Writing academic and research texts

PID_00260211

Montserrat Castelló
Anna Sala

Recommended minimum time required: 3 hours

Universitat
Oberta
de Catalunya

Montserrat Castelló

Senior Professor of Psychology. Director of the Research Institute in Psychology, Learning and Development (Re-Psy). FPCEE. Blanquerna. Universitat Ramon Llull.

Anna Sala

Doctor of Education Psychology. Professor affiliated to the Faculty of Psychology, Education Sciences and Sport at Blanquerna (URL) and the Universitat de Vic.

The assignment and creation of this UOC Learning Resource have been coordinated by the lecturer: Antoni Badia (2019)

Index

Introduction

"To understand what scientific language is and does, we need to look at what kind of tool it is. We need to see when, how, and to what purpose it is employed in the concrete settings of human history".

"Skill in scientific writing, as with most human arts, is knowing what you are doing and making intelligent choices".

Bazerman, 1988, pages 315-323

As an educational professional, not only do we need to be capable of interpreting the research carried out by other researchers, but we also need to know how to carry out our own research projects that allow us to expand and improve our educational practice, while generating knowledge that may be of use to other education professionals.

This research-generated knowledge is only useful for the education community when it is communicated effectively, using the appropriate channels, which are usually written. However, the writing of academic and research texts is a complex activity that often creates problems and tensions for authors, particularly those who do not have much experience in writing these texts. Knowing and understanding the characteristics of this type of writing requires understanding and regulating the writing process, which will help to understand when, how and why it may be appropriate to use particular discursive mechanisms, and ultimately, to allow us to make a strategic decision as a writer.

This module aims to introduce future educational professionals to the writing of academic and research texts, so that they can confer and use this knowledge professionally in order to disseminate their research results and communicate with other professional colleagues and communities. With this focus, the text is divided into three sections. In the introduction section, we shall define what we understand by "academic and research writing" and discuss the key characteristics and aspects that we must be aware of. The second section will focus on characterising the writing process, the different phases and styles of writing and the reading that it entails, and shall also provide some strategies for the effective management thereof. Finally, the third section will examine the characteristics of the genre of educational research, and will provide guidelines, resources and examples of how it can be used.

1. Writing academic and scientific texts: what, when and how?

Those of us who have already written an academic or scientific text will already be fully aware that this is a complex and often frustrating task that requires lots of effort, dedication and time. This complexity is intrinsic to the writing process (both for novice and seasoned authors), owing to the very nature of scientific writing.

> We define scientific writing as a situated, hybrid, dialogic and epistemic activity that requires the implementation of recursive planning, writing and revision processes.

We will later study each of these characteristics individually.

It is **situated** in the sense that the writing processes and the products thereof are highly dependent on the context and the conditions under which the text is written i.e. the specific communicative situation. Aspects such as the area of knowledge and the topic, the aims of the project, the genre of text that we are writing, the target readership, the support and advice received from our tutor, the knowledge we have of the topic and the amount of time we have to write the article are just some of the aspects which have a huge impact on what and how we write (Barton, Hamilton and Ivanič, 2000). The combination of each of these aspects is what makes every writing process and every text unique. This means that the writing process and the text produced will vary greatly depending on whether we want to write a research article, a novel or a cooking recipe, in the same way that the recipe will vary if the target audience is a primary school student or a professional chef. When we think about research articles or dissertations, the process can also vary depending on our experience with these texts and the chances of publication that arise during the writing thereof.

On the other hand, writing is also a **dialogic activity**. This means that the texts and the writing processes entail a constant dialogue that the author establishes with the text and with other individuals, primarily the potential future readers of the text (Master's tutor, committee or professors with an interest in the field) and other authors who have written about the same topic (Bakhtin, 1982; Dysthe, 2012). This dialogue is present throughout the writing process (and even before this begins), in the reading of related texts about the topic and in conversations held between the author and other people, such as his/her tutor and their colleagues. This is also made clear in the text, in the discussion that is established between the different referenced authors

and future readers of the article. Section 3 analyses this aspect and provides some resources that will help us to effectively establish these dialogues in the same text.

Thirdly, we have said that writing is a **hybrid** activity, as it is never carried out in isolation. Rather, it always entails a vast amount of further reading. Both activities, reading and writing, are necessarily interdependent and are interspersed during the writing process (Solé et al., 2005). For example, at the start of the writing process we will read a range of material to improve our knowledge of a topic, but we will also simultaneously take notes of interesting ideas that we found while reading other texts, make summaries and notes, etc. The same happens later in the process when we are fully immersed in the writing, as we will often need to re-read sections of texts that we have already covered, or even re-read parts of our own text. The relationship between reading and writing, as well as the weight held and the role played by each one, evolves and changes throughout the writing process. We will focus on these aspects in the next section.

Finally, writing is also an **epistemic** activity, as it is a tool that allows us to learn and create new knowledge. This characteristic is particularly important in scientific texts, as the aim of these texts is to provide new knowledge to the scientific community of reference. Writing allows us to re-elaborate ideas and make them more complex, take stock of what we don't know and consider the content. It also allows us to create new learning (Bazerman and Prior, 2003).

Table 1. The main characteristics of academic and scientific writing

Characteristics	Definition
Situated	The form of the writing process depends on the characteristics of each context, communicative situation and specific author.
Dialogic	The writing process entails a constant dialogue between the author and potential future readers, other authors in the same field and their texts.
Hybrid	The writing of academic and scientific texts is always performed alongside the reading of other sources and the re-reading of the text itself.
Epistemic	Writing is a tool that allows us to learn and create new knowledge.

To effectively manage the intrinsic complexity of these processes, it isn't enough to just have a good command of the particular content and about the topic on which we are writing. We also need to be conscious of the characteristics described above and learn to use them effectively in order to achieve our objectives. In other words, we must develop strategies to manage the writing process. We must also understand the characteristics of scientific texts and the conventions of our discipline in relation to these texts: i.e. we must understand the discursive genre. In the following pages we will focus on the writing

process and the discursive genre, examine their characteristics and introduce some strategies that research in this field has found to be effective in successfully carrying out scientific writing projects.

2. Writing (and reading) throughout the composition process

As we have already alluded to, each writing process is unique and specific, which makes it impossible to define the "ideal" writing process to be followed by all authors. However, research has allowed us to establish the strategies that must be mastered if we want to become a more efficient writer. Specifically, research has found that the most efficient writers manage the writing process differently to less efficient or novice writers, with regards to the various aspects (Bereiter and Scardamalia, 1987; Iñesta and Castelló, 2012). On one hand, efficient writers understand that writing helps them to develop their thoughts and knowledge on the subject about which they are writing. Moreover, they don't only write at the end of the process to explain what they have learnt. This means that the authors write from the beginning of the research and implement dynamic, flexible and recursive planning, writing and revision processes. It also means that they alternate between different types of writing throughout the process, and do so intentionally, making well-considered decisions based on the objectives and requirements at any one moment (Bergh, Rijlaarsdam and Steendam, 2016).

On the other hand, writers who are not used to composing scientific texts, and the majority of students, understand writing to be a rigid and lineal process that begins with the planning of the text and continues with the writing of ideas (which is also lineal) and culminates with the revision of the text, which is normally limited to superficial aspects such as spelling. In such cases, authors write to transfer their ideas, rather than to transform them.

Let's now take a look in closer detail at what is entailed by the management of the writing process, taking a perspective that is closer to that of the most effective writers who deem writing to be a learning tool: the characterisation of the writing process as a recursive process, and the different types of writing (and reading).

