GENRE ANALYSIS IN THE ACADEMIC WRITING CLASS: WITH OR WITHOUT CORPORA?

Viviana Cortes
Georgia University

1. INTRODUCTION

Writing for academic purposes and for scholarly publication is often challenging for novice writers since creating texts to report research studies while conveying the researchers' perspectives requires special attention and effort. An exception to the frequent misfortunes often retold by newcomers to academia can be found in an article by Matsuda (2003), which describes the author's experience on the road to become a published scholar while he was still a graduate student. Matsuda highlights how he learned that the importance of scholarly publication lies in the contribution that the writers intend to accomplish to their own academic communities and he emphasizes the need to focus on the purpose of that writing. Many non-native speakers of English who are newcomers to the writing of their academic disciplines fail to have such a positive and proactive attitude toward writing. They struggle with the new genres they face in their academic reading and writing assignments, failing to recognize the communicative purpose of their writing as well as the linguistic conventions and organization that characterizes different academic texts. This problem is often related to the lack of formal training on academic writing or to the core of the writing classes that are often offered for students to improve their academic skills.

The purpose of the present article is to introduce the design, implementation, and comparison of two genre-based English for academic writing classes created for international graduate students. One course was genre-based and corpus-based and the other was only genre-based. The foundation of the corpus-based class was the creation of a corpus of texts which are similar to those that learners are expected to write. This corpus would be analyzed by students to try to discover linguistic patterns and organizational conventions frequently used by published authors of Research Articles (RAs) in their

disciplines. Tribble (2002) affirmed that a corpus of these characteristics could provide learners with opportunities to draw generalizations on genre that they could eventually transfer to their own writing. Students' analyses of the corpus make use of techniques connected to Data-Driven Learning, or DDL (Johns, 1991). Through this type of techniques, students are guided to discover patterns in the language. At the same time, students explore language learning as schema-based restructuring (Bernardini, 2004), using corpora to observe and analyze linguistic conventions that are well established in their academic communities. In the traditional genre-based section of this course students analyzed a few hard copies of RAs following the same methodology used in the corpus-based course but without using any corpora or technology. Both courses were meant to raise students' awareness of the discourse organization of the RA, a genre chosen as the core for the analytical activities that students completed in both classes. Later, the written production of students in both classes was compared and students also completed a series of questionnaires and interviews that helped delineate the pros and cons of teaching academic writing with or without a language corpus.

The rest of the paper will be organized as follows. The next section will present the rationale for the design of these two courses and will provide a brief explanation for the use of corpora and the analysis of genre in the academic writing class. Section three will describe the research study that compared the corpus-based and the non-corpus based courses. Finally, section four will introduce implications derived from the findings of the study and suggestions for future research.

2. ADVANCED ACADEMIC WRITING: THE STATE OF THE ART IN AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES AND THE ISSUE OF DISCIPLINARITY

When International graduate students come to the United States to complete Master's or Doctoral programs, they often have very high English proficiency (Cortes, 2007). At the institution in which these new courses were created, a middle-size university in the Midwest of the United States, a minimum TOEFL score of 213 (230 for Economics) and high quantitative and verbal GRE scores (which vary across programs of study) are required for admission into different graduate academic programs. All new students whose first language is not English, however, take an academic language skill exam upon arrival to evaluate their proficiency at completing tasks that they will perform in academic settings. Many international graduate students often show a high level of English writing skills. Their writing, however, often needs improvement in the use of the linguistic and organizational conventions

of academic writing. These students are then placed in a required advanced academic writing class.

