ORIGINAL RESEARCH PAPER

Genre Analysis of Article Abstract Sections across Translation Studies and English Literature

Maryam Malekzadeh[1]
M.A. of Teaching English Language, Payame Noor University of
Najafabad, Isfahan, Iran.

Research article abstract play a central role in enhancing the visibility of scientific work. As such, writing clear and informative abstract is of paramount importance for any academic discourse community. To contribute to the present body of research findings, the present investigation was conducted to explore the probable rhetorical differences between research article abstract sections across the two disciplines of English literature and translation studies with reference to Swales' (2004) CARS model, an issue, which has not been addressed to date. Precisely, the study sought to discover what rhetorical structures characterize the article abstract sections written by translation and English literature researchers. The corpus featured 100 abstracts from both disciplines published in international journals that were analyzed in terms of the aforementioned model to unravel their underlying rhetoric structure. Overall, analyses revealed no significant cross-disciplinary difference between the rhetoric structures of the two sets of corpora except in terms of Step 1A of Move 2 (Indicating a gap). Specifically, it was found that the translation studies and English literature abstracts more often provided a clear reference to the primary purpose, principal outcomes, and methodology. To conclude, the pedagogical and theoretical significance of the findings were discussed in light of relevant theory and available research evidence.

Keywords: Abstract, Genre, Genre Analysis, Move, Step.

---

[1] E-mail: mary37malek@gmail.com

Introduction

For over two decades, the importance of genre knowledge has broadly been recognized in helping language learners to understand and master academic, professional or educational discourse (Swales, 2004). A genre comprises a class of communicative events in which language has primary role and the members of which share some set of communicative purposes (Swales, 1990).

The communicative purpose of the genre creates it and gives it an internal structure. So, in case of a change in a communicative purpose, there will be a various genre, whereas lesser changes in the communicative purpose or modifications helps to distinguish sub-genres. However, drawing a fine line among genres and sub-genre is not possible (Bhatia, 2004). Marking the article abstract as a genre or sub-genre differs from one researcher to another. Bhatia (1993) further maintains that scientific and academic introduction to research articles makes a separate genre. By this perception, a completely cohesive text is splatted into different genres, and the other parts of a text like the main body and conclusion become separate genres.

Hyland (2004, 1) notes, academic writing as "collective social practices" is constructed through particular genre types and specific discourse disciplines. In some English for Specific/Academic Purposes (ES/AP) contexts (e.g. genre-based approaches) teaching academic writing has been considered as an endeavor to discursive competence in students, that is, their ability to participate in the different discourse modes of their academic community (Bhatia, 1993). As the explanation of Hyland (1997), a model or an explicit structural pattern produces a framework for guided practice in the genre. This permits students to concentrate on specific stages in order to polish strategies to organize information and inferring realizations.

Genre analysis investigates discourse features in the broad context of the communicative event and attempts to bring the rationale of the discourse features in terms of author's intentions and institutional conventions (Swales, 1990). John Swales accomplished the first genre-base analysis in 1981. He investigated 48 research article(RA) introductions from different fields of science and presented his findings in the work "Aspects of Article Introductions", offering a four- move model. Swales claimed that article introductions have the structure within which a series of moves (parts) appear in a predictable order. Each move consists of several steps. A 'move' is a unit that relates both to the writer's purpose and to the content that s/he wishes to communicate. A 'step' is a lower level text unit than the move that provides a detailed perspective on the options open to the writer setting out the moves in the introduction (Swales, 1990). Swales in 1990 offered a revised model consisting of three moves.

Swales (1990) submit his famous CARS (Create A Research Space) model to show the rhetorical structure of research articles introductions. Many researchers have explored the generic patterns in genres on different sections of research articles as abstract sections (Hyland, 2000; Samraj, 2005), result sections (Brett, 1994; Williams, 1999), discussion sections (Holmes, 1997), discussion and conclusion sections (Yang & Allison, 2003). Among all sections of research articles, abstract sections have received special attention. Studies have shown that the structure of research article abstracts may be different in different disciplines, and so many researchers have tried on this subject. Nearly every scholarly journal written in English or in other languages requires an abstract for submitting along with the original research article (Martin, 2003). Abstracts not only serve as a key to understanding fully the arguments of the original articles (Swales, 1990), but also "provide readers with some language preparation for the full texts" (Cross & Oppenheim, 2006). Further, if presented in a structured format, abstracts are easier to read, search and recall, and often contain more information than the traditional ones (Hartley & Benjamin, 1998).