2.1. Planning, writing and revising: a recursive process

Writing is a complex cognitive activity that requires the implementation of planning, writing and revising processes. Is this always the case? How and when do each of these activities take place? The answer is not a simple one, as this largely depends on factors such as our knowledge of the topic and the genre, how we choose to represent the task and the demands that we detect throughout the process. Despite this, research indicates that the majority of students and writers who start writing research articles and scientific texts follow an overly lineal process (Castelló, 2000). This approach entails planning only before we start, in a broadly general manner, by identifying the topic and

the different sections that need to be included in the text. This is followed by writing the article or text, without modifying the defined structure, and then revising the text from a largely superficial perspective, focusing primarily on grammatical errors. However, the writing of a text as complex as a research article or Master's dissertation is rarely executed properly by following such a process. Rather, we must learn to plan, write and revise in a much more flexible and strategic manner which allows us to adjust to requirements as and when they arise, and to effectively resolve any issues that crop up throughout the process.

We are therefore dealing with a recursive writing process in which these processes – planning, writing (or 'textualizing') and revising – are continuously interchanged, with this occurring on different levels (Bergh and Rijlaarsdam, 2001). We will need to revise our text as we write it; detecting any issue or aspect that we feel could be improved will allow us to alter the planning. When this occurs, we should re-write the text to adapt it to the new plan, and then re-read the text to make sure that the changes made are appropriate. This revision is usually performed in an overly implicit manner on the level of sentences and words, but a planned and intentional revision must also be performed on more general levels of the text, in order to revise the sections that it will have, how they link together and the text as a whole. The planning, writing and revision processes must also be performed recursively on this level. This will allow us to plan before we start writing, but will also enable us to plan when, after revising a version of the text, we decide that the structure of a section requires changing. At the same time, this revision must be different to that carried out while we write each of the ideas. The level of detail and the scope of the planning and revision also vary according to the stage of the process. We can plan the general focus of the text or the structure of the method as well as the coherence of our writing, or can choose to only focus on grammatical aspects.

This means that, during the writing process, we will end up with a large number of drafts (intermediate texts) before we obtain the final text which is ready to be sent to a scientific journal or an evaluation committee. We must remember that drafts are not incomplete or faulty products. Rather, they are key tools in the writing process that allow us to check what we know, refine the initial ideas, reflect on the text and the research process, consider the results obtained and what they contribute to the field, highlight the doubts and questions that arise and open new lines of questioning on the content and form of the text in its current state, and that of the future final text. The objective of draft texts, therefore, is primarily to help us manage the writing processes in a more effective manner, and to aid the generation of knowledge (Bereiter and Scardamalia, 1987).

By understanding them in such a way, drafts become instruments that enable the planning and revision of the text. Working on a previous version, even if we feel that it's not of the required quality, is the best way to construct

the final text, while also allowing us to plan (and reconsider) what we wish to communicate and how we wish to do it. Don't trust the plan that only exists in your head, and be sure to refrain from discarding the plan that we already have and starting from scratch. Working on a draft version is deemed the best guarantee in this virtuous circle of planning, writing/textualizing and revising, and is thus the best way for authors to achieve their objectives (in section 3, we will list the specific resources to make this possible).

2.2. Different types of writing (and reading): exploratory, productive and communicative.

As we have already alluded to, the most efficient authors write and read in a different manner depending on the stage of the writing process and the issues that they detect in the text. Research in this field has defined three types of writing: exploratory, productive and communicative (Miras and Solé, 2012). As a general rule, an exploratory writing (and reading) style predominates at the start of the process, with productive writing becoming more present in the middle phases of the writing process. Then, towards the end of the process, the majority of the writing will be communicative. It must be stressed, however, that the three types of reading and writing can be utilised at any point of the process, and that they can also be implemented simultaneously. Therefore, when we are about to write a research report or article, we must recognise and be aware of the different characteristics in order to make intentional and strategic decisions about the actions to take, based on the objectives and requirements at each moment.

2.2.1. Exploratory writing and reading

The aim of scientific texts is to provide new knowledge for the scientific community and discipline of reference via the formulation of new principles, theories and concepts, or by giving nuance to and questioning prior knowledge (Hyland and Guinda, 2012). However, in order to generate new knowledge, we must know what has already been done in the field in which we wish to contribute. In other words, we must know which questions have already been asked by other authors, what results have been obtained, which conclusions and theories have been drawn and which questions and lines of research are yet to be explored. As we might expect, it is important to dedicate enough time to reading the texts (articles, books and chapters) that have been published in our field.

The first step in being able to write a scientific text, therefore, is to identify the most relevant authors, articles and theories in our research area. The complexity of this first task will depend on our knowledge of and experience in the topic, and the support we receive from our tutor or other colleagues with a higher degree of specialisation.

Exploratory writing and reading are aimed at identifying the most relevant texts for our study (which we will read later on), highlighting possible research questions and relatively unexplored areas that will help us to decide on our objectives and for taking notes that will help shape the planning of the text (Miras, Solé, Castells, Espino and Gràcia, 2008). As we may expect, reading is the fundamental and predominant activity in the exploratory phase. This is because it allows us to engage with the research topic, the different educational theories, the most relevant authors and, above all else, to gain a broader perspective of the research already conducted in our field. Despite this, writing also plays a key role in this phase. It is a crucial support in clarifying what we have learnt from the different readings, and helps to build ideas about the text that we haven't started to write yet.

Exploratory writing, also known as "pre-text", can assume different forms (personal notes, reading sheets, short summaries, minutes or notes from tutorials with our tutor, annotations and reading assessments, etc.) and must allow us to keep a record of the research process, the decisions we have taken during the exploratory reading, meetings with our tutor and all research-related activities and activities related to our future text. Despite the fact that these writing and reading activities tend to be rather unsystematic and might appear, on the surface, to be unproductive, we must be aware of their importance: these are the basis of productive writing and reading and must be used to guide the planning of our text (Castelló, 2002).

As we continue to explore the field, we will start to draw connections between the notes that we have taken, make outlines of the content of our text and even develop some ideas. These activities are different, as they entail a more refined elaboration of the knowledge acquired from the readings, and are characteristic of the following type of reading and writing.

2.2.2. Productive writing and reading

Productive writing and reading aim to develop our thoughts and establish our stance with regards to the topic about which we are writing. This differs from exploratory reading and writing, which need to be more reproductive. In this phase, writing and reading are shaped by the personal aims of the author, who aims to cover ground that has yet to be covered by other authors, and provide new knowledge to his/her discipline (Miras and Solé, 2012). This phase is therefore based on progressively developing our ideas, building the content and shaping the structure of the text, which is to be done simultaneously – yet again – to the reading of other texts. In this phase, however, the reading is no longer aimed at identifying the most relevant texts. Rather, it requires a deeper and more strategic reading of the resources chosen in the previous phase, analysing those we deem interesting or useful to help meet our objectives. This type of reading goes beyond knowing what the author has said, and focuses more on what it gives us as writers (Castelló, 2002).

Productive writing can adopt many forms, depending on the phase of the process at any one time and the preferences of each author: from outlines to complete drafts, and from graphs to concept maps. Regardless of the format, this type of writing is characterised by being personal, i.e. it is not intended to be read or purchased by other people. Typical conventions of scientific texts and requirements of readability are still not taken into account when the text is written, meaning that the author has fewer restrictions when it comes to putting forward his/her ideas in the text, developing them and reshaping them in order to make them more complex and suited to his/her objectives.