Several sections of this course are offered every semester. The original curriculum for this course, which was taught by professors, instructors, or graduate assistants, covered numerous genres: formal letters and memos, article and book reviews, conference abstracts, paper proposals, and, most importantly, the research report. This diversity of genres produced a very ambitious syllabus, which often resulted in lack of time to investigate and master each of those genres, considering that the materials and activities need to be covered in 14 weeks of two 80-minute weekly classes (the semester consists of 16 weeks but administrative tasks and a diagnostic test are completed in week 1, and week 16 is devoted to final exams). A large portion of the course focused on the investigation of the research report, for which the course was based on a textbook (Weissberg & Buker, 1990) as well as on class materials specially designed for the class. Course sections can have up to 20 students with varied first language backgrounds (Chinese, Korean, Portuguese, Russian, Turkish, and Spanish, among others) and from a wide variety of disciplines such as Engineering, Mathematics, Statistics, Physics, Biology, and Chemistry, to mention a few.

The course was offered in a traditional teaching setting for many years and it was always well received by students. In their course evaluation, students often expressed that even though the research reports in the textbook were rather dated and often belonged to the humanities, the class taught them to pay attention to the most salient aspects of academic writing. Cortes (2007) reported that some students, however, expressed concern regarding the course materials. Many students believed that in their disciplines researchers "do not write like this." Bhatia (2002) discussed important issues regarding discipline specificity. He stated that a genre often presents variation across disciplines. Differences in lexico-grammatical resources and rhetorical strategies are shown by different disciplines when expressing, for example, discipline-specific concepts, knowledge, and modes of conducting and reporting research. Bhatia's claim perfectly supports the frequent concerns of the students in the advanced academic writing class. The issues of genre-specificity and disciplinarity needed to become the core in the design of new advanced academic writing courses.

2.1. *With corpora: A corpus-based course for advanced academic writing*

In spite of the rough beginnings undergone by the relationship between corpora and pedagogy, the use of corpora in English for Specific Purposes

(ESP) and English for Academic Purposes (EAP) classes has become one of the latest points of interest for researchers and instructors in the field (Flowerdew, 2002; Tribble, 2002; Bernardini, 2004; Mishan, 2004; Swales, 2004). Several studies have stressed the advantages of informing classes with well-designed corpora (Tribble, 2002; Flowerdew, 2005). Flowerdew (2005), in her review of corpus and genre-based approaches to text analysis, highlights the importance of the identification of specific genres to be explored in the ESP/EAP class. In another study that reports pedagogical applications of language corpora, Lee and Swales (2005) stressed the benefits of creating and analyzing corpora in a course designed to help international doctoral students to improve their academic skills.

The design of a corpus-based course tried to take into consideration several issues on the analysis of a specific genre through corpora which have been covered in the literature. The objective of this new course was to help graduate students be better prepared to write an experimental RA, a task that they may find difficult and challenging but which is undoubtedly extremely necessary if they intend to become active members of their disciplinary communities. The ultimate objective of the new course was, however, to help students become analysts of the writing of their disciplines, guiding them on their analyses in order to raise awareness on different linguistic features and organizations typical of a genre for them to draw their own conclusions and to eventually use this method of analysis on other genres when the course was over. Flowerdew (1993) suggested that when students have to create a text in the target language in a genre they might not be familiar with, they should examine similar instances of that genre to try to discover "typical lexico-grammatical and discourse features unavailable in dictionaries or grammar books" (Flowerdew, 1993: 312). This was the foundation for the creation of this corpus-based and genre-based exploratory course. This new course used a twofold top-down/bottom-up approach to the analysis of the RA using a selection of reading materials that informs students of current studies in Applied Linguistics that analyze the writing of RAs in different disciplines, particularly studies that use Move-scheme (Swales, 1990; 2004). After getting acquainted with the findings of those studies, students test these findings in the writing of their own disciplines exploring a corpus of RAs that they collect themselves. The core of the course consists of thee important elements: a corpus made up of RAs, a user-friendly concordancing program, and a selection of reading materials extracted from studies in Applied Linguistics which report findings of the analyses of the different sections of the RA.

