1986. Pp. xii+ 144. L 7.96.
Source: SSLA, Vol. 10 N.2, June 1988 Pp. 271-273. Cambridge University Press.
Reviewer: **David Singleton** - Trinity College.

10. **LEXICAL SEMANTICS.** *D.A. Cruse.* New York: Cambridge University Press. 1986. Pp. xiv + 310.
Source: SSLA, Vol. 10, N. 3, October 1988, Pp. 404-406. Cambridge University Press
Reviewer: **Andrew D. Cohen** -Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

11. **INTERACTIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING.** *Wilga M. Rivers (Ed.)* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.. 1987, Pp. xvii+ 228. $10.95.
Source: SSLA, Vol. 10 N.3. October 1988. Pp. 410-411. Cambridge University Press
Reviewer: **Laurell W. McLain** - Indiana University.

12. **PRINCIPLES OF COURSE DESIGN FOR LANGUAGE TEACHING.** *Janice Yalden.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1987 Pp. ix+ 207. $9.95.
Source: SSLA, Vol. 10 N.3, October 1988. Pp. 412-414. Cambridge University Press.
Reviewer: **David Singleton**- Trinity College, Dublin.

13. **THE OPEN DOOR: THE BRADFORD PROJECT.** *Finbarré Fitzpatrick.* Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters. 1987. Pp. vii+120 $ 15,00 paper.
Source: SSLA, Vol. 10, N.3, October 1988, Pp. 423-424. Cambridge University Press.
Reviewer: **Carolyn Kissler** - University of Texas, San Antonio.

14. **ENGLISH FOR SPECIFIC PURPOSES: A LEARNING-CENTRED APPROACH.** *Tom Hutchinson and Alan Waters.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1987. Pp. viii+ 183.
Source: SSLA, Vol. 11, N.1, March 1989, Pp. 111-113, Cambridge University Press.
Reviewer: **Thomas Huckin** - Carnegie Mellon University.

15. **SPOKEN LANGUAGE.** *Paul Meara.* (Ed.). London: Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research. 1986. Pp. 115.
Source: SSLA, Vol.11, N.1 March 1989. PP. 113-114. Cambridge University Press.
Reviewer: **Karl Krahnke** -Colorado State University.

16. **RESEARCH IN READING IN ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE.** *Joanne Devine, Patricia L. Carrell and David E. Eskey (Eds.)* Washington, D.C.: TESOL, 1987. Pp. ii+192.
Source: SSLA, Vol. 11, N.3, Sept. 1989, Pp. 351-352. Cambridge University Press.
Reviewer: **Marva A. Barnett** - University of Virgina.

17. **LANGUAGE ATTRITION IN PROGRESS.** *Bert Weltens, Kees De Bot, and Theo Van Els (eds.).* Dorcrecht: Foris, 1986. Pp. vii+224. $19.90.

Source: SSLA, Vol. 11, N.2, June 1989. Pp. 217-218. Cambridge University Press.
Reviewer: **Cathy R. Pons** - Indiana University.

18. **THE CLASSROOM AND THE LANGUAGE LEARNER.** *Leo van Lier.* London: Longman 1988. Pp. xvii+ 262.
Source: SSLA, Vol. 11, N.3, Sept. 1989. Pp. 349-350. Cambridge University.
Reviewer: **Richard R. Day**- University of Hawaii.

19. **RESEARCH IN SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNING: FOCUS ON THE CLASSROOM.** *James P. Lantolf and Angela Labarca (Eds.)* Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1987. Pp. vii+232. $ 35.00.
Source: SSLA, Vol. 11, N.4. December 1989. Pp. 464-466, Cambridge University Press.
Reviewer: **Craig Chaudron**- University of Hawaii, Manoa.

20. **LANGUAGE AND WRITING: APPLICATIONS OF LINGUISTICS TO RHETORIC AND COMPOSITION.** *Victor Raskin and Irvin Weisner.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex. 1987. Pp. xvi+ 279.
Source: SSLA, Vol. 11, N.3, Sept. 1989. Cambridge University Press.
Reviewer: **John Swales** - The University of Michigan

21. **WRITING ACROSS LANGUAGES: ANALYSIS OF L2 TEXT.** *Ulla Connor and Robert B. Kaplan (Eds.)* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1987 Pp. vi+ 202.
Source: SSLA, Vol. 12, N. 1990. PP. 81-82. Cambridge University Press.
Reviewer: **Cheryl Engber** - Indiana University.