Researchers have addressed different communicative purposes of RA abstracts. Some of the early studies argue for the informative function of abstracts, Bhatia (1993, 82) refers to an abstract as a "faithful and accurate summary, which is representative of the whole article". The American National Standards Institute (ANSI) defines abstract as : "An abstract is an abbreviated, accurate representation of the contents of a document, preferably prepared by its author(s) for publication with it" (ANSI 1979, 1). Generally it is said that abstracts consist of four sections or moves as follows (Bhatia, 1993):

- Introducing Purpose: This move gives a definite indication of the author's intention, thesis or hypothesis, which forms the basis of the research reported. It may also include the aims or objectives of research or the problems that the author wishes to challenge.

- Describing Methodology: In this move, the author gives a good indication of the experimental design, including information on the data, procedures or method(s) used and, if necessary, the scope of the research reported.

- Summarizing Results: This is an important aspect of abstracts. The author mentions his observations and findings and suggests solutions to the problems.

- Presenting Conclusions: This move intended to interpret results and draw inferences.

As Hartley (2003) points out, structured abstracts illustrate an improvement over traditional abstracts because not only those present more information but also their format requires their authors to organize and present their information in a

systematic way, so when looking through abstract databases the organization aids rapid search and information retrieval.

Though many studies have previously investigated the rhetorical structure of research articles across different disciplines from different vantage points (Hasrati and Gheitury, 2010; Franqoise Salager-Meyer, 1990; Samraj, 2008; Jalilifar, 2010; Marefat and Mohammadzadeh, 2013; Fakhri, 1997; Ahmad, 1997; Safnil, 2000; Katalin Doro, 2013; Santos, 1996), to date, as of writing this research article, no published work has been conducted to compare and contrast the way abstract sections are organized in the two language related disciplines of Translation studies and English Literature using Swale's CARS Model. The analysis of a section of a research article, which mostly contains the major information of the research, will be necessary to meet the needs of scholars who are looking for reliable concise knowledge in a short matter of time. The present study therefore is justified on the grounds that it will cover the lacunae in the literature by contributing to the findings available regarding cross-disciplinary differences in terms of academic text organization.

The research questions addressed in this study are as follows:

• What rhetorical structures characterize the article abstract sections written by Translation researchers and English Literature researchers?

• What generic differences are among the abstract sections of Translation studies and English Literature?

Data and method of analysis

A corpus of one hundred research article abstracts was chosen randomly from the discipline of Translation and English Literature extracted from the articles published in International journals issued from 2010 to 2018. Fifty (50%) of the data were extracted of Translation articles and fifty (50%) from English Literature articles. Since the study was to investigate the rhetorical structure of RA abstracts in the sub disciplines under study, all the other sections subsequent to abstracts were ignored from this analysis. After selecting, the corpus was read sentence by sentence and the moves and steps in each abstract were identified and coded based on the framework of Swales' (2004,) CARS model.

The framework is illustrated below:

Move 1: Establishing a territory (citations required) ***, via
Topic generalizations of increasing specificity

Move 2: Establishing a niche (citations possible) ***, via
Step 1A: Indicating a gap **or**
Step 1B: Adding to what is known
Step 2: Presenting positive justification (optional)

Move 3: Presenting the present work, via

Step1: Announcing present research descriptively and/or purposively (obligatory)

Step 2: Presenting research questions or hypotheses*(optional)

