



Facultat de Psicologia, Ciències
de l'Educació i de l'Esport Blanquerna
Universitat Ramon Llull

Writing academic texts: organization and structure, authorial voice and intertextuality

Montserrat Castelló; Gerardo Bañales; Anna Iñesta & Norma Vega

Graduate School of Psychology. Blanquerna. Ramon Llull University.

Barcelona

Course 2009- 2010



Writing academic texts: organization and structure, authorial voice and intertextuality by [Montserrat Castelló; Gerardo Bañales; Anna Iñesta & Norma Vega](#) is licensed under a [Creative Commons Reconocimiento-NoComercial-SinObraDerivada 3.0 Unported License](#).

Writing academic texts: organization and structure, authorial voice and intertextuality¹

This document refers to those aspects and resources that we need to know and be able to use when writing an academic text. Its contents are organized in three sections: the first one refers to the organization of information, that is, to those issues that relate to the structure of the text, the sections that the paper should have, the information to be included in each section and how each of these sections must be written. The second section examines when and how the author should make him/herself visible, which resources are used to make his/her own position clear and also prevent the text from sounding little academic or impersonal. Finally, the third section refers to some resources used to engage the readers and to make proper use of citations.

1. The structure of an empirical research article

Generally speaking, the empirical research article can be said to follow a pretty fixed structure. Please find below some information regarding the most common sections in these texts.

1.1. The title

The title is an essential aspect of the research article. One of its main functions is to frame what we want to explain in the text. Moreover, the conciseness of the title should not limit its informative potential, so every word must provide specific information. In addition, when choosing the words of the title, we must be aware that they belong to the appropriate referential universe so that the reader can situate the work presented in the appropriate research field. Finally, in an age in which one of the main sources for article search are Internet search engines, the words in the title become crucial.

¹ This document is published and can be accessed on-line at: Castelló, M.; Bañales, G., Iñesta, A y Vega, N. (2009). *Escriure textos acadèmics: organització i estructura, posicionament de l'autor i relacions amb d'altres texts i autors.*

http://www.sinte.es/joomla_cast/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=22&Itemid=47



Generally speaking, the titles of research articles typically include a first part including the concepts / theme and a second part, after a period (".") or colon (":"), which includes some detail of the empirical work and / or the specific problem studied (eg. *Emotional variables and schizophrenia: an analysis of the relationship between self-esteem and disorder in adolescents*)

1.2. *The abstract*

The abstract is one of the most specific conventions of the academic genre and especially of academic research papers. Its function is to help readers identify articles that may be relevant to their own reflection. Duke (2000, p.85) defines abstracts as "a shortened version of the content accurate and the most important article," and distinguishes two types: the *descriptive abstract* and the *informative abstract*. The former describes what the study is about without referring to the method, results or conclusions. The informative abstract, on the other hand, does refer to these issues and, in fact, is the most common and recommended of the two. The length of abstracts may vary depending on the journal but it typically moves between 150 and 250 words. Its structure, according to the American Psychological Association (from now on APA) rules, must include information regarding the introduction, method, results and conclusions (IMRC).

1.3. *The introduction*

The Introduction is one of the most important sections of the research article and of any research project. Firstly because, as with any written text, the beginning (opening) determines how the reader will approach its content. Another of the reasons that account for the importance of this section is that this is where authors show their knowledge of the field, as well as their conceptual alignments with the dominant scientific discourses. Finally, the Introduction is also where authors should make explicit their (alleged) contribution to the professional literature on the subject analyzed (Nihalani and Mayrath, 2008, p.33).