22. **DESIGNING TASKS FOR THE COMMUNICATIVE CLASSROOM.** *David Nunan.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1989. Pp. x+211.
Source: SSLA, Vol. 12, N.4, Pp. 455-456. 1990 Cambridge University Press.
Reviewer: **Graham Crookes** - University of Hawaii.

23. **THE LEARNER-CENTRED CURRICULUM: A STUDY IN SECOND LANGUAGE TEACHING.** *David Nunan.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1988. Pp. xii + 196 $ 27.95 (cloth), $ 10.95 (paper).
Source: SSLA, Vol. 12, N.1. March 1990, 94-96, Cambridge University Press.
Reviewer: **Mary McGroarty** - Northern Arizona University.

24. **CULTURE AND LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT: LANGUAGE ACQUISITION AND LANGUAGE SOCIOLIZATION IN A SAMOAN VILLAGE.** *Elinor Ochs.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988. Pp. vii+ 255.
Source: SSLA, Vol. 12 N.1 March 1990, 96-97. Cambridge University Press.
Reviewer: **Robert S. Burton** - California State University - Chico.

25. **LEARNABILITY AND LINGUISTIC THEORY.** R*obert J. Mathews and William Demopoulos (eds.).* Dorcrecht : Kluwer, 1989, Pp. vii+ 217 $ 64.00.
Source: SSLA, Vol. 13, N. , 519-520, Cambridge University Press.
Reviewer: **Malcolm Finney** - University of Ottawa.

26. **TRANSFER IN LANGUAGE PRODUCTION.** *Hans Dechert and Manfred Raupach (Eds.)* Norwood, NJ: Ablex 1989. Pp. xvii + 278. $ 29.50.
Source: SSLA, Vol. 13, 1991, 90-91, Cambridge University Press.

Reviewer: **Terence Odiin** - The Ohio State University.

27. **FIRST LANGUAGE ACQUISITION: METHOD, DESCRIPTION, AND EXPLANATION.** *David Ingram.* Cambridge University Press, 1989. Pp. xi + 572.
Source:SSLA, Vol. 13, N. 3, 1991, Cambridge University Press.
Reviewer: **Julia S. Falk** - Michigan State University.

28. **SOCIOLINGUISTICS AND SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION.** *Dennis R. Preston.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell. 1989. Pp. 236.
Source: SSLA, Vol. 13, N. 3, 1991, Pp. 396-399, Cambridge University Press.
Reviewer: **Teresa Pica** - University of Pennylvania.

29. **SECOND LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT: CURRENT ISSUES.** *Pardee Lowe, Jr. and Charles W. Stansfield (eds.).* Englewood Clifford NJ: Prentice Hall Regents, 1988. Pp. v+ 201. $17.50.
Source: SSLA, Vol.13, N. 3, 410-411, 1991, Cambridge University Press.
Reviewer: **Andrew D. Cohen** - University of Minnesota

30. **DISCOURSE ANALYSIS FOR LANGUAGE TEACHER.** *Michael McCarthy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1991. Pp. x+ 213 $37.50 cloth. $14.95 paper.
Source: SSLA, Vol. 14, N.4, 1992, 463-464. Cambridge University Press.
Reviewer: **James Paul Gee** - University of Southern California.

31. **THE EMERGENCE OF BLACK ENGLISH: TEXT AND COMMENTARY.** *Guy Bailey, Natalie Maynor, and Patricia Cukor-Avila (eds.).* Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 1991. Pp. x+ 352. $ 70.00.
Source: SSLA, Vol. 14, N.4, 1992, 464-465. Cambridge University Press.
Reviewer: **James F. Ford** - University of Arkansas.

32. **THE DEVELOPMENT OF SECOND LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY.** *Birgit Harley, Patrick Allen, Jim Cummings, and Merrill Swain (Eds.).* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990. Pp. xiv+ 248. $ 13.95.
Source: SSLA, Vol. 14, N.1, March 1992, 102-103, Cambridge University Press.
Reviewer: **Rod Ellis** - Temple University Japan.