The drafts can adopt various forms during this phase, depending on the writer and the specific point of the process. For some writers, the first drafts are outlines containing the structure of the text, which are subsequently developed point-by-point in later versions. For others, the first drafts entail unconnected sentences and paragraphs that contain key ideas of the text, which later become connected and re-ordered as the text develops. Initially, texts often contain a large number of inaccuracies and implicit terms or ideas that need to be developed and defined at a later stage, as well as annotations, codes and personal symbols that help the author to ask themselves questions about the text itself, and to guide them and leave a record about the decision making process that he/she goes through as they write.

Despite this, in all cases the text will progressively assume the form of the final text via the implementation of a revision process and by developing the ideas contained therein. As we produce more content and shape the structure of the text, we will need to resolve ambiguities and inaccuracies. Doing so will not only make the text easier to understand for readers, but it will also broaden our knowledge and understanding of the topic (Vygotsky, 1978).

During this stage of the process, we will need to continuously alternate between the planning, writing and revision processes of our text; this is one of the most recursive phases of the entire writing process. For example, when we have an initial structure for the introduction, we will need to revise it to add new ideas (which requires planning at the same time). We should develop this structure progressively, textualizing each of the points. By doing so, we will probably need to make changes to the structure that we had initially thought of. Moving from an initial outline to a complete draft is, therefore, a complex task that requires plenty of time, resources and strategies, allowing us to progressively re-write the task and acquire more knowledge about the topic.

Whilst the time spent on this phase and the complexity thereof depends on each writer and his/her knowledge of the topic and genre, studies have shown that expert writers consider this phase of the process to be the most important one, which they deem to be necessary and therefore spend a lot of time working on it. However, if we're not used to writing scientific texts, we won't spend lots of time on this type of writing. On one hand, this is because novice writers often consider this to be the final phase of research, which only serves

to communicate what they have learnt and the research that they have carried out, not realising that writing also helps to develop their thoughts. On the other hand, novice writers don't know how to manage this process, how to write the Master's dissertation, when to plan it, how and why draft texts are used, how to revise them, etc. When we still aren't happy with the text after the first or second attempt, it's normal for us to be disheartened. In fact, the majority of undergraduate, Master's and PhD students aren't aware that all scientific writers require various versions of the text during this phase, writing in a highly recursive manner until they are able to progress to the next phase. When this happens, the result is usually a poorly written text which is excessively descriptive, with an unclear structure and a lack of cohesion and coherence (Bereiter and Scardamalia, 1987; Castelló, Iñesta and Corcelles, 2013).

2.2.3. Communicative writing and reading

Despite the obvious importance of implementing writing processes that allow us to generate knowledge and lay out our objectives in terms of the study topic, our text will not meet the communicative objectives if we do not adjust them to potential future readers and the conventions and rules of the discipline community of reference (Barton and others, 2000). For this reason, we need to implement a third type of writing (and reading) which aims to communicate efficiently. This means adjusting the text to the potential readership by reducing ambiguities, using discursive mechanisms to involve them in the text and anticipating their questions and queries, clarifying them in the text and adapting to the specific standards and conventions of the community and discipline (e.g. using certain terminology or a particular citation style system).

This type of writing, while most common in the final stages of the writing process, is not restricted to this stage. On the contrary, the communicative intention of the text that we alluded to could be aimed at different types of readers, such as our dissertation tutor or colleagues who we want to receive feedback from. As we have continued to highlight thus far, writing is a social activity, and it is important for us to be able to talk about our topic and socialise it during the writing process. In other words, we should be able to share the text (or the drafts) with other people, receive feedback about it, talk about what we are writing about and the writing process itself.

It goes without saying that our communicative writing process will be very different when we are going to share the text with our dissertation tutor, compared to how it will be for the final version of the text. Here, our aim will be to communicate with the members of the Master's dissertation committee and, in some cases, with the scientific community, if our article is deemed to be of the appropriate standard to be submitted to a journal for publishing. Regardless, when we write to communicate, we must take into account two things. On one hand, we must adjust our text to potential future readers to avoid misunderstandings, and in doing so obtain more useful feedback that is of a greater quality. Secondly, it is also useful and recommended to highlight

any doubts and questions that we may have about the text itself as we write it – such as writing comments in the margin – so that we can find them and resolve them later on in the process.

Communicative writing will also differ greatly depending on the process followed during the previous productive phase, with these two writing styles often being implemented simultaneously. In any case, we must stress that communicative writing does not entail writing a clean version of the text drafted in the previous phase. Rather, it requires further development of certain aspects of the content through various drafts, and once again relies on the recursive processes of planning, writing and revising. In this phase, writing is once again a tool for generating knowledge and delving further into the topic about which we writing (Bazerman and Prior, 2003). So, for example, when we try to define and mark out the key concepts of our study to the readers, we may unearth links with other concepts or studies that have not been mentioned until that point, which may require making substantial changes to our text and in the way in which we understand the topic.

In this phase, the role of reading is often limited to reading and re-reading our own text in order to adjust it, as mentioned above, to future readers. This must be a strategic reading, shaped by specific objectives that allow us to progressively build our text. During the first round of revision, for example, we can read our text to assess whether or not the structure is adequate. In this instance, we won't need to pay much attention to spelling or grammar errors. In the second round of revision we can start to focus on how the paragraphs are connected, the clarity of the sentences and the grammatical issues contained therein (syntax, cohesion, accuracy, etc.) which, when rectified, will improve the quality of the sentences. Finally, in a later phase, the revision should focus on all orthographical, formal and editing issues, which will help us avoid errors and improve the clarity and coherence of the text. The reading of other authors and other texts is not usually highly important in this phase. Instead, this reading primarily entails a focused research on specific aspects of the reference texts. For example, this reading may be aimed at identifying the discursive resources used by other authors to describe the limitations of a study, to reinforce the references in particular aspects of our text or to specify one of the concepts used.

The following tables provide a summary of the functions and characteristics of the three types of writing and reading described in this section (Table 2) and their link with the aforementioned planning, writing and revision processes (Table 3).

Table 2. Types of reading and writing, functions and texts

	Functions	**Text**
Exploratory reading and writing	To identify relevant authors, topics and theories. To keep a record of the reading and decision-making process.	Organising the information, personal notes, tutorial notes, reading annotations, summaries.

	Functions	Text
Productive reading and writing	To organise and re-organise ideas and start to elaborate them, to establish connections, to develop the structure and the arguments, etc.	Outlines, successive drafts with annotations, queries and unfinished text.
Communicative reading and writing	Adjust the text to the requirements and characteristics of the communicative situation.	Reviewing the different aspects until we are left with the final text.

Table 3. Link between the planning, writing and revision processes and the three types of reading and writing

	Planning	Writing	Revising
Exploratory	Focused on identifying future readings, producing initial ideas and starting to define the objectives.	Not very productive. Personal notes and annotations of readings.	Assessment of the notes, importance of the readings and the initial ideas.
Productive	Focused on defining the structure and content of the text.	Highly productive. Elaboration and development of ideas.	Assessment of the structure and content of the text.
Communicative	Focused on improving clarity and comprehension.	Variable/fairly productive. Re-writing for added clarity.	Assessment of the text from the readers' perspective.

In addition to understanding the three types of reading and writing and the processes entailed in the production of scientific texts, their characteristics and the role they may have in this process, we must also know how to use them strategically. In other words, we must take conscious and intentional decisions on what, when and how we read and write at all times, depending on the objectives that we have set and the requirements that we detect in our text.