Step 3: Definitional clarifications (optional)*

Step 4: Summarizing methods (optional)*

Step 5: Announcing principal outcomes **

Step 6: Stating the value of the present research **

Step 7: Outlining the structure of the paper **

* Optional and less fixed in order

** Probable in some academic disciplines

*** Possible cyclical patterning of moves particularly in longer Introductions

The CARS model seems to be the most comprehensive framework, and researchers on abstracts in different disciplines have successfully and extensively employed its earlier version. Therefore, as Ozturk (2007) maintains, the 2004 version of the CARS model successfully accounts for most of the limitations mentioned by many researchers against the 1990 Swales model. In this study following Safnil (2000, p.82) a communicative unit or move in the RAs was defined as: " a clause or a set of clauses or a paragraph which shows a clear indication of a specific identifiable communicative purpose, signaled by linguistic clues or inferred from specific information in the text. The communicative units or moves in a particular text together develop a set of communicative purposes relevant to the genre of the text".

If within one move, there were smaller communicative units aiming at achieving the communicative purpose of the move, it was considered as a sub communicative unit or Step. Thus, a step in this study, using Safnil's (2000) definition is "[a] segment of a text containing a particular form of rhetorical work necessary for realizing the communicative purpose of a Move. Steps are strategies for encoding communicative purposes. The steps are mostly signaled by linguistic and discourse clues in the text or are inferred from the context" (p. 83). The decision on whether or not a segment in the text, such as a clause(s) or a paragraph(s) could be classified as a move or a step depends on whether or not the segment had a distinct and identifiable communicative purpose or function. The notion of communicative purpose was central for analysis of RA abstracts. However, there are cases where the communicative purpose of a unit text is not clear, or where multiple functions are present in the context. The common way in these cases, as stated by Holmes (1997), is to analyze the text according to the most noticeable function.

Mainly the researcher carried out the analysis; however, in order to minimize the risk of arbitrariness, and for further validation purposes, and to ensure the reliability

of data analysis, two coders checked the codification of the data twice. For the purpose of this study, the frequency of occurrence of each move and step was statistically calculated. In this study repeated moves or steps were ignored. Then the data were analyzed by SPSS software for inferential statistics (i.e. chi-square).

Results

Table 1 presents the frequency of the occurrences of moves and steps in the abstract sections across Translation and English Literature studies. One of the most significant features of the table is that some of the occurrences are the same. The description of the table comes under it.

Table 1: Frequency of the occurrences for the abstracts' moves and steps of Translation Studies (TS) and English Literature Studies (ELS).

Moves	Steps	Number of TS units	%	Number of ELS units	%	Asymp.Sig
Move 1		34	68	32	64	0.673
Move 2	Step1A	12	24	22	44	0.035*
	step1B	5	10	5	10	1.00
	step2	2	4	3	6	0.646
Move 3	step1	48	96	48	96	1.00
	step2	20	40	21	42	.839
	step3	13	26	10	20	0.476
	step4	36	72	37	74	0.822
	step5	39	78	43	86	.298
	step6	8	16	12	24	.317
	step7	1	2	3	6	.30

Step 1 of move 3, i.e., "Announcing present research descriptively and/or purposively" was identified as the most frequently used and dominant step in Translation and English Literature RAs. This step was presented in 96% of both corpora. Step 5 of move 3, i.e., "Announcing principal outcomes" with 78% in Translation RAs and 86% in English Literature RAs acquired the second place in terms of the degree of the frequency. Step 4 of move 3, i.e., "Summarizing methods" with 72% occurrence in Translation RAs and 74% in English Literature RAs acquired the third place in terms of the degree of the frequency. Move 1, i.e.,

"Establishing a territory" was in the fourth place in the two corpora with 68% in Translation RAs and 64% in English Literature RAs. Step 1A of move 2 with 44% occurrence in English Literature RAs acquired the fifth place in this corpus, and with 24% occurrence in Translation RAs acquired the seventh place. Step 2 of move 3 with 42% acquired the sixth place in English Literature RAs, but with 40% the fifth place in Translation RAs, this is while the rest steps in both corpora had the least amounts of frequency.

