Arab World English Journal
INTERNATIONAL PEER REVIEWED JOURNAL ISSN: 2229-9327

Arab World English Journal (AWEJ) Volume 15. Number 2, June 2024 Pp.52--72
DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol15no2.4

Multidimensional Analysis of Differences in Lexico-Grammatical Patterns in Saudi and British Linguistics and English Language Teaching Research Articles

Sadia Ali
Department of English Language and Literature, College of Science and Humanities
Prince Sattam bin Abdulaziz University, Al-Kharj, Saudi Arabia
Corresponding Author: sad.ali@psau.edu.sa

Ebtesam Abdulhaleem
King Salman Global Academy for Arabic Language, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia

Received:02/14/2024 Accepted:06/17/2024 Published: 06/28/2024

Abstract
This study explores linguistic variation in research papers published by Saudi and British researchers in Linguistics and English language teaching (ELT). The main aim is to identify and compare interdisciplinary lexico-grammatical patterns between and within the sub-disciplines of these research articles, exploring the extent to which Saudi research articles align with or diverge from their British counterparts. Utilizing Biber's (1988) multidimensional model, this research developed a specialized corpus of academic research articles, which was analyzed using multivariate statistical techniques to investigate linguistic variation. The corpus included tagging of 67 linguistic features, and factor analysis was employed to identify patterns of linguistic co-occurrence. Significant findings indicate that Saudi research papers distinctly differ from British papers in their preference for informational, explicit, non-argumentative, and abstract discourse. Notably, while most sections of the research papers showed variations in non-argumentative discourse, the ELT conclusion sections from both regions demonstrated a tendency towards mixed-purpose discourse. The significance of the study lies in its detailed analysis of how regional differences affect lexico-grammatical choices within academic writing, offering a deeper understanding of linguistic strategies in scholarly communication. The study concludes with recommendations for further research to explore underlying factors contributing to these differences and suggests the development of targeted academic writing aids to support researchers in achieving greater international coherence in their discourse. This could potentially enhance the clarity and impact of scholarly communication across diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds.

Keywords: British linguistics, English language teaching research papers, lexico-grammatical patterns, linguistics research papers, multidimensional analysis, register variation, Saudi context
Cite as: Sadia Ali, S., & Abdulhaleem, E. (2024). Multidimensional Analysis of Differences in Lexico-Grammatical Patterns in Saudi and British Linguistics and English Language Teaching Research Articles . *Arab World English Journal, 15*(2), 52-72.
DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol15no2.4

Introduction

Research articles (RA) are the most important genre as they are necessary for the professional growth of scholars. They serve as a medium for communicating and sharing new ideas, information, and knowledge with the discourse community (Musa et al., 2015). Much work has been done on the analysis of such articles. However, most studies (e.g., Alamri, 2020; Kwan, 2017; Alotaibi & Pickering, 2013; Alhuqban, 2012; Alharbi & Swales, 2011) have mainly focused on the "move structure" of RAs. Very few comprehensive studies have described the grammatical features used in different registers. This paper comprehensively researches the linguistic features related to each dimension that perform a particular communicative function in each RA section to fully understand the linguistic features associated with the RAs' language. There is a difference in academic writing conventions and styles across different academic fields. The present study explores the linguistic features in English language RAs published in Saudi Arabia and Britain in Linguistics and ELT. The study's objectives are to investigate linguistic variation in Saudi research papers, explore interdisciplinary lexico-grammatical similarities and differences between Linguistics and ELT research papers, and find linguistic variation among the sub-categories of the selected research papers.

The present study uses the Multidimensional (MD) approach that centres around the co-occurrence of linguistic features specific to the texts. The present study aims to document the patterns of linguistic variation among academic articles by Saudi and British writers. Using MD analysis, we explore the dimensions of linguistic variation in research articles written by Saudi and British writers and the similarities and differences among them concerning those dimensions.

Literature Review

The genre of research papers has become the leading platform for academic knowledge transfer from researchers to other discourse communities (Swales, 2004). Writing a research paper is a challenging task for both native and non-native speakers of English. It is especially difficult for new researchers. They must be aware of linguistic features associated with the research articles in their related fields (Dobakhti, 2011). Much research has focused on analyzing, comparing, and contrasting discourse. Some studies also analyze research papers from the perspective of move analysis (Alharbi & Swales, 2011). For a long time, many researchers and professionals from various fields have investigated and analyzed research articles, such as computer science articles (Mangabeira et al., 2004), sociology (Schwemmer & Wieczorek, 2019), applied linguistics (Pho, 2008), and medicine (Haidich, 2010).