33. **INSTRUCTED SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION: LEARNING IN THE CLASSROOM.** *Rod Ellis.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990. Pp. vii+ 230 L 10.95.
Source: SSLA, Vol. 14, N. 1, March 1992, 194-105, Cambridge University Press.
Reviewer: **Martin Bygate** - University of Reading.

34. **SECOND LANGUAGE WRITING: RESEARCH INSIGHTS FOR THE CLASSROOM.** *Barbara Kroll (Ed).* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1990. Pp. ix + 246. $13.95.
Source: SSLA, Vol. 14, N.2, June 1992, 218-220, Cambridge University Press.
Reviewer: **John Hedgcock** - University of Houston.

35. **CONTEXTS OF COMPETENCE: SOCIAL AND CULTURAL CONSIDERATIONS IN COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING.** *Maggie Berns.* New York: Plenum. 1990. Pp. viii+ 185.
Source: SSLA, Vol. 14, N.2, June 1992, 220-221. Cambridge University Press.
Reviewer: **Craig Dicker** - Teachers College, Columbia University.

36. **ASPECTS OF LANGUAGE TEACHING.** H. *G. Widdowson.* Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1990. Pp. xiii + 213. $ 12.95.
Source: SSLA, Vol. 14, N.2, 1992. 229-230. Cambridge University Press
Reviewer: **John Swales** - The University of Michigan.

37. **LEARNING STRATEGIES IN SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION.** *J. Michael O'Malley and Anna Uhl Chamot.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1990. Pp. xi + 260. $34.50 cloth, $12.95 paper.
Source: SSLA, Vol. 14, N.2, 1992, 230-231, Cambridge University Press.
Reviewer: **Rebecca L. Oxford-** University of Alabama.

38. **CHILDREN'S LANGUAGE: VOL. 7.** *Gina Conti-Ramsden and Catherine E. Snow* (Eds.) Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. 1990. Pp. xiii + 337.
Source: SSLA, Vol, 14, N. , 228-229, 1992, Cambridge University Press.
Reviewer: **Susan Foster-Cohen-** Northern Arizona University.

39. **FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION: ISSUES AND STRATEGIES.** *Amado M. Padilla, Halford H. Fairchild, and Concepción M. Valadez* (Eds). Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1990. Pp. 256.
Source: SSLA, Vol. 15, N.2, 1993, 262-263, Cambridge University Press.
Reviewer: **Charles J. James-** University of Wisconsin-Madison.

40. **BILINGUALISM, BICULTURALISM, AND SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNING: THE McGILL CONFERENCE IN HONOUR OF WALLACE E. LAMBERT.** *Allan G. Reynolds (Ed).* Hilsdale, NJ:Earlbaum, 1991. Pp. xix + 261. $39.95 cloth.
Source: SSLA, Vol. 15, N. 2. 1993, 263-264, Cambridge University Press.
Reviewer: **Roy C. Major** - Arizona State University.

41. **READING DEVELOPMENT IN A SECOND LANGUAGE: THEORETICAL, EMPIRICAL, AND CLASSROOM PERSPECTIVES.** *Elizabeth B. Bernhardt.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1991. Pp. vii + 250. $42.50 cloth, $24.50 paper.
Source: SSLA, Vol. 15, N.2, 1993, 264-265, Cambridge University Press
Reviewer: **Gail L. Riley** - Syracuse University.

42. **LANGUAGE PROCESSING IN BILINGUAL CHILDREN.** *Ellen Bialystok* (Ed.). Cambridge University Press. 1991. Pp. xiii + 238.
Source: SSLA, Vol 15, N. 4, 1993, Pp. 523-524, Cambridge University Press.
Reviewer: **Roger Everett** - Michigan State University.

43. **DISCOURSE AND LANGUAGE EDUCATION.** *Evelyn Hatch.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1992. Pp. xi + 333 $49.95 cloth $16.95 paper.
Source: SSLA, Vol. 15, N.1, 1993, 387-388, Cambridge University Press.
Reviewer: **Andrea Tyler-** University of Florida.