The following table lists some questions that will allow us to reflect on the writing process, identify the problems and shortcomings of our text and of ourselves as writers, and guide our strategic decision-making:

Table 4. Questions to help guide the decision-making during the writing process

About the reading:

a) Objective of the research:
- Why do we need to search for information? For example, do we need to broaden or delve into a particular topic? Do we need to define a concept? Do we need to find research that backs up our results?

b) Resources:
- What types of source are most suitable for what we need? Which authors?

c) Objective of the reading:
- What information do we hope to obtain from this source?
- Why have we chosen it?
- Do we need to read the whole text, or can we only select certain parts?
- Do e need to read it in depth at this point?

About the writing:

a) Assessment of the text written so far
- What are the strengths and weaknesses of the text at this point? How can we determine them?
- Which aspects can we work on now, and for which aspects do we need further information/resources/etc.?

b) Objectives of the writing session?
- What is our objective for this writing session?
- Do we wish to develop a specific section of the article, or are we only writing a first version?
- Does the current version adhere to the structure that we had planned?

c) Resources:
- What resources do we have for this writing session (time, spaces, materials, etc.)?
- Are they suited to our objectives, or do we need to change the objectives or try to improve the resources we have available to us? For example, our objective may be to carry out a thorough review of our article, but we only have one hour to do so.
- How can we obtain the resources or the information that we require?

d) Planning:
- What is the main thesis of our text?
- Which concepts and studies are key to contextualising our study?
- What is the best order for developing our thesis?
- In what order must the results be presented?
- Which sections must be contained in the text, and which sub-sections must be contained in each section?
- What changes do we need to make to the structure to make it clearer?

e) Revision:
- Is the current structure of the text clear?
- Is the sequence logical and understandable? Does it allow for an understanding of the background and the contextualisation of our research?
- Is the structure of the results clear, and does it respond to the objectives that we laid out at the start?
- Is the structure of the discussion coherent with the way in which we presented the results in the previous section?
- Is the link with the study objectives clear and coherent?
- As things stand, which aspects do we need to pay more attention to? For example, do we need to prioritise overall aspects such as coherence and structure, or do we need to focus more exclusively on correcting spelling and grammar issues?
- Is revising this aspect a priority at this moment in time, or is it better to wait and revise it further down the line (for example, when we have a clearer idea of the text or when we spend a whole session on revising this aspect in all sections)?
- Do we need to revise the whole text now, or can we focus on a single section?
- Which aspects do we need to revise further down the line?

f) Socialising queries and the text:
- Which questions and queries have arisen that we have not been able to resolve ourselves?
- Who could we discuss it with? For example, a tutor, the lecturer of a particular subject, a classmate, etc.

3. Resources and mechanisms for ensuring the presence of the author and dialogue with the reader

The content of this section refers to the aspects and resources that we must be aware of and know how to use when writing a complex academic text, such as a research project. In particular, this section will analyse the most useful resources for ensuring that the text will be interesting, that the author is present in the text have a presence therein and that the reader will be involved.

Much research has been carried out in this field in recent years, with the results thereof proving that, while generalisations should not be made and that significant differences exist based on the context and the discipline, there are several resources that are often used recurrently by authors for different purposes: a) to make themselves visible, clarifying their position while ensuring that the text, despite being academic, refrains from being tedious or impersonal; b) involves the readers, ensuring not only that they understand the text, but that they also share its meaning and feeling; and c) creating dialogue with other authors and the scientific community in question, primarily by strategically quoting and referencing previous works.

The comments and suggestions that we shall later provide derive from research that has already been carried out. However, it is precisely for this reason that they should not be interpreted as unalterable truths, or that the reading thereof be excessively regulatory. As the research itself has demonstrated, the use of resources and the way in which the scientific work is communicated has evolved over the years, as reflections have been made on what research actually is and what it entails. It also depends on the disciplines, the contexts and even the epistemological approach and method chosen. Therefore, writing an article in English for an international journal that addresses other researchers of a similar status is not the same as writing a Master's thesis that has to be read and evaluated by a board of experts to verify that the student is sufficiently skilled. Also, research carried out from an ethnographic perspective in which the author has a much greater participatory and interpretive role is not written in the same way as an experimental piece.

3.1. Positioning: how is the author's voice made visible when writing a research article or report?

Any scientific text is the fruit of the decisions of one – or more – authors with a particular identity, who opt to explain their research through a series of linguistic and rhetorical resources that position them in their field of knowledge (Matsuda and Tardy, 2007). This section will address the resources that allow the author to communicate their position in the text, and thus have a

presence therein. These resources serve to distinguish the author's voice from that of other researchers, with which scientific texts interact indirectly (via citations or comments) or directly, such as the discussion of previous research projects and results.

3.1.1. The concept of voice

In order to clarify the notion of voice, it may be useful to compare scientific or research texts to a building. When we think about a famous building, we will probably only think about the outside of the building i.e. the façade. Frequently, especially if we don't have an architect's eye, we won't pay attention to certain materials or elements that configure and sustain the building. Buildings are composed of particular elements (concrete, cement, beams, glass, aluminium, ceramic, etc.) that are sustained thanks to the dialogue of forces established between these elements. They also come together to create specific spaces (hallway, stairs, landing, living room, terrace, etc.) that exercise equally specific functions, and lastly, come together to shape a single coherent façade. Furthermore, these spaces – and by extension, the whole building – exhibit a series of unique characteristics depending on the architectural style (Baroque, Modernism, Bauhaus, etc.) and the objectives of the architect (which are largely functional or artistic).

By applying these reflections to academic texts, the spaces could be likened to the different sections (e.g. in a research article or project: introduction, method, results, discussion and conclusions) which have different characteristics based on the area of knowledge in which the article is written (physics, psychology, history etc.).

If we take our analysis a bit further, we are faced with two decisive questions when it comes to writing a quality research text. Continuing with the building metaphor, it is possible to equate the specific elements with the dialogue of forces established between them which holds them in place, preventing the building of the text from collapsing.

Firstly, we must understand that the author's voice is that which configures the dialogue of forces between the different sections of the text. In this sense, voice is a construct that is used to refer to the discursive choices of the author, the strategic management of which entails the possibility of diversely and intentionally positioning oneself in a particular text. If we don't do this, the text will be impersonal and it will not be easy to establish the contribution or the intention of the author.

Secondly, the particular elements that comprise the text/building and which the author will have to articulate/conjugate are related to certain resources used by the author to leave his/her own stamp on the text, and to set out their position regarding the questions they are writing about.

From this perspective, therefore, the writer exercises the role of the author by intentionally selecting discursive resources and strategies which, once implemented, convey a situated version (i.e. circumscribed to the specific details of the context and its intentionality) of their voice. We must therefore make a strategic decision about the resources that we will use to be present as the author in the text.

The intentional choice of these resources will be visible to the eyes of the readers, who will use the different signals present in the text to place the author in one line of thought or another. For this reason, we say that the voice of the author is simultaneously individual and social, and that it can always be considered culturally and historically situated. This is the case because the author's selection of particular resources or strategies (depending on his/her values, interests, beliefs, practices and position in the community) gives an indication of their view of particular social and cultural discourses and, ultimately, reflects their identity as an author (Gee, 2005; Ivanič, 1998; 2005).