The results of the Chi-Square test indicated that, there was no statistically difference among the entire steps in the abstract sections of Translation and English Literature RAs, but in step 1A of move 2. There were no differences between Translation and English Literature researchers in applying rhetorical moves and steps constituting the generic structure of abstract sections of their studies.

It was obvious that not all authors follow the conventional structure of abstracts. Writers apply a range of different rhetorical structures in the construction of their own academic writing (using moves or sub moves as they prefer) so that this results from their different kinds of academic knowledge.

Discussion

This section discusses the findings obtained from the analysis of 100 abstract sections of research articles in the two corpora of Translation and English Literature RAs. Findings showed that there was not any significant difference in the use of Swales' (2004) model, but in step 1A of move 2. The variation arose within the two corpora was significantly equal. It was evident that there was a number of strategies in the two corpora, and the variety of the choice of moves and sub moves was apparent. It was concluded that the writers did not give the same importance to each single move. Certain moves, presented in some abstracts, were not necessarily found in the others. It was the third move (Presenting the present work) that dominated in most of the abstracts in these corpora of this study, and the other moves had a decreased dominance. Writers were likely to use some moves and disregard others. The use of moves varied and never appeared in a fixed manner. Findings showed that writers can apply the Swales' model as the framework in organizing abstract sections for various disciplines.

These findings were not in agreement with Hasrati and Gheitury's (2010) study in which they showed the CARS model was not found in most of the RA abstracts. So the results were relatively similar to the findings of Franqoise Salager-Meyer's (1990) study of 77 Medical English (ME) abstracts in which the major discoursal deficiencies of the abstracts were: 1) one fundamental move was missing; 2) two or more necessary moves were lacking; 3) illogical order in move presentation was seen and 4) conceptual overlapping in paragraph structure was seen.

The researcher realized that writers can apply the Swales' model as the framework in organizing abstract sections for various disciplines, and it was the same as the results of the study of Samraj (2008) in which Samraj across the disciplines of philosophy, biology and linguistics showed that the Swales' model could be applied to various disciplines.

To answer the questions of this study, it was found that 68% of Translation researchers and 64% of English Literature researchers write the move 1 in their abstract sections; establishing a territory, in which the writers make topic generalization of increasing specificity to create research territory. These results were in agreement with Jalilifar's (2010) study of 120 research article introductions in local Iranian and international journals, in English for Specific purpose, English for General Purposes, and discourse analysis. In this study some international authors preferred to begin their articles by move 3 not move 1, and as this study revealed some of the authors prefer to begin their articles with move 1 and inform their readers that the research is relevant to the public and agreed goals of that discourse community. The researchers in the two fields have nearly used the same frequency of this move, so as the result of the Chi square showed there was not any significant difference in utilizing this move. The result was in agreement with Jalilifar's (2010) study in which no significant differences were observed in frequency of move 1 in local and international corpora. About move 2 in which, researchers try to claim a niche for their research, 24% of Translation researchers used step 1A in their abstracts and indicated a gap. Only 10% of them applied step 1B and added some new points to their topics, and only 4% applied step 2 and wrote positive points justifying their study the number of which was fewer compared to that of step 1B. About 44% of English Literature researchers used step 1A in their abstracts and indicated a gap and this was not in agreement with Marefat and Mohammadzadeh's (2013) study of 90 English and Persian abstracts written in literature based on IMRD (Introduction, Method, Results, and Discussion) and CARS model, in which they showed that the Literature researchers did not mention the niche. A few of them, that is, about 10% of them applied step 1B and added some new points to their topics, and only 6% applied step 2 and wrote positive points justifying their study. Step 1A of move 2 (indicating a gap) with a 44% occurrence in English Literature RAs acquired the fifth place in this corpus, and with a 24% occurrence in Translation RAs acquired the seventh place. The findings of the analysis of this step indicated that there was a statistically significant difference between the two corpora in utilizing this step. The researchers used Step 1B and 2 of move 2 nearly with an equal frequency and there were not any significant difference between the two corpora in utilizing these steps. Samraj (2002) explained that the presence or absence of move 2 in article introduction may

stem from a variety of reasons. Fredrickson and Swales (1994, cited in Samraj 2002) justify the low presence of move 2 in Swedish linguistics RAs suggesting that the writers of these RAs do not need to compete for research space because of the size of the community. Also, Fakhri (1997, cited in Fakhri 2004) reported that move 2 was quite uncommon in her corpus attributing this to the lack of fierce competition for research space which results in a rhetorical structure that may appear differently when compared to the rhetorical style of more typical RAs.

