

**Discourse reflexivity: genre analysis of phd linguistics
research proposals**



Lubna khan

(15018084009)

MPhil Applied Linguistics

**A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
MPhil in Applied Linguistics**

**Department of English Language and Literature
School of Social Sciences and Humanities
University of Management and Technology, Lahore**

2018

Abstract

This is both an explanatory and exploratory study to find and investigate reflexivity in the PhD research proposals. This study particularly targets the proposals of SGC (School Graduate Committee) level in Applied Linguistics, in Lahore, Pakistan, to emphasize the importance of MMs (metadiscourse markers) in the creation of interpersonal rather than intrapersonal research proposals. Two sub questions of the study are: to what extent the inclusion of interactive MMs inform the writing of PhD Research Proposals? And How PhD researchers guide, negotiate and convince their readers by using interactional MMs?. These have been answered by doing quantitative analysis of three research proposals and qualitative analysis of the postal questionnaires (being asked from the research students of the respective proposals) and semi-structured interviews (being asked from the respective supervisors). Although there was very less use of interactional metadiscourse markers in the data and scientific tradition of research writing have been followed mostly, yet idiosyncrasies (breaking away from expected practice) have been found during the analysis, which showed some elasticity and transfer towards reflexivity. This study is very significant not only for MPhil and PhD Students but also for their supervisors since it focuses on the substantial use of MMs (metadiscourse markers) in the construction of a reflexive and interpersonal research proposal. This study specifically suggests the research students to employ the changing trends in their ESL research writing. Moreover, it aims to encourage ESL teachers/supervisors to provide explicit feedback to their ESL students, about the effective use of MMs (metadiscourse markers) in their research writings.

Dedication

I dedicate this thesis to my Parents who brought me up to this position and invested their best on me.

Acknowledgements

I owe a deep gratitude to my Chairman, Dr. Muhammad Shaban Rafi and my supervisor Dr. Nadia Anwar, who made this research possible. I pay special thanks to my supervisor for being a driving force behind my study. Her forceful backing, insightful comments and knowledgeable advice, guided me in the right direction. I will always be grateful for her endless patience and invaluable remarks.

I would also like to thank my family and friends for their continuous support, prayers and best wishes during the whole duration of this research – my little girls, Dua and Shaza, who had to play and spend most of their leisure time without me, my husband (Nosherwan Khan Adil), who had to take care of kids during my study hours and provided me free rides to the campus. I am indebted to my Friends, especially Ayesha, who encouraged me and pushed me on regular basis, to finish this thesis. Moreover, she rejuvenated my spirits with her company when they were at their lowest.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Overview	1
1.2. A Brief Introduction to the Topic	1
1.2.1. English for Academic Purposes (EAP) VS English as a Second Language (ESL)	2
1.2.2. ESL Writing Challenges at Tertiary/postgraduate Level in Pakistan	3
1.2.2.1. Lack of Mastery in Academic Writing Conventions	3
1.2.2.2. Lack of Mastery in Genre Specific Writing Conventions	4
1.2.2.3. Lack of Regular Feedback	4
1.2.3. Objectivity, Subjectivity and Inter-Subjectivity in Research	5
1.2.4. Research Writing at Higher Education Institutions of Pakistan	7
1.2.5. What is Metadiscourse?	9
1.2.6. Importance of Audience/Readers in Research	10
1.3. Rationale of the Research	11
1.4. Significance of the Research	12
1.5. Objectives of the Study	13
1.6. Research Questions of the Study	13
1.7. Summary	14
Chapter 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	15
2.1. Overview	15

2.2. Main Types of Discourse	15
2.2.1. Narration	15
2.2.2. Description	16
2.2.3. Exposition	16
2.2.4. Poetic discourse	16
2.2.5. Persuasion/ Rhetoric	16
2.3. Discourse VS Metadiscourse	17
2.4. Summary of the Background Work	20
2.4.1. Time Span and Geographical Distribution of the Previous Work	20
2.4.2. Narrow VS Broad Approaches of Metadiscourse	21
2.5. Prominent Models of Metadiscourse	22
2.6. Research Studies Based on Hyland’s Interpersonal Model of Metadiscourse	29
2.6.1. Studies on Essay Composition	30
2.6.2. Comparative Studies of L1 and L2 with Reference to Metadiscourse	31
2.6.3. Studies across Varied Disciplines	33
2.6.4. Studies Done in the Iranian Context	36
2.6.5. Research Studies Based on Thesis/Dissertations	38
2.7. An Exploratory Study on Research Proposals	41
2.8. Summary	42
Chapter 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	43
3.1. Overview	43