To summarise, having a presence in the texts by selecting and utilising mechanisms that highlight our voice as an author allows us to convey our identity as scientists or researchers.

3.1.2. Resources to make the author's voice visible in texts

Research highlights three main groups of resources that are useful and required for the author to make his/her voice visible in scientific or research texts, while adhering to the standards and conventions that regulate this type of text. The first refers to the way in which authors position themselves i.e. the way in which we, as authors, show ourselves in the text. The second resource group relates to how writers involve the readers in the text. The third group serves to communicate with other authors, and basically entails citations resources and the use of references (Ivanič and Roach, 1990; Greene, 1991; Hyland, 2005).

The resources that belong to all three groups – positioning, involvement and dialogue – are key, as they allow the author to construct and maintain a personal point of view whilst also ensuring the involvement of, and connection with, the reader. Therefore, when we need to write a research paper or article, we need to situate ourselves with regards to previously conducted research and the concepts that we are analysing. While maintaining dialogue with previous works, we must also find a satisfactory way of expressing our points of view, contributions, nuances and arguments in order to convince and involve the reader (Cadman, 1997).

The positioning of the author in scientific or research texts

One of the useful discursive mechanisms for positioning ourselves as authors is the range of expressions used to provide nuance to what we are saying, also known as hedges. These expressions indicate the value that the reader

has to give to a statement, considering the degree of accuracy or reliability that corresponds to it. When an author uses one of these expressions, he/she is telling the readers that their statements are based on plausible reasoning rather than the certainty of knowledge, and indicate the degree of confidence that can be attributed thereto (Hyland, 2005, page 52). This means, therefore, that these expressions are not used in a presentation of facts or results, but when discussing interpretations, gaps in research, inferences or deductions based on the data and results.

Given that all statements are evaluated and interpreted through the prism of disciplinary assumptions, we as authors must calculate the best way of presenting a statement that will make it more or less reliable, and which will also protect ourselves in the event of a future rebuttal.

For example, when we want to discuss the implications of previous research, instead of saying "the results of the studies conducted by these authors confirm that...", it is preferable to say "the results of the studies conducted by these authors suggest that...". These types of comments are frequent in the introduction or in the conceptual framework when we want to explain gaps in the research, justify our own research or set out a hypothesis that has not yet been proven.

These expressions are also commonly found in the discussion section, when explaining our own results. To do so, we will often need to resort to interpretations that are plausible, based on the results of previous studies, but which could be disputed by readers and other authors. Thus, instead of writing "these results explain why...", it would be better to say "these results may explain why..." or "these results probably explain why...".

Table 5. Discursive resources to make the author's position visible in scientific or research texts

Discursive resources	Function	Examples
Hedges, expressions that serve to add nuance to what we are saying	Statements are based on plausible reasoning rather than the certainty of knowledge.	In the discussion section, instead of saying "these results explain why..." it is better to say "these results may explain why...".
Boosters	They help the author to express confidence in their statements.	"The study would be one of the [...] activities" could be changed for "the study is unquestionably one of the [...] activities". Another example would be: "the reviewed studies present, in our opinion, a clear lack of..."
Attitude markers	They denote the author's affective relationship with their statements.	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...".
Self-reference	Making the voice of the author (we) visible	Instead of saying "This study is an attempt to...", we could say "My study is an attempt to".

Next, the resources known as "boosters" help the author to express his/her confidence in their statements, while indicating their degree of involvement in the topic being addressed. When a writer uses these resources and thus places emphasis on certain statements, he/she reveals the information that they consider to be shared with the reader, as well as his/her membership to a collective or community that shares this statement. This is seen clearly in the following example, where instead of stating that "the study would be one of the [...] activities.", the author opts for a more emphatic expression: "the study is unquestionably one of the [...] activities". By adding the word "unquestionably", what we are showing the reader is that we – as members of the community of researchers within the educational field (in this case) – know that there are no doubts when it comes to assessing an activity, such as the study, in a particular way. The gap could be filled with several qualifiers such as "most relevant", "most difficult", etc. In any case, what the author is stating is that his/her assessment is shared by the community of readers at which their study is aimed.

In the following examples, the adverbs and adjectives that are used – "clearly", "precisely", "clear", "fundamental" – also have this function of boosting or enhancing what is being said: "our results clearly suggest...", "it is precisely this aspect which has been researched the least...", "the revised studies present, in our opinion, a clear lack of...", "we feel that this is a fundamental question, given that..."

These expressions are commonly used throughout all sections of the text, but are particularly frequent at the start of the introduction when we make general statements that we know may be shared by all readers, and when we refer to aspects that we wish to highlight because they are linked to our work. This occurs, for example, when we wish to highlight what research has failed to resolve so far, which is precisely what we aim to address with our study; or when we wish to clarify the implications and contributions of our results in the discussion section.

The balance between hedges and boosters in a scientific article or research text allows us to know to what extent the author is committed to the content, as well as their position in a particular disciplinary community. This explains why the use of boosters is more frequently used by well-known authors – both to refer to his/her own work and to previous studies – and, insofar as the author has other publications or articles about the topic that are referred to by some of the statements, they may also avoid some nuances.

Thirdly, in scientific articles or research texts it is also common for authors to clarify their position via the implementation of attitude markers (which are translated in expressions such as "in agreement with", "preferably", "regrettably" and "unfortunately"), which indicate the affective – rather than epistemic – relationship that exists between the writers and their own statements. Contrary to the belief held by many novice authors or students, renowned

authors and experts don't usually adopt a neutral position with regards to the topic being investigated, and often exhibit their affective relationship with the current status of the research, the implications of the results or even with certain results. These are usually given at the beginning of the introduction or the conceptual framework when the topic is introduced. Here, for example, instead of making a statement such as "Research has show that changing teaching practices is not enough..." or "we know that the success of the treatment does not depend on..", the author says "Unfortunately, research has repeatedly shown that changing teaching practices is not enough" or "Regrettably, we know that the success of the treatment does not depend on...". They can also be used in a particular way when certain limitations are mentioned in the discussion section. One such example would be: "We are aware that a larger sample size would have avoided some of the problems mentioned; unfortunately, this was not possible as we wanted to preserve its validity".

Finally, the author can make his/her voice visible in the scientific text by referencing themselves i.e. by the degree of explicit presence shown in the text. This presence is shown by using the first person singular or plural (if the text was written with co-authors) and possessive adjectives. For example, instead of saying "This study is an attempt to...", we can say "Our study is an attempt to...". The absence or presence of explicit self-references is generally a conscious choice by the writer(s) to adopt a "situated disciplinary identity" (Hyland, 2005, page 181). Obviously, it only makes sense to use this resource when referring to our data, choices, instruments or results. It doesn't make sense, for example, to claim that our theoretical approach is constructivism, because this perspective was proposed by certain authors which we will refer to and cite. Rather, we should state that "our study adheres to the constructivist approach" or that "our choice to use a longitudinal design is due to our interest in...".

3.2. Involving readers in the text that we write

3.2.1. The concept of a reader

In scientific articles and research texts such as projects and reports, the readers are other researchers with a higher or lower level of expertise and members of the same community or communities as the writer. These are professional texts which are written to be read by other professionals, who will evaluate the text based on the criteria established by each community as valid for improving knowledge in a particular research area and social-historical context. However, the members of these research communities have different levels of expertise or familiarity with researching, writing or publishing scientific texts. Furthermore, each discipline (especially social sciences and humanities) may contain different theoretical and methodological approaches that value certain forms of expression and prioritise particular channels and formats. This complicates the way of understanding and representing the reader as a stand-

alone figure, as the interests, profiles and characteristics of potential readers may vary depending on the aforementioned parameters. We must therefore have a good understanding of the community we are addressing, its channels and forms of communication and the ways of assessing it in order to know what type of reader we are targeting.