From the perspective of social discourse, Swales (1990, 2004) proposes the Create a Research Space (CARS) model for the analysis of the Introduction which can be of use when we have to write this section. According to this model (Swales, 2004, p.230),

introductions tend to be arranged in three movements² or steps that, as we shall see, aim at achieving the recommendations that we just mentioned:

- *Movement 1: Establishing a territory*

The first movement is intended to make readers aware of the relevance of the research area which the study presented belongs to. This objective is fulfilled by including generalizations about the topic, which gain specificity as the introduction progresses. One of the major characteristics of this first movement is that it is obligatory to refer to other authors and, therefore, to include citations. In this sense, Swales (1990, p.148) distinguishes between *integrated citations*, in which the researcher's name appears as an integrating element in the quoting sentence, and *non-integrated citations*, where the cited authors appear in parentheses or is otherwise referred to (eg through footnotes). We will analyze in detail the differences between these different forms of citation in a following section.

Therefore, in this first movement, the topic and the general concepts involved are presented.

- *Movement 2: Establishing a research niche*

The aim of this second movement is to situate the study itself in relation to the relevance of the research field established in the previous movement. The aim of this second movement is fulfilled when we indicate a gap in the research field (Step 1A), or when we add something to the existing knowledge about a phenomenon (step 1B). Optionally, we can also present positive proof concerning the relevance of research topic (Step 2).

At this point, Swales (1990, p.155) directs our attention to the manner in which the authors make the existence of a gap in the corresponding field clear. In this regard, the author stresses that the vast majority of linguistic indicators suggest that this movement does not entail the open denial, but rather they use more indirect modalities such as quasi-negative or negative quantifiers (*no, little, neither... nor...*), the negation using a lexical verb (*forgotten, ignored*), adjectives (*incomplete,*

² In the field of genre analysis, the concept of "movement" refers to a discursive or rhetoric unit that performs a coherent communicative function within an oral or written discourse. It is, therefore, a functional rather than a formal unit that can be instantiated as a sentence or as a paragraph (Swales, 2004, p.228-229).

misguided), names (*lack, limitation*), and still other expressions (*without taking into account...*). The intention behind this language use is reinforced by the use of inclusive “we”, which is presented as a subject in most of the sentences aimed at pointing towards the research gap. Finally, Swales notes that in this second movement of the introduction, reference to other authors would be possible but not mandatory.

- *Movement 3: Occupying the niche*

In the third movement, authors explain how they will deal and defend the specific gap identified earlier. This is achieved by following a mandatory step in this movement which can translate into two modalities: to present the objectives of the study (Step 1A) or to present the study itself (step 1B). Lack of reference to previous studies and the use of deictic markers (eg *this, this paper, see below*) mark the beginning of this movement. Precisely, Swales alerts (1990, p.160), the delay in the use of such deictic signals become a symptom of lack of experience as an academic writer.

Finally, once the introduction is finished it is also possible a) to present the research questions or hypotheses (Step 2), b) to include clarifications regarding conceptual definitions (Step 3), c) to summarize the characteristics of the research methods used (Step 4), d) to announce the main results of the study (Step 5), e) to emphasize the relevance of the study (step 6), and f) to advance the structure of the paper (Step 7).

Swales (1990, p.158; 2004, p.230) also suggests that movements 1 and 2 can be recursive, above all in the case of extense and detailed literature reviews, or in the case of conceptual articles.

According to what we just said, there should be at least two major ways of organizing the Introduction.

In the first of these possible ways to organize the introduction, we would begin by broadly establishing the territory (or the topic) and then, in this first moment, we would review the previous studies conducted on this territory (or topic). This review would end up announcing a gap, a problem or an issue that is not sufficiently clear or has not been (sufficiently) researched into/analyzed. This would be, in fact, the second step or

movement of the introduction. Finally, in a third movement we would present the objectives of our research study.

In the second way to organize an introduction, we would also begin by broadly establishing a territory, but we would quickly move on to the second movement, announcing that our interest focuses on solving a gap, problem or issue that is not sufficiently clear or has not been (sufficiently) investigated/analyzed, that is, we would rapidly establish (for example, in a second paragraph) the research niche. We would then review the previous studies on the topic, only focusing on those which are centrally relevant to solve our problem. The selection of the literature to be reviewed would thus be made from the niche, in such a way that avoiding having to discuss all that has been done and focusing, instead, on what is truly relevant, prevents the review from becoming too descriptive. Indeed, when we write a literature review we must not just describe what other authors have learned about the topic / gap, we must also argue or discuss how the studies conducted are helpful or not, if they provide complementary ideas, allow us to make our niche more specific. Finally, in a third movement we would present our research objectives, which, logically, would naturally follow the arguments presented in the review.