3.2. Settings and Nature of the Study	43
3.2.1. Population of the Study	43
3.2.2. Research Data (Research proposal as a Specialized Genre)	44
3.2.3. Sample and Sampling	45
3.2.4. Nature of the Study	47
3.3. Theoretical Underpinning	48
3.3.1. Approach of the Study (Genre Analysis as an Approach to Content Analysis)	48
3.3.2. Hyland's Model of Metadiscourse as an Analytical Tool	50
3.4. Research Instruments	53
3.4.1. A Questionnaire	53
3.4.2. Semi-Structured Interviews	54
3.5. Validity and Reliability	54
3.6. Ethical Considerations	55
3.7. Summary	56
Chapter 4: DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS	57
4.1. Overview	57
4.2. Discussion on the Basis of Manual Analysis of Research Proposals	57
4.2.1. Comparison of Interactive Metadiscourse Markers	58
4.2.1.1 Transitions	59

4.2.1.2. Frame Markers	60
4.2.1.3. Endophoric Markers	62
4.2.1.4. Evidentials	63
4.2.1.5. Code glosses	63
4.2.2. Comparison of Interactional Metadiscourse Markers	64
4.2.2.1. Hedges	64
4.2.2.2. Boosters	65
4.2.2.3. Attitude Markers	66
4.2.2.4. Self-mentions	67
4.2.2.5. Engagement Markers	68
4.3. Key Findings	68
4.4. Qualitative Analysis of Questionnaires	69
4.4.1. Pragmatic Interpretation of RM1	70
4.4.2. Pragmatic Interpretation of RA2	71
4.4.3. Pragmatic Interpretation of RS3	71
4.5. Pragmatic Interpretation of the Supervisors' Interviews	72
4.6. Summary	75
Chapter 5: CONCLUSION	76
5.1. Overview	76
5.2. Conclusion and Pedagogical Implications	76
5.3. Delimitations of the Study	78

5.4. Recommendations for Research Students and Supervisors	78
5.5. Some Suggestions for Future Researchers	79
5.6. Summary	79
REFERENCES	80-90
APPENDICES	91- 105
Appendix I: Categories and sub-categories in the Analytic scheme of Metadiscourse in the Narrow Approach	91
Appendix II: Research Information Sheets	92
Appendix IIA: Research information sheet – (Chairman Department of English Language and Literature)	92-94
Appendix IIB: Research information sheet- Research Participants (PhD supervisors)	95-97
Appendix IIC: Research information sheet - Research Participants (PhD Students)	98-100
Appendix III: Informed consent forms	101-103
Appendix IIIA: Informed consent form: HOD (DELL department)	101
Appendix IIIB: Informed consent form: Research Participants (PhD Supervisors)	102
Appendix IIIC: Informed consent form: Research Participants (PhD students)	103
Appendix IV: Questionnaire form for PhD students	104-106
Appendix V: Semi-structured interview for PhD supervisors	107
Appendix VI: List of 400 Lexical items (Hyland, 2005, pp. 218-224)	108-114

List of Tables

Table. 2.1 Functions of metadiscourse in academic texts (Hyland, 1998, p.442)	26
Table. 2.2 An Interpersonal Model of Metadiscourse (Hyland & Tse 2004, p. 169; Hyland, 2005. P. 49)	28
Table 2.3. Metadiscourse in Postgraduate Dissertations (per 10,000 words)	39
Table. 3.1. Demographic Information of the Research Participants	47
Table 3.2. Categories and Sub-categories of Interactive Metadiscourse Markers	51
Table 3.3. Categories and Subcategories of Interactional Metadiscourse	52
Table 4.1. Frequency and Percentage Counts of all MMs in the Research Proposals	58

List of Figures

Figure 3.1: Cross-fertilization of genre analysis with other theoretical and analytical frameworks	50
Figure 4.1: Questionnaire Result of RM1 in the form of Bar chart	70
Figure 4.2: Questionnaire Result of RA2 in the form of Bar chart	71
Figure 4.3: Questionnaire Result of RS3 in the form of Bar chart	72

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Overview

This chapter introduces the topic of the research while providing a few glimpses of academic writing practices in Pakistan. This introductory chapter will also outline the purpose, rationale and significance of this research, particularly in our context. Moreover, the research objectives and the research questions give a clear