For a dissertation or research project – whether for undergraduate degrees, Master's degrees or, to a certain extent, PhDs – the communication conditions and the figures of the writer and reader are very specific. This is due to various factors. Firstly, this is an academic situation in which the writer, despite having to carry out research and express themselves as a researcher, remains a student with limited experience in the area of research, with even less experience in scientific publication (especially in the case of university work). This is therefore a simulation in which the author remains a student, but has to act like a researcher and write an eminently academic text – the Master's dissertation – which often adopts the article format of the research community. The first people to read the text will also be lecturers, who will assess the work using academic criteria rather than exclusively professional and scientific criteria (Castelló and Iñesta, 2012; Russell, 2012).

These circumstances, which walk the line between the academic work of a student and the activity of a professional researcher, make it difficult for the reader to be represented when we write a research project. Are we writing for the dissertation review board or for the scientific community? Are we writing this piece primarily for academic purposes, or are we trying to carry out research and write a text that will be considered for publication and made accessible to other researchers? In the majority of cases there is no single answer, as both things need to be done simultaneously: writing for a dissertation review board to get the credits we need to graduate, but doing so requires adhering to the standards of the scientific community to the greatest extent possible, which may often involve the possible publication of our work. We therefore suggest that we write for an imaginary reader who is a qualified expert of the research community to which we are addressing, and is therefore an experienced researcher. It is highly likely that this will be the profile of the members of the dissertation review board who will assess our work.

3.2.2. Resources for involving the reader in our text

The second group of resources, known as "implication markers", are mechanisms that are explicitly aimed at the reader, which serve to focus the attention on them or involve them in the discourse. Based on prior experiences, writers are able to predict the reactions of readers and anticipate any objections or a possible lack of understanding, and can implement resources to guide their interpretation and provide an early response to these objections. There are several mechanisms that help the writer meet these objectives. The first of which is the use of reader pronouns, which are named as such because they aim to include the reader in the reasoning contained in the text. In scientific

articles and research texts, the first person plural is the most commonly used reader pronoun. For example, instead of saying "If this question is analysed, it is seen how...", we could say "If we analyse this question, we see how...".

Table 6. Resources for involving the reader

Discursive resources	Function	Examples
Use of reader pronouns	Include the reader in the reasoning contained in the text (us)	It is better to write "If **we analyse** this question, **we see** how...", instead of "If **this question** is analysed, it is seen how...".
Comments and clarifications	Add comments (between brackets, commas or hyphens) after certain statements to ensure that the reader will understand them.	Instead of "...have established two opposite approaches", we could say "...have established two opposite approaches – by which we refer to the **superficial and profound** approaches – ...". Another example would be: "Wong and Le Mare (1982) suggest that anxiety alters the perception of efficacy (**understood as school performance**) which is why we shall measure anxiety levels..." instead of "Wong and Le Mare (1982) suggest that anxiety alters the perception of efficacy, which is why we shall measure anxiety levels...".
Referring to shared knowledge	Ensure that the reader recognises a statement as being familiar or broadly accepted.	Instead of saying **"motivation is considered to be..."**, it would be better to say **"It is widely agreed** that the motivation is..."
Direction expressions	Encourage the reader to perform an action or consider a question from a particular angle.	Instead of saying "the situation arises...", we should say **"We can see** more clearly how this situation arises...". Another example would be **"It is important to take into account** that this approach does not consider contextual variables...", instead of writing "This approach does not consider contextual variables...".
Direct questions to the reader	Asking a question to encourage the reader to adapt the same point of view.	Ask **"How** can we identify the "negative" effects?" instead of saying "The negative effects can be identified by...".

Secondly – as with any other type of text – in scientific articles or research it is frequent to interrupt an argument to offer a comment that ensures readers' understanding. These comments are often given between commas, hyphens or brackets and are made to avoid ambiguities or erroneous interpretations, without providing unnecessary information, as it is assumed that the reader already knows where to go to acquire said information. For example, instead or saying "Wong and Lemar (1982) suggest that anxiety modifies the perception of efficacy, which is why we shall measure anxiety levels...", we should say "Wong and Le Mare (1982) suggest that anxiety modifies the perception of efficacy (understood as school performance), which is why we shall measure anxiety levels...". These comments, that improve accuracy and shape the type of reader interaction, are suitable in the different areas of the text. They are particularly useful in the introduction and method section, in which concepts, instruments and research tools are introduced to the reader.

Thirdly, we can also involve the reader by appealing to shared knowledge, referring to something that we expect the reader to know based on the fact that they belong to the same community of researchers. This resource is used to get the reader to recognise a statement as being familiar or accepted, but it also

helps to ask for and construct the solidarity of the reader. This resource could be implemented in the introduction section when introducing the research topic, where instead of writing "The motivation is considered to be...", we change the phrase for "There is a broad consensus between researchers that the motivation is...".

Fourthly, we can use direction expressions to invite the reader to perform an action or consider a question from a certain perspective. These types of resources are often used in the first person plural form, including imperatives (e.g. "we must consider", "we must remember"), forms implying an obligation which are addressed to the readers ("we should", "we could") and predicative adjectives that express the writer's opinions on the importance or necessity ("it is important to understand that", "it must be highlighted that", etc.). One such example would be writing "Let's take a closer look at how this situation occurs in..." as opposed to "The situation occurs in...". These resources should be used carefully, and are often implemented in the results section when the writer highlights the aspects that the reader should focus on, or the issues that they wish to highlight from the tables, charts or graphs. They are also commonly used in the discussion section in which the results are analysed, where they are discussed with reference to previous studies and their new contributions to the field of research. In such cases, the author guides the reader throughout the discussion section through the use of these directive expressions, which prioritise the aspects that they wish to highlight or demonstrate in each case.

Finally, writers of scientific and research texts may also occasionally resort to the audience involvement resource par excellence: questions which serve to focus attention, encouraging the reader to share the point of view of the writer. Therefore, instead of saying "The negative effects of this approach could be identified by...", we could ask "How could we identify the negative effects of this approach?".

The writer must use each of these resources with caution, always considering when and why they should be used. For example, instead of using self-reference ("us") in the phrase "Technology helps us in many everyday activities...", it would be more appropriate to appeal to the knowledge shared with the reader, through a more efficient alternative such as "It cannot be denied that technology facilitates many everyday activities...". The most important thing is to realise that these resources exist and to understand that writers use them for different purposes, given that they help to set the writer's position in the text and the voice allocated thereto by the readers.

3.3. Citations and references as resources for communicating with other voices and texts

By following Bakhtin's definition, scientific and research texts have a clear dialogical function. Namely, that they are always written in response to previous texts, with the writer's intention being for them to be read and discussed by other authors (Bakhtin, 1982). This is explicitly shown in the introductory sections of a research article or project, where the previously conducted research is revised and the theoretical positioning is established. This is also found in the discussion or future implications section. Likewise, perhaps more implicitly, the dialogical dimension permeates all sections of the text. Whether in the setting of objectives, the discussion of methodology or the presentation of results, it is expected for decisions and statements to be made while considering aspects that have been established by previous studies as understood and valid, whether to corroborate it or refute it.