Various studies also take into account examining various sections of research articles. Galaidin (2021), Bhatti et al. (2019), and Darabad (2016), for example, focus on the abstract section of research papers. Alhuqban (2012) conducted a cross-cultural analysis. He examined the rhetorical structures of Arabic and English Abstracts from police and security sciences research articles. The author analyzed 30 abstracts from each discipline using three models: Swales' (2004) modified CARS, Bhatia's (1993) four-move structure, and Hyland's (2000) five-move structure. Alotaibi and Pickering (2013) also compared abstracts (Arabic and English) published in English RAs in the Arab Journal for the Humanities by Arab scholars in the field of linguistics using Hyland's (2005) model. Further, Dhungana (2024) explores the challenges non-native English speakers face in academic writing, emphasizing the need for new researchers that "[they] must be aware of the specific linguistic conventions that characterize the research articles in their disciplines to effectively communicate their findings" (p. 10).

Similarly, the introduction section from pure and applied linguistics has also been studied. The introduction section of some studies was investigated using move analysis. Albatsha and Aleshinskaya (2021), Afshar et al. (2018), Khamkhien (2015), Jalilifar & Kabezadeh (2012), Jalilifar (2010), Khany & Tazik (2010), and Atai & Habibie (2009). Al-Qahtani (2006) conducted a contrastive analysis of the introduction sections from Arabic and English research articles. The research divided participants into three groups: Arab authors educated in the Middle East, Arab authors educated in the United States, and U.S. Native English speakers. The data were analyzed using Swales' (1990) CARS model. The results showed differences between the research introductions of Arab authors and English speakers. In a separate study, Alotaibi and Pickering (2013) examined 20 Arabic research articles from psychology and sociology. They analyzed the introduction sections using Swales' (1990) move analysis. The findings revealed significant differences in the rhetorical moves used in Arabic introductions of psychology and sociology research papers.

The section of the literature review needs to be more attention. Kwan et al. (2012) and Kwan (2006) examined the literature review. Kwan et al. (2012) evaluate two research domains, i.e., design science research and behavioural science research. The results show marked cross-domain differences. Kwan (2006) analyzes the schematic structure of literature reviews in doctoral theses in applied linguistics. The findings highlight that applied linguistics articles' literature review and introduction sections are structurally different. However, there needs to be more sections on the methods and results. The method section was examined by Peacock (2011), Lim (2006), and Bruce (2008). Cotos et al. (2017) suggested a comprehensive cross-disciplinary approach to study the method section that included three moves and sixteen steps. Peacock (2011) evaluated 288 methods sections across eight fields in a comprehensive corpus analysis: science (i.e., biology, chemistry, and physics) and social science (i.e., 38 business, language, and linguistics, law, public and social administration). The study found several interdisciplinary differences in moves and move cycles. Khamkhien (2015) also examined 25 introduction and methods sections of research articles from applied linguistics. The research study aimed to determine the rhetorical structures and lexica-grammatical linguistic aspects that frequently appeared in the two sections of Thai journals written in English.

Numerous researchers from various fields, mainly applied linguistics, have scrutinized and analyzed the discussion section (Jalilifar et al., 2015; Le & Harrington, 2015; Amnuai & Wannaruk, 2013; Dobakhti, 2013). Depending on the journal's format, the conclusion section is sometimes considered part of the discussion section. Research has been conducted across several disciplines to examine the conclusion part of the research article (Reza & Rokhsareh, 2015; Vukovi & Bratic, 2015; Aslam & Mehmood, 2014; Morales, 2012).

The concept of ESP genre analysis in Saudi Arabia has caught the interest of a few researchers. Alhuqbani (2013) analyzed the rhetorical structures and verb tenses of each move of RA abstracts from four Arabic disciplines: law, linguistics, medical, and police. There were 40 Arabic abstracts in the corpus (10 from each discipline). The study used Bhatia's (1993) four-move structure and Hyland's (2000) five-move structure. The findings revealed that the number of moves described in the two models varied among these four fields.

Alotaibi (2013) also explored the correlation between RA abstracts and introductions in Arabic and English from two disciplines: educational psychology and sociology. The corpus had 40 RA abstracts and introductions (20 from each discipline). Hyland's (2000) model was used for the abstracts, and the modified version of Swales' CARS model (2004) was used for introductions

and abstracts. The findings revealed significant differences in the use of language in the two disciplines.