All movements of the Introduction, as Teberosky (2007, p.29) reminds us, have a markedly intertextual character since the focus of attention is placed on the other authors with whom one establishes a dialogue. In turn, Padilla (2005) states that in order to ensure a constructive dialogue in the introduction, one should consider the rules for a critical discussion:

1. Defend your own point of view by presenting an argument that is related to that point of view and not with any other
2. Do not misrepresent the proposals of other authors at your convenience when these need to be questioned, but refer to the point of view that these authors actually present
3. Do not use formulations that are insufficiently clear, confusing or ambiguous

1.4. *The method*

It is well known that the main objective of the method is to explain the readers the steps followed to conduct the study. The information provided should be sufficiently detailed so as to ensure that the reader gets an image of integrity of the author and, if necessary, so as to allow other researchers to replicate the study.

Regarding the development of paragraphs in this section, most of them are independent paragraphs devoted to the different parts or aspects of the procedure for collecting and analyzing the data. It must be noted, however, that this does not prevent this section from having a strong argumentative component, given that its goal is to make the seriousness of the work done clear so that the readers trust the results and the conclusions presented (Padilla, 2005, 129). The idea is to show that the methodological options chosen are appropriate and little refutable.

In order to ensure the necessary cohesion and consistency in this section one must use anaphoric references³ and repetition of lexical items. In contrast, using synonyms to refer to key concepts, instruments and variables would be confusing for the reader. We should always refer to them in the same way throughout the text.

As for verb tenses, both Swales (1990) and Teberosky (2007) indicate that the method section tends to have a greater number of verbs in the past and passive voice, indicating the nominalization of actions, facts and procedures deployed. That is, procedures and actions, as well as the reasons become action verbs. Thus, instead of saying: "*We used the questionnaire because...*" or "*We used the classification of...because...*" it is advisable to write: "*The questionnaire was chosen because...*", "*The classification of... was used to prove that...*".

1.5. *The results, discussion and conclusion*

These three sections usually concentrate a higher degree of variability, at least regarding the distribution of content in different sections (Swales, 1990; Padilla, 2005; Teberosky, 2007). In any case, its importance is clear for the author's argumentation, since the data presented in the results section will be the basis for the argumentation in the discussion section (Padilla, 2005, p.130).

³ Anaphoric references allow us to refer to concepts or ideas already mentioned in the text. Typical anaphoric markers are pronouns.

The results should be presented so that their organization allows the reader to get a clear response to the research questions or hypothesis (Mayer, 2008), so it is advisable to present them following the order of the objectives of the study and referring to them. Moreover, this section is characterized by figures and tables, as well as by a certain repetition resulting from their description (Duke, 2000), so it is necessary to highlight and make clear to the reader what are the most relevant results (Nihalani and Mayrath, 2008). However, this is delicate since one must avoid stressing as significant results that may not be that relevant (Mayer, 2008) or to emphasize those facts that most interest us, ignoring other significant results.

The Discussion is another of the key sections because, along with the Introduction delimits the body of the text (Teberorsky, 2007, p.29). Nihalani and Mayrath (2008) suggest that this section serves to highlight the importance of the results as well as to argue the way in which the results obtained answer the research questions and hypotheses formulated. In this respect, these authors note that one should not go too far when extracting conclusions or implications from the results that may not be adequately grounded in the data. One must build one's own arguments logically and, consequently, refer to the results only when appropriate, avoiding the repetition of a description that should have been included in the results section (Duke (2000, p.95).