Finally, the findings showed that move3 was applied more than the two other moves in the abstracts. About 96% of the Translation and English Literature researchers applied step 1 of move 3 in their writings and it was in agreement with Swales (1990) model claiming "it's the obligatory element in move 3 and the writers announce their research descriptively and/or purposively". The findings were in line with Jalilifar's (2010) study in which he claimed that almost all the International article introductions included step1 of move 3.

About 40% of the Translation researchers and 42% of English Literature researchers have presented their research questions or hypotheses (step 2), this is while 28% and 20% of them have applied step 3 respectively and had definitional clarification in their abstracts, and these results were optional and in agreement with Swales (2004)model. Around 72% and 74% of them have mentioned their methods and frameworks (step 4) in abstracts, respectively and the results were not in agreement with the Marefat and Mohammadzadeh's (2013) study in which it was shown that the Method and Discussion sections were neglected in literature RAs and in agreement with Jalilifar's (2010) study in which step 4 of move 3 was optional and seen in international RAs to a much greater extent.

Around 78% and 86% of the researchers have announced principal outcomes of their study in the abstracts (step5). These results were in agreement with Katalin Doro's (2013) study of forty research articles showing that literature abstracts focused on the placement of the research into a wider context and offered a more tentative reference to the findings (M3-S5). The results were also similar to Marefat and Mohammadzadeh's study (2013) in which the results showed that literature RA writers generally focus on Introduction and Result sections, and literature abstracts generally matched CARS model. Only 16% and 24% of researchers have applied step6 and stated the value of their researches, but step 7 was applied less in frequency by researchers compared to step 6 (2% & 6%) and they have outlined the structure of their papers in the abstracts, so these two steps were optional the same as what Swales (2004) had claimed. The results were in agreement with Ahmad's (1997) study on Malay natural sciences articles and Safnil's (2000) on Indonesian social sciences articles so that they found some steps and moves in CARS are not fully applicable for those articles. The findings of the analysis of steps of move 3

indicated that there were not statistically significant differences between the two corpora in utilizing these steps. The results were not in agreement with Jalilifar's (2010) study in which application of steps of move 3 in international corpus revealed statistically significant difference. These results were in agreement with Santos' (1996) study in which there is an apparent mismatch between the ways by which writers compose their articles. Moreover, three major genre-specific features as the size of textual space were allocated to each move (move balance), the blending of moves into the same statement (move embedding), and the reversed sequence of moves (move reversal), might be different in different disciplines.

Conclusion

The main purpose of this study was to find out the differences between the rhetorical structure presented in Translation and English Literature RAs with reference to Swales' (2004) CARS model. Based on the above — mentioned discussion except step 1A of the second move, no significant difference was found between the two groups under investigation. English Literature researchers apply this step more than Translation researchers, and they frequently indicate an existing gap in the field of their research, and sometimes add what is known or present positive justifications about the topic. It is obvious that writers do not give the same importance to each single move. Certain moves, which seem to be present in some abstracts, are not necessarily found in others. This is the third move dominating most of the abstracts. By contrast, the other moves have a decreased dominance. Writers are likely to use some moves and disregard the others. The use of moves varies and never appears in a fixed manner. Certainly, all of these analyzed entities unveil the authors' writing tendency, orientation, and even the field of specialty.

This study was restricted to English Translation and Literature fields and the writers being native or non-native was not considered in this study, and it is recommended that in another studies English Teaching field be considered by researchers, and these three branches be compared as cross-disciplinary fields and the writers being native or non-native be considered.