Alqahtani and Alhamami (2024) discuss the critical obstacles in L2 academic writing faced by Saudi English primary students, highlighting the differences in rhetorical structures. They state, "Significant differences in the rhetorical moves used in Arabic and English research articles indicate the need for awareness of these linguistic features by new researchers" (p. 65). In 2016, Fallatah conducted a study comparing the writing styles of Saudi English research article (RA) abstracts with international English RA abstracts and Arabic RA abstracts. They used Swales and Feak's (2004) five-move CARS model to analyze the abstracts. The study found that Saudi English RA abstracts differed from international English RA abstracts in several ways: 1. Saudi English RA abstracts showed more variation in the presence of different moves, such as the introduction, methods, results, discussion, and conclusion. 2. Saudi English RA abstracts tended to be more verbose, with more words used to convey the same information. 3. Saudi English RA abstracts used excessive citations, acronyms, and itemized lists, leading to a cluttered and less cohesive presentation of information. 4. Saudi English RA abstracts were often multi-paragraphed, unlike the typically single-paragraph format of international English RA abstracts. Overall, the study indicated that Saudi English RA abstracts have distinct linguistic features that set them apart from international English RA abstracts and Arabic RA abstracts.

This study aims to analyze research articles in the fields of linguistics and ELT authored by Saudi and British researchers. It compares all the sections (abstracts, introduction, literature review, methodology, analysis and discussion, and conclusion) of research articles. By employing a multidimensional analysis approach, this study endeavors to provide valuable insights into the differences in lexico-grammatical patterns between them.

Methodology

A specialized corpus of research papers published by Saudi researchers was developed. A parallel corpus of research papers published by British researchers was also developed. The articles were selected from two disciplines: linguistics and ELT. A hundred research articles from both disciplines were taken. The total number of articles was four hundred, i.e., two hundred from each country. These articles were further divided into six categories. The sub-categories were based on the sections of the research articles: abstract, introduction, literature review, methodology, analysis & discussion, and conclusion. So, the total number of text files in the corpus was 2400.

The data was compiled into a corpus, cleaned, and given unique codes. The Biber tagger was used to computationally identify linguistic features, and their frequencies were counted with Biber's Tag Count program. The frequencies were then normalized and standardized to ensure equal weight of all features. The study followed a procedure that included data collection, data tagging, computation of linguistic features, analysis of co-occurrence patterns, dimension score calculation, ANOVA, and functional analyses to interpret the dimensions. Table 1. shows the codes used in the paper.

Table 1. *List of Codes used in the present study*

	Codes		Codes
Saudi research articles	SR	British ELT literature review	BELTL
British research articles	BR	Saudi Linguistics literature review	SLL
Saudi ELT research articles	SELTR	British Linguistics literature review	BLL
British ELT research articles	BELTR	Saudi ELT methodology	SELTM
Saudi Linguistics research articles	SLR	British ELT methodology	BELTM

British Linguistics research articles	BLR	Saudi Linguistics methodology	SLM
Saudi ELT abstract	SELTA	British Linguistics methodology	BLM
British ELT abstract	BELTA	Saudi ELT analysis and discussion	SELTAN
Saudi Linguistics abstract	SLA	British ELT analysis and discussion	BELTAN
British Linguistics abstract	BLA	Saudi Linguistics analysis and discussion	SLAN
Saudi ELT introduction	SELTI	British Linguistics analysis and discussion	BLAN
British ELT introduction	BELTI	Saudi ELT conclusion	SELTC
Saudi Linguistics introduction	SLI	British ELT conclusion	BELTC
British Linguistics introduction	BLI	Saudi Linguistics conclusion	SLC
Saudi ELT literature review	SELTL	British Linguistics conclusion	BLC

Analysis and Discussion

This section includes the results of the ANOVA test and descriptive statistics. The results of ANOVA show statistically significant differences across categories and within the selected disciplines of research articles from Saudi Arabia and Britain. Descriptive statistics provide mean, maximum, minimum, and standard deviation scores of the two disciplines from both countries. The co-occurrence of linguistic features in the texts defines the linguistic dimensions. Biber labelled dimension one as 'Involved vs Informational Discourse'. Higher frequencies of *verb (uninflected present, imperative & third Person), 'that' deletion, first-person pronoun/possessive, modals of possibility, second person pronoun/ possessive, wh-clause, nominal pronoun, demonstrative pronoun, co-ordinating conjunction-clausal connector, do as proverb, wh-question, verb 'be' (uninflected present tense, verb, and auxiliary), sub-ordinating conjunction-causative, adverb/qualifier-emphatic (e.g., just, really). Adverbial/qualifier-amplifier* are associated with higher involved discourse. On the other hand, the higher frequencies of *nouns (excluding gerunds), prepositions,* and *attributive adjectives* are related to informational discourse. The results show the highest frequencies of linguistic features associated with negative polarity, indicating a high information density. Table 2 contains ANOVA results, which present the significance level across categories and within the selected disciplines of research articles from Saudi Arabia and Britain. In the ANOVA test, the mean value is non-significant if $P>0.05$, significant if $P<0.05$, and highly significant if $P<0.01$. A P-value of less than 0.05 is a conventional threshold for considering the statistical significance. Statistically significant differences were attested across categories and within the selected disciplines of research articles from Saudi Arabia and Britain, as the significance level is less than 0.05.