44. **SIMILAR LEXICAL FORMS IN INTERLANGUAGE.** *Batia Laufer-Dvorian.* Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag. 1991. Pp. x + 250. DM 124.
Source: SSLA, Vol. 15, N.1, 1993. 122-123, Cambridge University Press.
Reviewer: **Paul Meara** - University College Swansea.

45. **COMPETING DISCOURSES: PERSPECTIVE AND IDEOLOGY IN LANGUAGE.** *David Lee.* London: Longman. 1992. Pp. xii + 210.
Source: SSLA, Vol. 15, N. 1, 1993, 123-124, Cambridge University Press.
Reviewer: **Robert S. Burton** - Califonia State University -Chico.

46. **THE NATIVE SPEAKER IN APPLIED LINGUISTICS.** *Allan Davies.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1991. Pp. x + 181. $29.00.
Source: SSLA, Vol. 15, N. 1, 1993, Pp. 124-125, Cambridge University Press.
Reviewer: **David Birdsong** - University of Texas.

47. **SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION AND LANGUAGE PEDAGOGY.** *Rod Ellis.* Clevedon. UK: Multilingual Matters. 1992. Pp. iv+ 268. $89.00 cloth $ 36.00 paper.
Source: SSLA, Vol. 15, N. 3, 1993, Pp. 388-390, Cambridge University Press.
Reviewer: **Wendy Smith** - California State University, San Bernardino.

48. **AN INTRODUCTION TO SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION RESEARCH.** *Diane Larsen-Freeman and Michael H. Long.* London: Longman. 1991. Pp. xvii + 398.
Source: SSLA, Vol. 15, N. 3, 1993, 394-396. Cambridge University Press.
Reviewer: **India Plough** - Michigan State University.

49. **DEVELOPING COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE IN A SECOND LANGUAGE.** *Robin Scarcella, Elaine S. Andersen, and Stephen D. Krashen.* New York:Newbury House, 1990. Pp. xvii+ 356.
Source: SSLA, Vol. 14, N. 4, 1992, 472-473, Cambridge University Press.
Reviewer: **Laura Everett** - Michigan State University.

50. **FIRST LANGUAGE ATTRITION.** *Herbert W. Seliger and Robert M. Vago (eds).* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991. Pp. xviii + 259. $59.50 cloth. $22.95 paper.
Source: SSLA, Vol. 15, N.4, 1993, Cambridge University Press.
Reviewer: **Jeffrey T. Chamberlain** - George Mason University.

51. **CLAUS FAERCH and GABRIELE KASPER** (eds.): *Introspection in Second Language Research.* Multilingual Matters, 1987.
Source: Applied Linguistics, Vol. 10, N.3, 1989, 360-364. Oxford University Press.
Reviewer: **Rod Ellis**- Ealing College of Higher Education.

52. **KEITH JOHNSON.** *Communicative Syllabus Design and Methodology. Oxford: Pergamon, 1982. P p. x + 222.*
Source: Applied Linguistics, Vol. 5, N.2, 172-173, !98- Oxford University Press.
Reviewer: **J.P. B. Allen** - The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

53. **A. D. EDWARDS and D. P. G. WESTGATE:** *Investigating Classroom Talk.* Falmer Press, 1987.
Source: Applied Linguistics, Vol. 10, N.4, 1989, 447-448, Oxford University Press.
Reviewer: **Courtney B. Cazden** - Harvard University.

54. **BASIL HATIM and IAN MASON:** *Discourse and the Translator.* Longman, 1990.
Source: Applied Linguistics, Vol. 11, N.4, 1990, 401-402, Oxford University Press.
Reviewer: **Peter Newmark** - University of Surrey.

55. **TERENCE ODLIN:** *Language Transfer: Cross-Linguistic Influence in Language Learning.* Cambridge University Press., 1989.
Source: Applied Linguistics, Vol. 13, N. 1, 1992, 120-122, Oxford University Press.
Reviewer: **David Singleton** - Trinity College, Dublin.

56. **STEPHEN KRASHEN:** *Language Acquisition and Language Education.* Prentice Hall International, 1989.
Source: Applied Linguistics, Vol. 13, N.1, 1992, 123-125, Oxford University Press.
Reviewer: **Christopher Brumfit** - University of Southampton.