A corpus-based course designed around the analysis of corpora made up of samples of academic writing from students' own disciplines could to

a certain extent bridge the 'discipline-specificity' gap. Fox (1998) reported a study in which students and teachers in different disciplines collected and analyzed corpora to study discipline specific linguistic phenomena. In the newly-designed corpus-based course the first weeks of the semester are then devoted first to the collection of a corpus of RAs by students and the division of those articles into their most prominent sections (typically but not exclusively introduction, methodology, results, discussion and conclusion, and abstracts) and later to a series of corpus management exercises that help students become familiar with the concordancing computer software used for linguistic analysis and the methodology of analysis that they will use for the rest of the semester. Following Clapham's (2001) recommendation, which suggested that text topics and genre should be checked with specialists in the field, students surveyed professors in their area of specialization to retrieve the name of several journals or professional publications that may be considered good models of writing for students to analyze. The selected journals had to have an electronic version and, in addition, the university library had to subscribe to those publications[1]. The computer program selected for this class is Antconc (Anthony, 2008), which is free downloadable software. The articles that students collected together with the concordancer and the materials designed for the class were stored in a specially designed computer environment created in the lab used for this class. The minimum number of texts in the corpus collected by each student in this section of the class was twenty-five. Many students, however, collected corpora of forty or fifty research articles.

The use of corpora in the classroom has often been criticized because the pedagogical applications of corpora focused only on bottom-up procedures, that is, using concordances to identify frequent linguistic features in a particular text type and to analyze the limited sentence/s provided by the concordancer. Lynn Flowerdew (2005) explained that the disadvantages of such a bottom-up approach can be overcome by analyzing whole texts and studying lexico-grammatical features in the move structures in which they are used. For the new course bottom-up and top-down approaches were intertwined for students to better understand the writing organization and the linguistic conventions of RAs in their disciplines. Drawing on Mishan's (2004) distinction between inductive and deductive data-driven activities, using a bottom-up approach, the course included inductive activities using concordancing software. A top-down approach, on the other hand, was implemented by means of deductive

---

[1] The fact that all the texts in the corpus must belong to journals to which the University Library subscribes is essential to conform to the Copyright Act (section 18 (f)(4)).

activities that focused on selected readings, creating in that way a framework of reference to be compared with students' disciplinary corpora.

As of the third week in the semester and after a brief overview of the overall organization of the RA, the course focused on one section of the article at a time. Once the highlights of the section of the RA under analysis were presented by the instructor by means of a screen presentation and detailed explanations, students read the corresponding work file they copied and pasted in their computer environments for the daily activities. Students then engaged themselves in reading comprehension and corpus exploration activities. They finally worked on a series of exercises that, upon completion, were corrected on-line by the course instructor. After each article section was analyzed, students worked in small groups in an oral discussion in which they shared the findings they got and conclusions they drew on the writing of that specific section in their disciplines. These discussions provided students with insights on the writing in disciplines other than their own and with a better framework of comparison for their own analyses. Their final conclusions on the linguistic conventions, organization, and schema of communicative purposes of the sections of the RA in their disciplines were reflected in a final report that students wrote at home and handed in to their course instructor toward the end of the semester.

In addition to the class activities and final reports, students met with their instructors twice during the semester in previously scheduled private conferences. The first round of conferences was scheduled near midterm and, at this time, students and their instructor discussed writing process issues, research methodology reports, and prospects for the final project. For this final project, students were encouraged to work on the writing of a RA they might be writing for one of their disciplinary courses. In this way, students had the chance of transferring the findings of their analysis to the writing of their own research. These final projects were completed following a drafting technique: students were allowed to re-write their drafts of the different sections of their final papers, taking into account instructors' feedback and corrections to improve the writing quality of their final drafts. The second round of student conferences was held near the end of the semester and, at this time, students discussed the development of their final papers with their instructor, going over any difficulties they may be encountering in the process of preparing their final drafts.