As for how to organize the information in the Discussion section, and drawing on Swales (1990, p.172) and Padilla (2005, p.130), we can refer to the following movements:

- Inclusion of contextual information: summary of results and summary of main arguments presented in previous sections in order to remind the reader what we want to emphasize and enhance the relevance of the arguments which will be presented later.
- Enumeration of the results obtained, including the most prominent or clear first and then those regarded as secondary or tentative
- Comment on whether the results obtained were expected or unexpected
- Reference to previous studies to compare results or to support our own inferences or conclusions

- Description and justification of the reasons and arguments supporting our own claims, especially when we suggest explanations for an unexpected result
- Inclusion of examples from the data, especially to support previous explanations
- Deduction and hypothesis for future work, usually referring, where appropriate, to the possibility of generalizing some or all of the results obtained
- Limitations of the research itself and questions that remain open with comments on possible solutions or ways to address them
- Recommendations concerning future research on the same gap and prospective

We must also bear in mind that, as Swales (1990, p.173) points out, the Introduction and Discussion are divergent movements in the sense that the former progresses from the more general (the state of the art on an issue in the area concerned) to the more specific (the study presented), while the latter starts from the specific (the results of the study) to finish in the general (the significance of the study presented within the area concerned).

Teberosky (2007) also notes that, as in the Introduction, in the Discussion a greater number of verbs in the active voice are used, showing more changes between present and past tenses.

However, some contrastive studies on this section (Padilla, 2005) have shown that, for example, the research articles in the Anglo-Saxon world include all these aspects and, at the same time, the comment on other studies is done with the objective of raising open controversy, so as to reinforce the importance of the results obtained. In the articles written in the Spanish-speaking countries, however, we summarize and evaluate our own results which are also discussed but in a rather low-profile controversial mode, showing a much more prudent approach when assessing one's own results and those obtained by others.

2. Posicionament: Com es manifesta la veu de l'autor en un text acadèmic?

To clarify the notion of voice, it is helpful to compare academic texts to a building. When we look at a famous building we usually only realize the overall external appearance, that is, the facade. Often, especially if we cannot complement our view with that of an architect, we are not sensitive to certain materials and elements that configure and maintain the building. Specifically, buildings are made of individual elements (concrete, beams, glass, aluminum, ceramics...) that are sustained thanks to the dialogue of forces that is established between them. These elements make up specific spaces (hallways, stairs, landing, lounge, terrace ...) serving equally specific functions until ultimately forming a single coherent facade. In addition, these spaces and, therefore, the whole building, display a series of special features according to the architectural style (baroque, modernism, Bauhaus ...) and according to the architect's (more or less functional or artistic) goals.

If we take these thoughts to academic texts, the spaces in a building may be associated with the sections of a research article (Introduction, Method, Results, Discussion and Conclusions), which would show special characteristics according to the knowledge field where the article is inscribed (quantum physics, psychology, history).

If we go a little further in our analysis, we find two issues which become crucial when elaborating high quality academic texts. If we maintain the metaphor of the building we may associate these two issues to the individual elements as well as to the dialogue forces which, as we said, holds them together and prevents the textual construction from falling apart.

On the one hand, we may consider that the authorial voice is that which configures the dialogue of forces between the different sections of the text. In this sense, voice is a construct that refers to the author's discursive choices, whose strategic management involves the possibility of positioning differently and deliberately in every text.

On the other hand, the individual elements that make up the text/building and that the author must articulate have to do with certain resources that the writer uses to imprint a personal label into the text and position him/herself regarding the issues s/he is writing about.

From this perspective, therefore, the writer plays his/her authorial role through the intentional selection of discursive strategies which, when implemented, show a situated

version of his voice (i.e., circumscribed to the specificities of the context and his/her own intentionality).

To the complexity involved in the intentional management of these resources must be added the fact that any choice will prove revealing to the eyes of readers, who will use the different signals present in the text to situate the author in one or another line of thought. That is why we understand authorial voice is both individual and social, and that it can be considered to be always culturally, socially and historically situated. Indeed, the choice of certain strategies or resources (according to the author's values, interests, beliefs, influence relations) align the writer with certain social and cultural discourses within the research field, and not with others. From this point of view, writing in academic contexts implies intentionally drawing on and dialoguing with the existing discourses, and this personal combination of social discourses reveals the identity of the author (Gee, 2005; Ivanic, 1998, 2005).