57. **WILLIAM E. RUTHERFORD:** *Second Language Grammar: Learning and Teaching.* Longman. 1987.
Source: Applied Linguistics, Vol. 13, N.2, 1992, 230-233, Oxford University Press.
Reviewer: **Mark Simblist** - University of Sidney.

58. **DAVID NUNAN:** *Designing Tasks for the Communicative Classroom.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1989.
Source: Applied Linguistics, Vol. 14, N.4, 1993, 442-445, Oxford University Press.
Reviewer: **Peter Robinson** - University of Hawaii at Manoa.

59. **KEES DE BOT, RALPH B. GINSBERG, and CLAIRE KRAMSCH (eds.)**: *Foreign Language Research in Cross-Cultural Perspective.* Amsterdam and Philadelphia. John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1991.
Source: Applied Linguistics, Vol. 14, N.4, 1993, 431-432, Oxford University Press.
Reviewer: **Bernard Spolsky** - Bar-Ilan University.

60. **ALLAN DAVIES:** *The Native Speaker in Applied Linguistics.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1991.
Source: Applied Linguistics, Vol. 14, N. 3, 1993, 316-317, Oxford University Press.
Reviewer: **Carl James** - University of Wales.

61. **HERBERT W. SELIGER and ELANA SHOHAMY:** *Second Language Research Methods.* Oxford University Press, 1989.
Source: Applied Linguistics, Vol. 13, N.3, 1992, 324-325. Oxford University Press.
Reviewer: **Bert Weltens** - University of Nijmegen.

62. **ROBIN SCARCELLA, ELAINE S. ANDERSEN, and STEPHEN D. KRASHEN** (eds.): *Developing Communicative Competence in a Second Language.* Newbury House, 1990.
Source: Applied Linguistics, Vol. 13, N.3, 1992, 322-323, Oxford University Press.
Reviewer: **Paul Bogaards** - Leiden University.

63. **TIM CAUDERY (ed.):** *New Thinking in TEFL.* Aarhus University Press. 1991.
Source: Applied Linguistics, Vol. 15, N.1, 1994, 107-109- Oxford University Press.
Reviewer: **Michael McCarthy** - University of Nottingham.

64. **ROD ELLIS:** *Second Language Acquisition and Language Pedagogy.* Multilingual Matters, 1991.
Source: Applied Linguistics, Vol. 15, N.1, 1994, 109-111, Oxford University Press.
Reviewer: **Ken Sheppard** - Center for Applied Linguistics.

65. **Computational Linguistics: An introduction.** Ralph Grishman. New York: Cambridge University Press. 1986. Pp. viii+ 193.
Source: TESOL Quarterly, Vol. 21, N.3, Sept. 1987. 556-558.
Reviewer: **Patricia Dunkel** - The Pennsylvania State University.

66. **Exploring Through Writing: A Process Approach to ESL Compositon.** Ann Raimes. New York: St. Martin's Press. 1987. Student's book pp. xiii+318; Instructor's Manual (In Instructor's Edition), Pp. 42.
Source: TESOL Quarterly, Vol. 22, N.1 March 1988.
Reviewer: **Melaine Schneider** - Ohio University.

67. **The Learner-Centred Curriculum: A Study in Second Language Teaching** *(Cambridge Applied Linguistics Series).* David Nunan. Cambridge:Cambridge University Press, 1988. Pp. xii+ 196.
Source: TESOL Quarterly, Vol. 24, N. 1, 1990, Pp. 95-98.
Reviewer: **Patt Rigg** - American Language and Literacy.

68. **Teaching and Learning Vocabulary.** I. S. P. Nation. New York: Newbury House, 1990. Pp. xi + 275.
Source: TESOL Quarterly, Vol. 25, N.4, 1991, Pp. 705-707.
Reviewer: **Marianne Celce-Murcia** - University of California, Los Angeles.

69. **Teaching and Learning Vocabulary.** I.S. P. Nation. New York: Newbury House, 1990. Pp. xi + 275.
Source: TESOL Quarterly, Vol. 25, N.4, 1991, Pp. 707-710.
Reviewer: **James Coady** - Ohio University.