2.2. *Without corpora: analyzing genre the traditional way*

On a given semester, a section of the corpus-based advanced academic writing class could not be assigned to a computer lab due to a scheduling conflict. That was the origin of the new curriculum for a traditional genre-based class. For this course, students followed the same procedure to identify the model texts they would analyze throughout the semester (consulting their major professors and other scholars in their academic programs) but this time, they had to bring to class the hard (paper) copies of four RAs that would become the core of their analyses. Students worked on these articles basing their analyses on the same materials used in the corpus-based class, which were provided by their instructor in paper copies. The progression for the analysis of the RA was the same in both courses as were the assignments students were expected to complete. When trying to identify linguistic tendencies, students read the articles over and over again, using highlighters and markers to bring things to their own attention. In addition, some writing activities that were frequently completed in class had to be handwritten by students in this section. It was interesting to note that some students confessed they found handwriting hard as they had almost completely lost the habit having become so dependent on computers for their writing. The student/teacher conferences were held following the same schedule planned for the corpus-based class and the final reports and final projects were based on the same assignment prompts for both classes.

3. THE COMPARATIVE STUDY

The purpose of comparing the writing of both classes was to check whether the amount of data and the methodology used for text analysis in each class could affect students' writing proficiency when they produced their own RAs. In addition, the study would compare students' perceptions towards the design of the course they were taking. The data came from three different sources. The production of students in a corpus-based class and a non-corpus class taught by the same instructor was collected and analyzed. The research papers submitted at the end of semester were analyzed and evaluated holistically by this researcher and the introduction sections of a group of RAs produced by students in each class was evaluated by five raters to compare student writing across course sections. In addition, students completed three questionnaires (at the beginning, in the middle, and near the end of the course) that reflected their perceptions on section of the course they were taking. Finally, three students from each course were interviewed during the final student conference meetings

near the end of the semester. It is necessary to point out here that the students in each of these classes did not know of the existence of a similar course that was taught with a slightly different curriculum (technology setting vs. traditional setting).

3.1. *Students' previous knowledge on genre and corpora: Questionnaire 1 (Course beginning)*

The aim of having students complete this questionnaire was to obtain basic information about students' previous experience in academic writing. As shown in Table 1, the questionnaire revealed that the corpus-based class had more doctoral students than the non-corpus class, which had more Master's students. This difference also produced logical consequences in students' previous experience with academic writing in general and with the writing of RAs in their native languages in particular, as many PhD students had written some RAs reporting their MA theses studies but often these articles had been written in students' first languages. Students' experience with RA writing in English was low in both courses. Students in the corpus-based class could provide more information on the organization of the RA and the sections that these articles usually present in their disciplines. Moreover, these students could identify that the most important issues in the writing of the RA were directly connected to the organization and purpose of this type of writing, while students in the traditional setting focused more on the importance of strategies for the presentation of data and methodologies and on the saliency of appropriate grammar usage. All the students in the corpus-based class reported they had no previous experience with corpora or concordancers.

TABLE 1. Answers to questionnaire 1

Questionnaire #1	Corpus-based setting	Traditional setting
Number of students	14	14
Program of studies	23% MA-MS 77%Ph D	67% MA-MS 33%Ph D
Experience with RA in L1	83%	42%
Experience with RA in English	42%	30%
Identify RA sections	85%	42%

Questionnaire #1	Corpus-based setting	Traditional setting
Importance of writing RAs	25% discussion of findings 33% general organization of paper 33% discipline-specific vocabulary 9% other	45% data presentation and formulae 51% grammar and language issues 4% other
Previously worked with a corpus	0%	
Previously worked with concordancer	0%	

3.2. *Half-way there: Questionnaire 2*

The second questionnaire was administered to both classes near the middle of the semester, in week 8. Table 2 presents a summary of students' answers to questionnaire 2. Students in both classes perceived they had gained new knowledge on the RA and they believed that this knowledge could help them with their academic reading and could eventually be transferred to their own writing. All students believed they had learned the scheme for writing the first sections of the RA after analyzing the texts in their disciplinary corpora. Students suggested they would like to share their findings in groups more often, in order to compare different organizations and language conventions they may have discovered across disciplines. Before this questionnaire, class discussion was limited and students' suggestions were taken into consideration for more frequent discussions conducted in the second part of the semester. Students in the corpus-based class were also asked to evaluate the use of the corpus and the concordancer and all students in this class found both helpful.