What we have just noted highlights a perspective on the academic text that is not obvious if we only pay attention to its final version. This invisible side has to do with the process of construction of the academic text, a crucial process that we need to make visible in order to learn about our own strengths and weaknesses when writing this kind of texts. However, this visibility (or awareness) is not enough but is only the starting point in a process of enculturation and academic literacy learning within our own knowledge field. We must also learn and put in practice the strategic (i.e., intentional) use of resources to construct and make our own voice visible, which we will present in the following section.

2.1. *Resources to make our voice visible in our academic texts*

Research on the subject (Ivanic and Roach, 1990; Greene, 1991; Hyland, 2005) highlights two major groups of resources which are useful and necessary for the author to make his/her voice visible in his/her academic texts, respecting the rules and conventions that govern this type of texts:

- a. positioning and engagement
- b. citation or reference use.

The resources belonging to the first group -positioning and involvement- are essential for the author to construct and maintain a personal point of view at the same time as

s/he manages to engage and connect with the reader. Thus, when writing this type of texts, we must position ourselves in relation to the material we are discussing and find a satisfactory way of expressing our own claims and arguments (Cadman, 1997).

2.1.1. Positioning

Among the discourse mechanisms which are useful to position ourselves as authors we can find, firstly, the expressions used to qualify what we say, also called *hedges*. These expressions indicate the value that the reader ascribes to given statement, considering the degree of accuracy or reliability it deserves. The use of these expressions implies that the author's claims are based on plausible reasoning rather than on the certainty of knowledge, and they indicate the degree of confidence that can be attributed to them (Hyland, 2005, p.52).

Given that all statements are evaluated and interpreted through the prism of disciplinary assumptions, writers must calculate how to present a claim, both giving it more or less reliability so as to protect themselves in case of its eventual refutation. For example, instead of the certainty expressed in the following claim: "*The results of the studies conducted by these authors confirm that...*", we could say "*The results of the studies conducted by these authors suggest that...*", or instead of saying in discussion: "*These results are best explained by...*", we should write: "*These results may be explained by...*" or: "*These results may probably be explained by...*".

Secondly, the resources called 'boosters' help authors express confidence in their claims, while making their degree of involvement with the topic addressed. The extent to which the writer emphasizes his/her words by making use of these resources shows which information s/he considers shared with the reader, as well as his/her sense of belonging to a group that shares this viewpoint. An example of the use of such boosters would imply changing the following sentence: "*The study would be one of the activities...*" by the following: "*The study is without a doubt one of the activities...*". In the following sentences, the adverbs and adjectives used -clearly, precisely, clear, crucial- also allow writers to emphasize what is being claimed: "*Our results clearly suggest...*", "*This is precisely the aspect which has been less studied...*", "*The studies reviewed present, in our opinion, a clear failure...*", "*This question seems crucial, since...*".

The balance between hedges and boosters in a text reveals the author's commitment with the content of the text, the kind of relationship s/he establishes with his/her readers, and his/her position in a particular disciplinary community. That is, a well known author may increase the use of boosters to refer to his/her own work and, insofar as this author has other books or articles on the topic that support some of his/her claims, s/he may also avoid nuances and prefer more direct expressions. For example, instead of writing: *"The results obtained in qualitative studies suggest that academic writing could somehow be related with the construction of a researcher identity"* s/he may write *"Academic writing is clearly related with the construction of a researcher identity"*.

Thirdly, we can make our position clear through the use of attitudinal markers (for instance: *preferably, unfortunately, fortunately*). The use of such resources suggests the writer's emotional relationship, rather than epistemic, regarding his/her own claims. For example, instead of saying: *"We know that the success of the treatment does not depend on..."*, we could say: *"Unfortunately, the success of the treatment does not depend on..."*.