70. **Process and Experience in the Language Classroom (Applied Linguistics and Language Study Series).** Michael Legutke and Howard Thomas. London: Longman. 1991. Pp. xv + 332.
Source: TESOL Quarterly, Vol. 26, N.3, 1992, Pp. 573-575.
Reviewer: **David Nunan** - Macquarie University, Australia.

71. **Developing Communicative Competence in a Second Language.** Robin C. Scarcella, Elaine S. Andersen, and Stephen D. Krashen (Eds.). New York: Newbury House. 1990. Pp. xviii+ 356.
Source: TESOL Quarterly, Vol. 26, N.3, 1992, Pp.576-578.
Reviewer: **Susan Fiskdal** - The Evergreen State College.

72. **RUTHERFORD, WILLIAM E.,** *Second Language Grammar: Learning and Teaching.* Hariow: Longman, 1987. 195pp., L6.95 (Applied Linguistics and Language Study Series).
Source:System, Vol. 17, N. 3, 1989, 426-428, Pergamon Press.
Reviewer: **Julian Edge**- English Language Research- Birmingham University.

73. **HEATON, J. B.,** *Writing English Language Test.* London and New York: Longman, 1988, 129pp., L6.50 (Longman Handbooks for Language Teachers).
Source: System, Vol. 18, N.1, 114-115, Pergamon Press, Great Britain.
Reviewer: **Grant Henning** - Senior Research Scientist.

74. **O'MALLEY, J. MICHAEL and CHAMOT, ANNA UHL.,** *Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1990. 260pp., L8.50 pbk. (The Cambridge Applied Linguistics Series).
Source: System, Vol. 19, N.3, pp. 322-323, 1991, Pergamon Press, Great Britain.
Reviewer: **Carl James** - Linguistic Department - University of Wales.

75. **SINGLETON, DAVID.,** *Language Acquisition: The Age Factor.* Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters, 1989, 323pp., L14.95/ $32.00.
Source: System, Vol. 19, N.4, pp. 475-477, 1991, Pergamon Press -Great Britain.
Reviewer: **Rebecca Oxford** - The University of Alabama- College of Education.

76. **KENNING, M. M. and KENNING, M. J.,** *Computers and Language Learning: Current Theory and Practice.* Chichester: Ellis Horwood Limited, 1990, 153pp., L18.75/$29.95 (Computers and their applications).
Source: System, Vol. 20, N.2, 1992, pp. 241-244, Pergamon Press, Great Britain.
Reviewer: **Mike Levy** - Bond University - Australia.

77. **OLLER, JOHN W. JR.,** *Language and Bilingualism: More Tests of Tests.* Cranbury, NJ: Bucknell University Press, 1991, 175pp., $29.50.
Source: System, Vol. 21, N.3, 1993, pp.400-405, Pergamon Press Ltd. Great Britain.
Reviewer: **Kyle Perkins** - Southern Illinois University.

78. **McALEESE, RAY** (ed.). *Hypertext: Theory into Practice.* Oxford/Norwood, NJ:Intellect Books, Blackwell Scientific Publications and Ablex Publishing Corporation, 1989, 175pp., $29.50.
Source: System, Vol. 20, N.2, pp.244-246, 1992, Pergamon Press - Great Britain.
Reviewer: **David Scarbrough** - City of London Polytecnic- Language Services Centre.

79. **PENNINGTON, MARTHA C.** (ed.). *Teaching Languages with Computers: The State of the Art.* La Jollia, CA: Athelstan Publications, 1989. 177pp., $12.50/L7.35.
Source: System, Vol. 18, N.3, 1990, pp. 379-382. Pergamon Press, Great Britain.
Reviewer: **Glyn Jones** - ELS - Davie's School of English - London.

80. **SELINKER, LARRY,** *Rediscovering Interlanguage.* London: Longman, 1992. 228pp., L11.99.
Source: System, Vol, 22, N. 1, 1994, pp. 119-122, Pergamon Press, Great Britain.
Reviewer: **Timothy Riney** - Department of English - International Christian University - Japan.