TABLE 2. Answers to Questionnaire #2 (mid-term)

Questionnaire #2	Corpus-based setting	Traditional setting
Number of students	14	14
Learned new things about RA's	100%	100%
New knowledge will help with reading	100%	100%

Questionnaire #2	Corpus-based setting	Traditional setting
New knowledge could be transferred to writing	100%	100%
What do you think you learned from this class so far?	RA's organization Linguistic conventions of initial sections of RA	Organization and discipline specific language conventions
Needs improvement	More varied corpora	More class discussion
Suggestions for second part of the semester	More class discussion Peer review	Better slides for overhead projector
Corpus perceived as helpful	100%	
Concordancer perceived as helpful	93%	

3.3. *End of the semester feedback: Questionnaire 3*

Near the end of the semester, students were asked questions regarding the materials they worked with in their class, as shown in Table 3. Students in the corpus-based class sometimes thought they would like to work with larger corpora for the linguistic features they surveyed with the concordancer, but they realized that it would not be possible to work with larger corpora on the analysis of the moves in the sections. Some students reported that the corpora they had collected were too large for this type of exercises, and they would have liked to have more time to survey all the articles in search of patterns in each move schema. 93% of the students in each class thought they would recommend this class to other international students who needed it. The students in the traditional setting class thought that analyzing only four papers was very limiting because there was no room for any generalizable findings in their analysis. In addition, when they were asked whether they had thought of analyzing any online articles that they could be reading for other classes looking for moves, 61% of students said they had thought about it, but had not analyzed any online RAs, and 53% reported they had analyzed more hardcopies of articles other than the four they had selected for their class.

TABLE 3. Answer to questionnaire 3.

Questionnaire #3	Corpus-based setting	Traditional setting
Concerns/comments	45% too many papers to analyze 55% too little time for analysis	69% found sample for analysis was too small 31% sample was big enough
Recommend the class	92%	93%
Class score (1 very satisfied to 4 very dissatisfied)	1,3	1,5
Suggestions for future sections	No major suggestions	No major suggestions
Did you think of using online papers to complete your analysis?		61% never thought of using online papers
Used more papers than the 4 in the sample		53% analyzed more papers (not online)
Would you take this class in computer lab?		53% no benefit in having class in computer lab 47% computers could help with grammar and spelling

3.4. *Holistic evaluation of final papers*

Final articles were evaluated holistically using a scoring rubric adapted from Stoller, Horn, Grabe, & Robinson (2005). The results of this comparison did not present any significant difference (attested by a t-test). Over a total of 25 points, the average of the scores of the articles corrected in the corpus-based class was 23.2, while in the non-corpus class, the average was 22.7. Most articles presented an organization that resembled the scheme presented in class or reported by students as frequently used in the articles they analyzed in their corpora.

3.5. *Rating group evaluation of introductions*

For the second part of the writing assessment a sub-group of 10 introductions of the papers corrected holistically was randomly chosen to be evaluated (5 from each course). Only introductions were selected because these sections

are considered the most homogeneous sections in the RA throughout the disciplines (Swales, 1990). This evaluation was conducted by a group of 5 raters (four professors in the English department, three from the Applied Linguistics program and one from the Rhetoric and Composition program, and one teaching assistant, a PhD student), who had taught this class corpus-based or with the previously used syllabus. All evaluators went through a rating session in which they were exposed to the same materials that students reviewed and analyzed in their classes on the move scheme organization and linguistic features frequently found in RA introductions and for which they practiced using the four-point rubric adapted from Stoller et al. (2005) (see Appendix A). The rating group presented a moderate inter-rater reliability (.71). The results of the chi square conducted for this comparison presented no significant difference: over a total of 4 points the corpus-based class averaged 2.48, while the non-corpus-class averaged 2.4.