When writing a scientific or research text, we must always remember to place our voice within the dialogues and conversations that are established within a community, which is often disciplinary, by providing, discussing, synthesising, paraphrasing or rewording – among other things – that which other people have previously written throughout history (Prior, 2001; Bakthin, 1986).

An easy – yet possibly overly simplified – way of analysing the characteristics of the dialogue within scientific and research texts may be to liken intertextuality with what happens when we arrive at a party. We arrive and want to talk to the other attendees, who are spread around the room in various groups. Each group is discussing a different topic, with some conversations being at a more advanced stage than others. To join one of these conversations and be valued by the other participants, we must first have an understanding of the topic that is being discussed, know what has already been said and have a grasp of the tone of the conversation. By doing this, we would be able to join the conversation and give our opinion in order to contribute relevant information, outline our agreement or disagreement with something that someone else has said or lay out the possibility of analysing another aspect of the topic that has not yet been proposed by anyone else. Then, once our voice has been accepted by the other participants, we might be able to take the conversation in a new direction or bring up a different topic about which we would like to hear the opinion of others.

Conversely, when we join in a conversation without knowing what has already been said, the tone of the conversation or the intentions of the participants, our comments may sometimes be repetitive, inadequate or uninteresting. In these cases, our voice may be easily ignored or excluded by the other participants, who will continue to discuss the topic without paying attention to what are saying.

Something similar happens in scientific conversations, as texts will be accepted or rejected depending on the extent to which they adjust their discourse to the forms of dialogue, topics and interests that characterise the vast network of interrelated texts comprising research and academic discourses (Spivey, 1997). In these conversations, one of the primary challenges faced by authors is to construct an original text that guarantees the establishment of dialogical connections with texts written by other authors (Ivanič, 2005). In other words, the author has to manage the dialogic resources in advance, while positioning themselves from a particular angle of the discussion. Citations and references are the best resources for explicitly viewing this interaction, which are explained in the following section.

3.3.1. Types and uses of different citation systems

Citations and references are, without a shadow of doubt, the best discursive mechanisms for effectively interacting with other viewpoints and texts. In scientific texts, authors do not usually use citations to show that they have read the work of a particular author; not even to recognise the authority bestowed in the author by attributing a particular concept or result to him/her. The primary function of citations is to establish a dialogue or conversation with authors who have preceded us, to recognise the different theories and methods and assess or discuss them with the appropriate nuances, from our own position, based on the decisions that relate to our research. The dialogue also extends to the results of these previous studies, both outlining the similarities and also, in a very unique way, conveying the new information that our study has contributed to the conversation, explaining how and why it has altered the tone or content of the conversation and saying why it enriches, supplements or broadens the discussion. Therefore, when citations or references are made to other studies and contributions from this dialogical perspective, we must carefully and strategically choose who we cite, when we cite them and why we are doing it. This is because we should only interact with people who we understand, who speak a similar language to us or who we would like to involve in our discourse. It therefore makes zero sense to indiscriminately cite everything that we have read, and makes even less sense to reference authors or articles that are contradictory or which have little in common. Readers of scientific and research texts also understand the field of study, and view the list of references as another way for the author to position themselves in the context of research.

In addition, citations and references constitute highly important discursive tools for persuading, discussing or justifying the author's own point of view and those of others. Citations also help to situate the text in terms of spatial-temporal, socio-cultural, epistemological and disciplinary coordinates. Scientific texts also help to define the specific context of knowledge or the problem to which the study or text contributes (Teberosky, 2007, page 41).

Table 7. Resources for interacting with other viewpoints in scientific and research texts

Type of citation		Definition	Example
Direct citation		Literally copying the words of another author.	"The abstract is an accurate and shortened version of the most important content contained in the article" (Duque, 2000, page 85).
Indirect citation	Integrated	Using the work of another person in our own text, integrating the name of the author **within the sentence**.	The studies carried out by Beal (1989) and Beck and Robinson (2001) highlight the difficulties faced by pre-school children in interpreting ambiguous messages.
	Non-integrated.	Using the work of another person outside of our original discourse, integrating the name of the author **between brackets** to clarify that the previous statements are based on the citation or citations.	In order to product and interpret different notation systems, such as writing, children pass through a slow constructive process that begins at three years of age (Adi-Japha and Freeman, 2001; Brenneman, Massey, Machado and Gelman, 1996).
Evaluation of a statement		An indirect citation may be accompanied by an evaluative comment (which can be positive or negative).	"I must also highlight another function that also **plays a highly important role**, as Mercer (2000) **correctly** reminds us…".

We therefore recommend correctly and strategically using the different types of citations, which can be categorised simply according to their function and the way in which they are integrated into the text (Castelló, Bañales, Corcelles, Iñesta and Vega, 2008; Teberosky, 2007).

One option is direct citations, which, as we are well aware, entails literally transmitting the ideas of other authors into our text, as illustrated by the following example: "To order a library is to exercise, silently and modestly, the art of the critic (Borges, 1974; page 998)". The use of this citation method allows us to bring other authors into the conversation without their viewpoint being confused with our own, as the two arguments are formally kept apart. Taking into account everything that we have repeated throughout this section about the need to make our voice heard, this type of citation is relatively uncommon in scientific texts, with it only being used under highly specific circumstances (e.g. in the introduction or at the end of the research project, or when we are using very famous or special citations that have a particular meaning).

On the other hand, the use of indirect citations entails a variable degree of interpretation and paraphrasing, as the author is no longer using the literal formulation; rather, they incorporate other authors into their discourse. In other words, it is the author who explains, comments on or includes the words of another author in his/her text. We may choose to incorporate the arguments of other authors for several reasons e.g. to indicate who we were influenced by, the perspective from which a particular concept is understood, who we align ourselves with, who we recognise as an interlocutor and even who it is that we are arguing with.

There are many conventions regarding the use of this type of indirect citation in an academic or scientific text, which depend on whether or not the citations are integrated or not integrated in the author's discourse. As shown in table 7, when using integrated citations, we are still not using the literal formulation of the author who we are citing. Rather, we will paraphrase the content. This means that we are saying the same thing as the author who we are referencing, but in our own words. Here, we are inserting the author into the body of the text (not between brackets). This is therefore known as "integrated citation", because we integrate the author in our text. This gives great relevance to the voice of another author in our own text, with our voice being pushed to the background of the discourse, limited to paraphrasing the arguments of others. This is particularly obvious when we use several citations of this type, one after the other. In these texts, the overall effect is that the author doesn't have enough to say, and instead chooses to speak using the words of others. This effect is highlighted in the following example:

"Richard (2017) argues that disassociation is a process in which psychological experiences and interpretations are unrelated, with meanings being changed. He explains how the subtle distortion of experiences and interpretations can profoundly alter personal experiences.

Furthermore, Steinberg and Schnall (2012) suggest that disassociation is an adaptive behaviour that is used to cope with tensions or traumas. On the other hand, Bernstein and Putnam (1996) argue that different levels of disassociation entail memory loss and contextual disconnection."

In the case of non-integrated citations, meanwhile, the author detaches themselves further from the literal formulation, as the ideas that he/she cites or the information to which they refer are an inseparable part of their discourse. In other words, the text reflects the view of the author which, in another section, contained within brackets[1], reminds us of the sources they have used. A characteristic example of this citation format is seen in the following paragraph: "However, despite the teacher involving the families in the analysis of the situation, they may struggle to understand because the meanings of the basic rules of the educational relationship are not shared (Yaser, 2001)". Here, the citation refers to a particular meaning of the concept ("educational relationship") and encourages the reader to interpret it, even though it is the author who is talking throughout the paragraph.