Fourthly, authors can make their voice visible through self-reference, i.e., through the degree of explicit presence displayed in the text. This presence is shown in the frequency with which authors use the first person plural (*"we"*) and possessive adjectives (e.g. *"our study"*). For example, instead of saying: *"This text is an attempt to..."* we can say: *"Our text is an attempt to..."*. The absence or presence of explicit self-reference is usually a conscious choice that expert academic writers make to adopt a "discipline situated identity" (Hyland, 2005, p. 181).

2.1.2. Engagement markers

Regarding the second group of resources, known as *engagement markers*, these are mechanisms that are explicitly directed to the readers, whether to focus their attention or to include them in the discourse of the text being written. Based on their previous experiences and knowledge of the academic field, writers can predict the readers' reactions to certain claims and, for instance, anticipate possible objections, or comprehension difficulties, which then allows them to use certain resources to guide the interpretation of the text and proactively respond to any possible negative reactions. Among the mechanisms for achieving these objectives is, firstly, the use of reader pronouns, thus called because its goal is to include the reader in the reasoning presented

in the text. The first person plural is the most widely used pronoun. For example, instead of saying: *"If this question is analyzed it can be considered as..."* would say: *"If we analyze this question we can consider it as..."*.

Secondly, we can include aside comments to briefly interrupt the argument and provide an insight of what has been said to ensure the reader's understanding. For example, instead of saying: *"Lemar and Wong (1982) suggest that anxiety modifies the perception of efficacy and therefore measure the level of anxiety would say..."*, *"Wong and Lemar (1982) indicate that anxiety modifies the perception of efficacy (understood as job performance) and therefore measure the level of anxiety..."*.

Thirdly, the reader can also be engaged by appealing to shared knowledge. This resource aims to make the reader recognize a claim as familiar or accepted, but it is also useful to construct a certain solidarity with the reader. An example of this resource would involve modifying the following sentence: *"This disorder is considered..."* by: *"It is commonly agreed that this disorder is..."*.

Fourthly, we can use directive phrases or sentences to invite the reader to consider an action or an issue from a particular point of view. This kind of resources include the use of imperatives (e.g., *"Take the following as an example..."*), forms that imply obligation addressed to the audience (e.g. *"We should consider that..."*) and predicative adjectives expressing the writer's judgments regarding importance or necessity of a certain claim (e.g. *"It is important to understand that..."*). An example of its use would involved changing the following sentence: *"This situation has an impact on..."* into *"Let us consider more specifically how this situation affects..."*.

Finally, we can use questions, the engagement resource par excellence, so as to invite the reader to share our point of view. So, instead of: *"The negative effects can be identified mainly by..."* we can say: *"How can we identify the negative effects? The most widely used method would be..."*

All these resources must be used with care in academic texts and always knowing when and why we are using them. For example, we must realize that in sentences like the following: *"Today's technology allows us to have many facilities in our lives and we increasingly demand more of it..."*, instead of using self-reference ("we") as a resource,

it would be more adequate to appeal to shared knowledge, using an alternative such as:
"It is undeniable that technology facilitates many everyday activities...".

3. **Intertextuality: How do we establish a dialogue with other academic texts?**

Writing an academic text also means participating with our own voice in the dialogues that are established within a disciplinary community, contributing, discussing, synthesizing, paraphrasing or reformulating, among other things, what other authors have written in the past (Prior, 2001; Bakthin, 1986). This is not a common conversation, but has specific rules and resources that we must learn to adequately use depending on the discourse community in which it occurs so that our voice is taken into consideration (Hyland, 2005; Nelson 2008).

An easily, though perhaps a bit simplified, way of analyzing the characteristics of this dialogue in academic texts may be to compare intertextuality with what happens when we participate in the conversations at a party. At our imaginary party we observe that there are several groups of people speaking about different topics and where conversation is more or less advanced.