3.6. *Students' opinions at large: Interviews*

Three students from each of these classes were interviewed at the end of the semester. Students expressed that they were very satisfied with the class and that they had found the class very useful for the analysis of writing in their disciplines, feeling confident that they could transfer their findings to their own writing. The students in the corpus-based class were asked their opinion on the use of technology and they were also asked to think about the possibility of taking the same class in a traditional environment. Students affirmed they felt very comfortable with the use technology in this class and they were very happy with the new skills they had acquired in the use of the concordancer that they perceived as a tool they could continue using to analyze writing in the future. Regarding the possibility of a non-corpus-based class, students found it hard to believe that a class like this could function successfully. They thought that revising the articles in hard copies would be very uncomfortable and limiting and also they were concerned about the amount of handwriting they would have to do. On the other hand, students in the non-corpus class were asked about the possibility of taking this class in a lab with a collection of articles, and some computer programs that could help in the process. Two of the students stated that they could not picture a class like this one taught in a computer lab, but they affirmed that having a spellchecker in the computer could be an asset. The third student from the non-corpus class, an instructional technology PhD student, quickly described a course design that perfectly matched the corpus-based class and followed up his description with a list of pros and cons that were, in fact, foreseeing the results of the comparison

reported in this article. He also commented that some time during the course he could picture a class like the one he was taking but taught in the computer lab and with many writing samples to analyze. This was not a surprising answer from this student as the design of this type of instruction was part of his area of specialization.

4. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In spite of the fact that the gains presented by the writing samples evaluated did not show any differences across course sections, students in both classes were satisfied with the genre-specificity and disciplinarity that were the foci of these courses. Moreover, the final papers reflected that students in both classes were on the way to master the organization of the RA that they had discovered in their classes.

The use of the concordancer and the corpus in the corpus-based class could have been an obstacle in the acquisition of this new knowledge on the RA, as it takes time for students to collect the corpus and become acquainted with the new method of analysis but the results of the comparison show that this did not happen. The use of the corpus and the corpus-based tools resulted in new skills that students acquired and could eventually keep on using once the semester was over. Undoubtedly, the students in the non-corpus class could have benefitted from the use of the computers in the lab but they also produced writing that mirrored the organization and linguistic conventions used in their disciplines that they had acquired in this course.

The corpus-based class has been taught on several semesters since first implemented in 2005. Later sections of this course have experimented with different genres, introducing the same methodology of analysis on what Swales (2004) calls a "minor genre" (i.e., book reviews). Students collect a corpus of books reviews (and in some disciplines, article reviews) and they work on materials designed specifically to analyze this type of texts (Motta-Roth, 1998). Later in the semester, students transfer this methodology to the analysis of RAs like in the pilot class. Using the same methodology in more than one genre in their disciplines provides students with extended practice in the analysis of texts that have very different communicative purposes and different organization.

The corpus-based course has been shown to be very popular among students from a wide variety of disciplines and quite successful in helping students analyze the writing of their disciplines to use their findings as a foundation for their own research writing. It was undoubtedly positive to hear students tell their instructor that they have been using the concordancer to look for

certain linguistic features outside their classes, or that they continued using the concordancers in their home computers to survey any other writing after the course was over. These course designs, however, were never adopted for all the sections offered at the university. New teaching methodologies are not massively spread out in a short period of time: it takes time and more studies that analyze them to convince administrators and instructors who might not be too inclined towards new methods or technologies of the advantages of this type of classes.