APPENDIX B

Table B -1 Distribution of moves in the 80 applied linguistics texts

MOVE	1	2	3	MOVE	1	2	3	MOVE	1	2	3
1	+	+	-	28	+	+	+	55	+	+	+
2	+	+	+	29	+	+	-	56	+	+	-
3	+	+	+	30	+	+	+	57	+	+	+
4	+	+	+	31	-	+	+	58	+	+	-
5	+	+	+	32	+	+	+	59	+	+	+
6	+	+	+	33	+	+	+	60	+	+	-
7	+	+	-	34	+	+	+	61	+	+	+
8	+	+	+	35	+	+	+	62	+	+	+
9	+	+	+	36	+	+	+	63	+	+	+
10	+	+	+	37	+	+	+	64	+	+	+
11	-	+	+	38	+	+	-	65	+	+	+
12	+	+	+	39	-	+	+	66	+	+	+
13	+	+	+	40	+	+	+	67	+	+	+
14	+	+	-	41	+	+	+	68	+	+	+
15	+	+	+	42	+	+	-	69	+	+	+
16	+	+	+	43	+	+	+	70	+	+	+
17	+	+	+	44	+	+	+	71	+	+	+
18	+	+	+	45	+	+	-	72	+	+	+
19	+	+	+	46	+	+	+	73	+	+	+
20	+	+	+	47	+	+	+	74	+	+	+
21	+	+	+	48	+	+	+	75	+	+	+
22	+	+	+	49	+	+	-	76	+	+	+
23	+	+	+	50	+	+	-	77	+	+	+
24	+	+	-	51	+	+	+	78	+	+	+
25	+	+	+	52	+	+	+	79	+	+	+
26	+	+	+	53	+	+	+	80	+	+	+
27	+	+	+	54	+	+	+				
N	**26**	**27**	**23**	**N**	**25**	**27**	**20**	**N**	**26**	**26**	**23**

Table B - 2 Distribution of Strategies appearing in BRs

MOVES	STRATEGIES	N	%
1	S1-Making topic generalizations	53	66..25
	S2- Claiming centrality	54	67.5
	S3 - Indicating the audience	20	25
	S4 - Informing the origin	19	23.27
	S5- Stating the aim	17	21.25
	S6- Referring to previous publications	10	12.5
2	S7- Describing the organization of the book	54	67.5
	S8- Reporting the content	80	100
	S9- Evaluating the book	73	91.25
	S10- Presenting suggestions	15	18.5
3	S11-Recommend-ing/disqualifying the book	77	96.25
	S12- Giving suggestions for future applications	5	6.25

Table B - 3 Frequency of Patterns in BRs (=80)

Book Reviews	N	%
Favourable	72	90
Unfavourable	8	10
TOTAL	80	100

APPENDIX C

Table C -1 Frequency of occurrence of potential U-nouns in BRs

U-NOUN	N	%	U-NOUN	N	%
problem	39	6.02	concern,	06	0.92
chapter	36	5.56	findings,		
way	31	4.79	impression,		
issue	23	3.55	message,		
approach, study	21	3.24	perspective, weakness		
fact	17	2.62	conclusion,	05	0.77
claim, view	16	2.47	factor,topic		
theme,question	15	2.31	suggestion, statement,		
point	14	2.16	strength, thesis		
attempt, idea assumption, discussion, aim, articles area, goal,	13	2.0	Characteristics,aspects, concept, contribution, procedures,	04	0.61
section features, focus, hypothesis, criticism, example,	11	1.70	position,, proposal, role, task, theory caveat,criteria, sub-	03	0.46
reason argument, category, difficulty, evidence, part,paper, principle, purpose	08 07	1.23 1.08	theme, treatment,insight emphasis, situation, implication assertion, activities, case,form, disappointment,matter, omission, job, plea, objective, involvement danger,term errors,end, model, case synthesis, stage	02	0.30
TOTAL	572	74.13	TOTAL	25	25.09
TOTAL	**OF**	**ITEMS**			**647**