In order to enter any of these conversations and be considered by other participants, we should first know what topic is being discussed, what has already been said, and get an idea of the tone (formal, humorous...) of the conversation. Once we know this, we may intervene giving our opinion to complement or add relevant information, expressing our agreement or disagreement with what someone else has said, or suggesting the possibility of addressing another aspect of the topic that nobody has mentioned yet. Once our voice has been accepted by the rest of the participants, we may consider introducing a turn in the conversation or even introducing a different topic regarding which we may want to hear their opinion on.

However, if we participate in a conversation without knowing the background, tone or participants' intentions, our comments may be repetitive, inappropriate or uninteresting, and our voice can be easily ignored or excluded while the rest of the participants continue talking almost without paying attention to what we said.

Something similar happens in the academic conversations which take place through the paper publishing in journals, since texts will be accepted or rejected insofar as they adjust their discourse to the forms of dialogue, topics and interests that characterize the vast network of interrelated texts that shape academic discourses (Spivey, 1997). In these conversations, one of the authors' main challenges is to construct an own (personal) text, guaranteeing the establishment of dialogical connections with other authors' texts (Ivanic, 2005); that is, we need to manage dialogic resources in a deferred mode and, at the same time, present ourselves as authors who position ourselves in a certain moment of dialogue. An excellent resource to make such dialogue explicit is the use of citations and references which we will present below.

3.1. *Citations and references as resources to establish a dialogue with other voices and texts*

The appropriate use of citations and references is an important discursive tool to persuade, justify or discuss our own arguments and views as well as those of others. Besides citations also help to situate the text in space-time, sociocultural, epistemological and disciplinary coordinates and, in the case of academic texts, they help define the context-specific problem or gap regarding which our own text is a contribution (Teberosky, 2007, p.41).

It is important, therefore, to make a proper and strategic use of the different kinds of citations that can be classified according to their function and integration in the text (Castellón, banal, Corcelles, Iñesta and Vega, 2008; Teberosky, 2007).

Thus, we can make use of *direct citations* which imply transmitting other authors' ideas literally, as illustrated by the following example: "'Culture shapes the mind, which provides us the toolbox through which we not only construct our worlds but also our conceptions about ourselves and about our capabilities' (Bruner 1999, p. 12)". This kind of citations allow us to invoke other authors without blending their voice with our own, since both contributions remain formally differentiated.

In contrast, when using *indirect citations* a variable degree of interpretation and paraphrasing is possible because we no longer use the cited author's original formulation. Instead, we include the cited author's discourse in our own for varied

purposes such as, for instance, to indicate the perspective from which a particular concept is understood, to clarify our own alignments, to make explicit who we recognize as an interlocutor and even to indicate those we discuss.

The conventions regarding the use of such indirect citations in academic texts are diverse, according to whether these are *integrated citations* or *non-integrated citations*. An example of an *indirect integrated citation* would be: "*Tharp (2002) considers that schools need a reform with the following objectives: excellence, equity, inclusion and academic harmony.*" As we can see, although Tharp's literal wording is not included, much relevance is granted to this author's voice in the text itself, given that our voice remains in the background, focusing on the paraphrasing of other contributions.

In the case of *non-integrated citations* we move further away from the cited author's literal wording, because the author is included in brackets and the ideas or information referred become an inseparable part of our own discourse, that is, our text comes to reflect the cited author's voice. A typical example of this kind of citation would be: "*However, although the psychologist makes the patient participant in the analysis of the situation, the understanding may be difficult precisely because both participants do not share the understanding regarding the basic rules of the therapeutic relationship (Yagun, 2001).*" In this case, the citation refers to a particular meaning of the concept (therapeutic relationship) and indicates the readers how they should interpret it.

Our degree of closeness or distance, agreement or disagreement regarding the cited author's ideas is variable. An example of an *indirect non-integrated citation* in which the other authors' work is assessed could be: "*Some authors have developed interesting proposals in primary and secondary education relating self-regulation training and formative assessment (Allal, 2000; Sanmarti, 1993).*" The following would be an example of an *indirect integrated citation* also of evaluative kind: "*Allal's (2000) interesting work shows that the learning of self-regulation is possible through formative assessment practices*".