[1]We have used the APA referencing system throughout this section, so the comments regarding citations follow this system and its conventions. Some comments would be slightly different if we used other reference and citation formats.

Another aspect that must be considered is the degree of proximity or distance, and agreement or disagreement, that the author adopts with regards to the citation. These levels can vary, and can be distinguished when authors opt to assess or discuss some of the ideas held by the authors they have cited, whether done through integrated or non-integrated indirect citations. One example of a non-integrated indirect citation in which the author evaluates the work of others may be: "Some authors have developed interesting proposals in primary and secondary education, establishing a connection between the learning of self-regulation and practices of training and educational evaluation (Allal, 2000; Sanmarti, 1993)". The following, meanwhile, are examples of integrat-

ed indirect citations, which are also evaluative: "The interesting work of Allal (2000) shows that self-regulation can be taught using training and educational evaluation practices"; and "the method implemented by Castro (2006) does not allow essential aspects to be accounted for, such as motives or implicit processes".

Besides these evaluative (positive, negative) comments, different verbs can be used to refer to the work of other authors, with the use thereof representing varying degrees of relationship with the work. We will therefore need to choose from verbs such as "explains", "defines", "provides", "clarifies", etc., depending on our intention in each case.

As we have seen throughout this module/chapter, writing a scientific text such as an article or research project requires many roles to be assumed and many tasks to be performed, all of which are relevant. The most important thing, however, is for the author to decide what to do, when to do it and know why they are doing it. Despite the route not always appearing clear to them, the author must be confident in the fact that the best way to arrive at their destination is to use the tools mentioned in this chapter, and to stride forwards. The quotation by Augusto Monterroso synthetically and eloquently encapsulates the most important aspects discussed throughout these pages:

> "One equals two: the writer who writes (who might be bad) and the writer who corrects (who must be good). Sometimes these two don't come together as one. Three is even better, if the third person crosses out words without even correcting. And what if there is a fourth person who reads, who must be convinced by the first three one way or another? Or if he has to convince them in the same way? This isn't what Walt Whitman was referring to when he said "I contain multitudes", but it's not far off".
>
> Augusto Monterroso, 1986

Bibliography

Bakhtin, M. (1982). "El problema de los géneros discursivos". In: *Estética de la creación verbal* (pages 248-293). (Original edition in Russian, 1979). Madrid: Siglo XXI.

Barton, D.; Hamilton, M.; Ivanič, R. (eds.) (2000). *Situated literacies: Reading and writing in context*. London: Routledge.

Bazerman, C.; Prior, P. (eds.) (2003). *What writing does and how it does it: An introduction to analyzing texts and textual practices*. London: Routledge.

Bereiter, C.; Scardamalia, M. (1987). *The psychology of written composition*. Hillsdale, N. J.: Erlbaum.

Bergh, H. van den; Rijlaarsdam, G. (2001). "Changes in cognitive activities during the writing process and relationships with text quality". *Educational Psychology* (vol. 21, no. 4. pages 373-385). Doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410120090777

Bergh, H. van den; Rijlaarsdam, G.; Steendam, E. van (2016). "Writing process theory: A functional dynamic approach." In: C. A. MacArthur; S. Graham; J. Fitzgerald (eds.). *Handbook of writing research* (2nd ed.). New York: Guilford Press.

Borges, J. L. (1974). *Obras completas, 1923-1972*. Buenos Aires: Emecé.

Castelló, M. (2000). "Students' conceptions on academic writing". In: A. Camps; M. Milian (eds.). *Metalinguistic activity in learning to write* (pages 49-78). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Castelló, M. (2002). "De la investigación sobre el proceso de composición a la enseñanza de la escritura". *Revista Signos* (vol. 35, no. 51-52, pages 149-162).

Castelló, M.; Iñesta, A.; Corcelles, M. (2013). "Learning to write a research article: Ph. D. students' transitions toward disciplinary writing regulation". *Research in the Teaching of English* (vol. 47, no. 4, pages 442-477).

Dysthe, O. (2012). "Multivoiced classrooms in higher education academic writing". In: M. Castelló; C. Donahue (eds.). *University writing: Selves and texts in academic societies*. Bingley, United Kingdom: Emerald Group Publishing Limited (Studies in Writing, vol. 24, pages 201-216).

Gee, J. P. (2005). *An introduction to Discourse Analysis. Theory and method*. New York: Routledge.

Greene, S. (1991). *Writing from Sources: Authority in Text and Task. Technical Report No. 55* [online report]. National Center for the Study of Writing and Literacy. [Consulted on: 16 August 2007]. http://www.nwp.org/cs/public/print/resource/677

Hyland, K. (2005). "Stance and engagement: a model of interaction in academic discourse". *Discourse Studies* (vol. 7, no. 2, pages 173-192).

Hyland, K.; Guinda, C. S. (eds.) (2012). *Stance and voice in written academic genres*. Houndmills. United Kingdom: Palgrave Macmillan.

Iñesta, A.; Castelló, M. (2012). "Towards an integrative unit of analysis: Regulation episodes in expert research article writing". In: C. Bazerman; C. Dean; J. Early; K. Lunsford; S. Null; P. Rogers; A. Stansell (eds.). *International advances in writing research: Cultures, places, measures* (chapter 24, pages 421-448). Fort Collins, CO: WAC Clearinghouse & Parlor Press.

Ivanič, R. (1998). *Writing and Identity. The discoursal construction of identity in academic writing*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ivanič, R. (2005). "The discoursal construction of writer identity". In: R. Beach; J. Green; M. Kamil; T. Shanahan (eds.). *Multidisciplinary perspectives on literacy research* (pages 391-416). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Ivanič, R.; Roach, D. (1990). "Academic writing, power and disguise". In: R. Clark; N. Fairclough; R. Ivanič; N. McLeod; J. Thomas; P. Meara (eds.). *Language and power* (pages 103-121). Clevedon, Avon: British Association for Applied Linguistics / Centre for Information on English Language Teaching and Research.

Matsuda, P. K.; Tardy, C. M. (2007). "Voice in academic writing: The rhetorical construction of author identity in blind manuscript review". *English for Specific Purposes* (vol. 26, no. 2, pages 235-249).

Miras, M.; Solé, I. (2007). "La elaboración del conocimiento científico y académico". In: M. Castelló (coord.). *Escribir y comunicarse en contextos científicos y académicos: Conocimientos y estrategias* (pages 83-112). Barcelona: Graó.

Miras, M.; Solé, I.; Castells, N.; Espino, S.; Gràcia, M. (2008). "La representación de las tareas de lectura y escritura para aprender: el punto de vista de los alumnos". In: A. Camps; M. Millan (coord.). *Miradas y voces: investigación sobre la educación lingüística y literaria en entornos plurilingües* (pages 91-102). Barcelona: Graó.

Monterroso, A. (1986). *Obras completas (y otros cuentos)*. Mexico: Secretaría de Educación Pública, Lecturas Mexicanas (second series, no. 32).

Solé, I.; Mateos, M.; Miras, M.; Martín, E.; Cuevas, I.; Castells, N.; Gràcia; M. (2005). "Lectura, escritura y adquisición de conocimientos en educación secundaria y educación universitaria". *Infancia y Aprendizaje* (vol. 28, no. 3, pages 329-347).

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The psychology of higher mental functions*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.