Table C - 2 Candidates for Unspecific Nouns appearing in BRs

UNSPECIFIC NOUN	Frequency=1
allusion, allegation, anathema, appendix, basis, belief, boundary, cavil, competency, comprehensiveness, controversy, convention, construct, component, content, combination, classification, data, decision, distinction, dilemma, difference, disservice, drawback, domain, dichotomy, discrepancy, description, exposition, explanation, enquiry, facet, framework, formula, footnote, foundation, field, guideline, group, help, heart, impression, item, information, investigation, justification, lacuna, line, list, merit, method, mechanism, movement, notion, need, norm, nugget, opposition, orientation, observation, process, proviso, postulation, piece, passage, paradigm, quibble, reference, result, reservation, research, reasoning, slant, stance, spot, strategy, solution, structure, source, system, surprise, tendency, text, technique, trend, truth, thrust, vision, viewpoint, volume, word, worry.	
TOTAL	**92**

Table C - 3 Frequency of U-nouns according to the type of classification

CLASSIFICATION OF U-NOUNS	N	%
ILLOCUTIONARY	185	28.5
MENTAL PROCESS	138	21.3
RELATIONAL	40	6.1
TEXT	58	8.9
SUBTECHNICAL	127	19.6
EVALUATIVE	29	4.4
TOTAL	**647**	**99.6**
*Enumerables	70	10.8

Table C - 4 Frequency of modifiers for the U-nouns in BRs

TYPE	N	%
Ideational	95	11.8
Interpersonal	71	8.8
Textual	634	79.3
TOTAL	**800**	**99.9**

Table C - 5 List/Frequency of ideational modifiers appearing in BRs

IDEATIONAL MODIFIERS	**N**
MAIN	10
CENTRAL	6
MAJOR	5
GENERAL, THEORETICAL	4
BASIC, EXPLICIT, DISTINCTIVE, FUNDAMENTAL, PARTICULAR, PRINCIPAL	3
CRUCIAL, CONCLUDING, FINAL, LAST, MINOR, OWN, SIMILAR	2
ARBITRARY, ANCILARY, BIBLIOGRAPHICAL, CERTAIN, DUAL, CONTROVERSIAL, CURRENT, ADDITIONAL, DELIMITED, ESSENTIAL, EARLIER, EMPIRICAL, EXTENSIVE, GRAMMATICAL, GENERIC, INDIVIDUAL, INITIAL, IMPLICIT, INTEGRATIVE, KEY, LOGICAL, ORDERED, POTENTIAL, PREVIOUS, PEDAGOGICAL, PRIMARY, PHILOSOPHICAL, QUATERNARY, QUALITATIVE, RESTRICTED, SELECTIVE, ULTIMATE, UNIFYING, UNDERLYING	1
TOTAL	**95**

Table C - 6 List / frequency of interpersonal modifiers appearing in BRs

INTERPERSONAL MODIFIERS	**N**
GREATEST	4
IMPORTANT	7
INTERESTING, SERIOUS	3
POSSIBLE, POWERFUL, REASON - BLE, RIGOROUS, STRONG WEAK,	2
APPROPRIATE, BROAD, CLEARER, DISTURBING, DIFFICULT, DIFFERENT, FRESH, FORMIDABLE, GREAT, GOOD, LUCID, ILLUMINAT- ING, NAGGING, NOTEWORTHY, OBVIOUS, OBJECTIVE, NEW, PROBLEMATIC, RECENT, SENSIBLE, SIGNIFICANT, USEFUL, VITAL, VALUABLE, STARTLING, WELL- TESTED, WIDE-RANGING	1
TOTAL	**71**

Table C - 7 List/frequency of textual modifiers appearing in BRs

TEXTUAL MODIFIERS	**N**
THE, THIS	159
A, AN	42
THESE	76
GENITIVE	35
POSSESSIVE ADJECTIVE (his,her)	29
ANOTHER	17
TWO	20
THREE	15
OTHER	08
FOUR	07
ONE	09
SUCH	21
SOME, THIRD, A NUMBER OF	05
THAT, MANY	03
VARIOUS, SEVERAL, A FEW, FIVE, FIRST, SECOND	02
SIX, SEVEN, TEN	01
TOTAL	634

Table C - 8 Distribution of Specific Categories in the 80 reviews

CATEGORY OF SPECIFICS	N	%
CONTENT	309	47.7
TOPIC	84	7.4
EVALUATIVE	66	10.2
DISCOURSE SELF-REFERENCE	114	17.6
ENUMERATION	70	10.8
PURPOSE RELATION	40	6.1
TOTAL	647	99.8