REFERENCES

Anthony, L. (2008): *Antconc 3.2.1.* Software.
Bhatia, V. (2002): "A generic view of academic discourse". *In:* J. Flowerdew (ed.), *Academic discourse*. London: Longman, Pearson Education, 21-39.
Bernardini, S. (2004): "Corpora in the classroom: An overview and some reflections on future development". *In:* J. Sinclair (ed.), *How to use corpora in language teaching*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins,15-36
Clapham, C. (2001): "Discipline specificity and EAP". *In:* J. Flowerdew & M. Peacock (eds.), *Research perspectives in English for Academic Purposes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 84-100.
Cortes, V. (2007): "Genre and corpora in the English for academic writing class". *ORTESOL Journal* 25, 9-16.
Flowerdew, J. (1993): "An educational, or process approach to the teaching of professional genres". *ELT Journal* 47 (4): 305-316.
Flowerdew, L. (2002): "Corpus based analyses in EAP". *In:* J. Flowerdew (ed.), *Academic discourse*. London: Longman, Pearson Education, 95-114.
Flowerdew, L. (2005): "An integration of corpus-based and genre-based approaches to test analysis in EAP/ESP: countering criticisms against corpus-based methodologies". *English for Specific Purposes* 24 (3): 321-332.
Fox, G. (1998): "Using corpus data in the classroom". *In:* B. Tomlison (ed.), *Materials development in language testing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 25-43
Johns, T. (1991): "Should you be persuaded: Two examples of data-driven learning". *In:* T. Johns & P. King (eds.), *Classroom Concordancing, ELR Journal* 4, 1-16.
Lee, D. & J. Swales (2006): "A corpus-based EAP course for NNS doctoral students: Moving from available corpora to self-compiled corpora". *English for Specific Purposes* 25 (1): 56-75.

Matsuda, P. K. (2003): "Coming to voice: Publishing as a graduate student". *In:* C. Pearson Casanave & S. Vandrick (eds.), *Writing for scholarly publication*. Mahwah/London: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates, 39-51

Mishan, F. (2004): "Authenticating corpora for language learning: A problem and its solution". *ELT Journal* 58, 219-227.

Motta-Roth, D. (1998): "Discourse analysis and academic book reviews: a study of text and disciplinary cultures". *In:* I. Fortanet (ed.), *Genre studies in English for academic* purposes. Castellon de la Plana: Universitat Jaume I, 29-58.

Swales, J. (1990): *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Stoller, F. L., Horn, B., Grabe, W. & Robinson, M. S. (2005): "Creating and validating assessment instruments for a discipline-specific writing course: An interdisciplinary approach". *Journal of Applied Linguistics* 2 (1): 75-104.

Tribble, C. (2002): "Corpora and corpus analysis". *In:* J. Flowerdew (ed.), *Academic discourse.* London: Longman, Pearson Education, 131-14.

Weissberg, R. & Buker, S. (1990): *Writing up research: Experimental research report writing for students of English.* Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

APPENDIX A. EVALUATION RUBRIC
(ADAPTED FROM STOLLER *ET ALII*, 2005)

Score	Description
1	All moves are present, fully developed, in a logical sequence. No extra moves are present. Wording is clear and concise. Level of detail, writing style, and formality are appropriate for an expert and/or scientific audience. Few, if any, errors are made in the use of academic conventions. Few, if any, grammatical or mechanical errors are present.
2	All moves are present, but one move is out-of-sequence or has minor problems. No extra moves are present. Wordiness and/or errors in level of detail, style, or formality occur in a handful of instances. A handful or errors are made in the use of academic conventions. A handful of grammatical or mechanical errors are present.
3	All moves are present, but a few have minors problems or are out-of-sequence. Extra moves may be present. Wordiness and/or errors in level of detail, style, or formality are noticeable and, at times, distracting. Errors in academic conventions are noticeable and, at times, distracting. Grammatical and mechanical errors are noticeable and, at times, distracting.
4	One move is missing or underdeveloped. Moves may be out-of-sequence; extra moves may be present. Wordiness and/or errors in level of detail, style, or formality are frequent and regularly distracting. Errors in academic conventions are frequent and make the writing appear unprofessional. Grammatical and mechanical errors are frequent and limit the reader's ability to understand the material.