In this study, the abstract sections was considered as its main base of analysis across English Translation and Literature RAs; we recommend the other researchers, writers and students to conduct pieces of researches focusing on the other parts of the RAs such as methods, results and discussions in order to have more insights about this genre.

Other research projects should be undertaken on many important academic genres. It is recommended that other researches deal with these genres, such as seminar papers, presentations, theses, conference abstracts, dissertations and laboratory reports.

The findings of the present study may have some implications for EAP writing pedagogy. It is useful for ESP (English for specific purposes) teachers. It can lead to a better understanding of how information is structured within a text. Besides, the results of this research will help both experienced and novice researchers to report their research findings in a permissible style. The outcomes could also be applied to enhance the efficacy of writing courses in preparing and expanding language learners' written competence by raising their awareness and highlighting the important point that organizing the information collected by researchers in different languages is related to disciplines which influence the readers' perception and use of contents. This, in turn, is likely to promote language learners' mastery over factors governing text organization which leads to a more effective writing production.

Reference

Ahmad, V.K, (1997). Research article introductionsin Malay: rhetoric in an emerging research community, *In A. Duszak (Ed), Culture and Styles of academic discourse*, p. 273-303.

ANSI (1979). *The American standard for writing abstracts.* New York: ANSI Publication

Bhatia, V. K., (2004). Worlds of written discourse. London, Continuum.

Bhatia, V., (1993). Analyzing genre: Language Use in Professional Settings, London Longman.

Brett, P., (1994). A genre analysis of the results section of sociology articles, *English for Specific Purposes*, 13, 47-59.

Cross, C., Oppenheim, C., (2006). A genre analysis of scientific abstracts, *Journal of Documentation*, 62(4), p. 428-446.

Doro, Katalin, (2013). The Rhetoric Structure of Research Article Abstracts in English Studies Journals, *Journal of English Studies*, 2(1), p. 119-139.

Fakhri, A., (2004). Rhetorical properties of Arabic research article introductions, *Journal of Pragmatics*, 36, p. 1119-1138

Hasrati, M., Gheitury, A., (2010). A Genre Analysis of Persian Article Abstracts: Communicative Moves and Author Identity, *Iranian Journal of Applied Language Studies*, 2(2), p. 47-74.

Hartley, J., (2003). "Improving the Clarity of Journal Abstracts in Psychology: e Case for Structure", *Science Communication*, 24(3), p. 366-379.

Hartley, J., Benjamin, M., (1998). An evaluation of structured abstracts in journal published by the British psychological society, *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 68, p. 443-456.

Holmes, R., (1997). Genre analysis and the social sciences: an investigation of the structure of research article discussion section in three Disciplines, *English for Specific Purposes*, 16.

Hyland, K., (2004). Graduates' gratitude: The generic structure of dissertation acknowledgements, *English for Specific Purposes*, 22(3), p. 303–324.

Hyland, Ken., (2000). Disciplinary Discourses: Social Interaction in Academic Writing, London: Longman 2000.

Hyland, K., (1997). Scientific claims and community values: Articulating an academic culture, *Language and Communication*, 17 (1), p. 19-31.

Jalilifar, A. R., (2010). Research article introductions: Sub-disciplinary variations in Applied linguistics, *The Journal of Teaching Language Skills (JTLS)*, 2.2, p. 29-55.

Marefat, H., Mohammadzadeh, Sh., (2013). Genre analysis of Literature research article abstracts: A Cross-Linguistic, Cross-Cultural Study, *Applied Research on English Language*, 2(2), p. 37-50.

Martin, P. M., (2003). A genre analysis of English and Spanish research paper abstracts in experimental social sciences, *English for Specific Purposes*, 22(1), p. 25-43.

Ozturk, I., (2007). The textual organization of research article introductions in applied linguistics: Variability within a single discipline. *English for Specific Purposes*, Published by Elsevier. Ltd, 26, p. 25-28.

Safnil.(2000). Rhetorical structure analysis of the Indonesian research articles. Unpublished PhD dissertation. The Australian National University, Canberra, Australia.