Apart from these evaluative comments (positive, negative), we can use different verbs to refer to other author's work. Our verb choice also shows varying degrees of involvement with their ideas. Thus, we should pay attention to whether we say that a

given author "explains," "defines", "provides", "clarifies", "suggests", "pretends" or others, according to our communicative intention in each case.

References

- Bakhtin, M.M. (1986) *Speech genres and other late essays*. (Vern W. McGee, Trad.). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Cadman, K. 1997. 'Thesis writing for international students: a question of identity?' *English for Specific Purposes*. 16, 1, 3–14.
- Castelló, M.; Bañales, G.; Corcelles, M.; Iñesta, A. y Vega, N. (2008). Voces en la escritura académica. Comunicación. *Seminario científico Identidad, aprendizaje y enseñanza*. Junio, 2008, Castelldefels, España.
- Castelló, M.; Bañales, G.; Corcelles, M.; Iñesta, A.; i Vega, N. (en prensa) *La voz del autor en los textos académicos: construyendo la identidad como escritor*. Barcelona: Edebé;
- Duque, M.M. (2000) Manual de estilo. El arte de escribir en inglés científico-técnico. Madrid:Paraninfo
- Gee, J. P (2005) An introduction to Discourse Analysis. theory and method. Routledge. New York.
- Greene, S. (1991). Writing from Sources: Authority in Text and Task. (Tech. Rep. No. 21). National Center for the Study of Writing and Literacy Technical Report [Versión electrónica]. Recuperado el 16 de Agosto de 2007, de <http://www.nwp.org/cs/public/print/resource/677>
- Hyland, K. (2005). Stance and engagement: a model of interaction in academic discourse. *Discourse Studies*, 7(2), 173-192.
- Iñesta, A. (2009) *La regulació de l'escriptura d'articles de recerca. Estratègies d'escriptors experts en castellà com a primera llengua i en anglès com a llengua internacional*. Tesis doctoral no publicada. FPCEE Blanquerna
- Ivanic, R. (2005). The discursual construction of writer identity. En R. Beach, J. Green, M. Kamil & T. Shanahan (Eds.), *Multidisciplinary perspectives on literacy research* (pp. 391-416). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Ivanic, R. (1998) *Writing and Identity. The discursual construction of identity in academic writing*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Ivanic, R. & Roach, D. (1990). Academic writing, power and disguise. En R. Clark, N. Fairclough, R. Ivanic, N. McLeod, J. Thomas, & P. Meara (Ed.), *Language and power* (pp. 103-121). Clevedon, Avon: BAAL and CIL

- Mayer, R. (2008) Old advice for new researchers. *Educational Psychology Review*, 20, pp. 19-28
- Nelson, N. (2008). The reading-writing nexus in discourse research. En C. Bazerman (Ed.), *Handbook of research on writing* (pp. 435-450). New York: Erlbaum.
- Nihalani, P.K. i Mayrath, M.C. (2008) Publishing in educational psychology journals: Comments from the editors. *Educational Psychology Review*, 20, pp.29-39
- Padilla, C. (2005) Exposición/Explicación y argumentación en el discurso académico escrito del español. A G. Vázquez (coord.) *Español con fines académicos: de la comprensión a la producción de textos*. Madrid: Editorial Edi Numen
- Prior, P. (2001). Voices in text, mind, and society. Sociohistoric accounts of discourse acquisition and use. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10, 55-81.
- Spivey, N. N. (1997). *The constructivist metaphor: Reading, writing, and the making of meaning*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Swales, J. (1990) *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge:Cambridge University Press.
- Swales, J. (2004) *Research genres.Exploration and applications*. Cambridge: CambridgeUniversity Press
- Teberosky, A. (2007). El texto académico. En M. Castello (Ed.), *Escribir y comunicarse en contextos científicos y académicos. Conocimientos y estrategias*. (pp. 17-46). España: Grao.