Salager-Meyer, F., (1990). Discourse flaws in medical English abstracts: a genre analysis per research and text type, 10, p. 365-384

Samraj, B., (2008). A discourse analysis of masters' theses across disciplines with a focus on introductions, *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 7(1), p. 55- 67.

Samraj, Betty., (2005). "An Exploration of a Genre Set: Research Article Abstracts and Introduction in Two Disciplines." *English for Specific Purposes*, 24,p.141-56.

Samraj, B., (2002). 'Introductions in Research Articles: Variation across Disciplines', *English for Specific Purposes*, 21, 1-17.

Santos, M.B., (1996). "The Textual Organization of Research Paper Abstracts in Applied Linguistics." , 16(4), p. 481-99.

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

Swales, J. M., (1990). Genre Analysis. English in Academic and Research Settings. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Williams, I., (1999). Results sections of medical research articles: Analysis of rhetorical categories for pedagogical purposes, *English For Specific Purposes*, 18(4), p. 347-366.

Yang, R, Allison, D., (2003). Research articles in applied linguistics: Moving from results to conclusions, *English for Specific Purposes*, 22, p. 365-385.

تحلیل مقابله‌ای ژانر از قسمت چکیده مقاله‌های رشته‌های مترجمی و ادبیات زبان انگلیسی

مریم ملک زاده[1]©

دانش‌آموخته کارشناسی ارشد دبیری زبان انگلیسی، دانشگاه پیام نور شعبه نجف آباد، اصفهان، ایران.

چکیده مقالات زمینه‌ای مهم برای مشاهده جهد و کوشش علمی‌اند. نوشتن چکیده‌ای واضح و حاوی اطلاعات مفید برای هر جامعه مباحثه تحصیلی یک ضرورت است. چکیده‌ها معمولا اطلاعاتی در مورد پیشینه حوزه و روش تحقیق و یافته‌های اصلی و نتایج فراهم می‌آورند. پیشینه پژوهش در حیطه تحلیل ژانری مقابله‌ای نشان می‌دهد که تفاوت‌های معانی بیانی احتمالی بین قسمت چکیده مقالات رشته‌های مترجمی و ادبیات زبان انگلیسی تاکنون مورد بررسی و تحلیل قرار نگرفته‌است. بنابراین مقایسه ساختار معانی بیانی چکیده مقالات نوشته شده دراین رشته‌ها و پاسخ به سوالات طرح شده به عنوان هدف اصلی این تحقیق مورد توجه است. اینکه چه ساختارهایی قسمت چکیده این مقالات را شکل می‌دهد و چه تفاوت‌های اصولی بین آنها وجود دارد. صد چکیده از مقالات تحقیقی رشته‌های مترجمی و ادبیات زبان انگلیسی منتشر شده در مجلات بین‌المللی برای بررسی و تحلیل ساختار معانی بیانی تجزیه و با پیروی از مدل کار سولز تحلیل شدند. این تجزیه و تحلیل بین رشته‌ای نشان داد که تفاوت‌های بارزی بین ساختارهای معانی بیانی پنجاه چکیده ازمقاله مترجمی و پنجاه چکیده از مقالات ادبیات انگلیسی وجود ندارد جز در نشان دادن گپ آشکار شد که چکیده‌های مقالات مترجمی و ادبیات انگلیسی اغلب اشاره واضحی به هدف اصلی تحقیق، نتایج اساسی و اصول و روش تحقیق دارند. چکیده‌هایی که شامل کمتر از سه گام هستند اغلب مبهم محسوب می‌شوند خصوصا برای خواننده‌ای که خارج از جامعه‌ی مباحثه‌ای تحصیلی در زمینه خاص تحقیق است. یک نتیجه از این تحقیق می‌تواند حساس کردن محققان متخصص نسبت به ارزش نوشتن چکیده‌های واضح باشد.

واژه‌های کلیدی: چکیده، ژانر، تجزیه و تحلیل ژانر، حرکت، گام.

---

[1] E-mail: mary37malek@gmail.com