As in the MD model, the linguistic features are in complementary distribution to each other, and the continuum contains narrative features on one side, and non-narrative features on the other; low narrative discourse indicates the presence of non-narrative features. So, Biber labels dimension two as 'Narrative vs. Non-narrative Concerns'. The features with positive weight include *past tense verbs, third-person pronouns, perfect aspect verbs, synthetic negation,* and *present participle clauses*. Present *tense verbs, attributive adjectives, past participial*, and *word length* co-occur to produce non-narrative discourse on the negative polarity. The results indicate that both countries have non-narrative discourse to a varying degree. On D2, a statistically significant difference between groups (between the two countries regarding their categories) and within groups (between the disciplines with a county) has been observed.

Table 2. *Variance across categories and within the selected disciplines of Saudi and British research articles on five textual dimensions*

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Dim_1	Between Disciplines	7178.809	23	312.122	13.034	.000
	Across categories	56898.088	2376	23.947		
	Total	64076.897	2399			
Dim_2	Between Disciplines	426.011	23	18.522	3.977	.000
	Across categories	11065.739	2376	4.657		
	Total	11491.750	2399			
Dim_3	Between Disciplines	4924.187	23	214.095	14.421	.000
	Across categories	35274.582	2376	14.846		
	Total	40198.769	2399			
Dim_4	Between Disciplines	2073.104	23	90.135	10.118	.000
	Across categories	21166.294	2376	8.908		
	Total	23239.397	2399			
Dim_5	Between Disciplines	2053.856	23	89.298	5.097	.000
	Across categories	41624.501	2376	17.519		
	Total	43678.357	2399			

Besides the above two dimensions, "Explicit vs. Situation Dependent Discourse" is another dimension that uses three types of WH clauses to create Explicit discourse. These constructions are: wh-pronoun-relative clause-object position, wh-pronoun-relative clause-subject position, and wh-pronoun-relative clause-object position with prepositional fronting. There are other ways to make discourse explicit, such as coordinating conjunctions, phrasal connectors, and singular noun-nominalization. In contrast, situation-dependent discourse uses content words such as time, place, and situation-dependent adverbs. The difference between explicit and situation-dependent discourse is statistically significant.

The study found that while Dimension 4, which represents "Overt Expression of Argumentation/Persuasion," contained only positive features, all sections of the research papers from both countries had a discourse on the negative continuum. Several linguistic features contributed to argumentative discourse, such as infinitive verbs, modal verbs of prediction, suasive verbs, subordinating conjunction-conditionals, modal verbs of necessity, and adverbs within auxiliary. In contrast, non-argumentative discourse was produced by third-person pronouns, private verbs, and hedges on the negative continuum. Statistically significant differences were found between and within groups on Dimension 4.

Dimension 5 ranges from the positive "Impersonal (Abstract) Discourse" to the negative "Non-Impersonal (Non-Abstract) Discourse." It includes both the production and reception of impersonal discourse through adverbial conjuncts, agentless passive verbs, passive verbs, and usage of 'by'. On the negative side, non-impersonal discourse is produced by the type/token ratio, closely related to the positive features. Dimension 5, like others, exhibits distinct differences within and between groups, suggesting that this dimension captures essential writing characteristics.

Linguistic Variation between Saudi and British Abstract Section

The study divides research articles into different sections. The first section is the abstract. Biber (1988) believes that 'texts from a single genre might represent several different text types' (p. 170). Statistical analysis shows that on dimension one, both the countries in their academic

genres, i.e., ELT and Linguistics research papers, with negative mean scores, produce informational discourse to varying degrees. According to Biber (1988), the linguistic features integrated and producing informational discourse are mainly used in typical writing. He further elaborates, 'integration refers to how a large amount of information is packed into relatively few words in typical writing' (p. 43). Table 3 shows the mean, maximum, lower bound, upper bound, and standard deviation of Saudi and British abstract sections. The standard deviation helps analyze the spread of the distribution, and the mean describes the relative frequency of words in the entire corpus. A significant linguistic variation exists between Saudi and British abstract sections. Table 3 indicates that on D1, BELTA, with a mean score of -15.64, is the least, and SELTA, with a mean score of -18.67, is the most informational in discourse production.

On the other hand, SLA, with a mean score of -18.08, is more information than BLA (-17.36). So, there is a significant difference in the mean scores of British and Saudi ELT abstracts in producing informational discourse. On D2, the abstract of both countries produces non-narrative discourse. Like D1, on this dimension, BELTA, with a mean score of -2.75, is the least, and SELTA, with a mean score of -3.87, is the most non-narrative. The mean scores of SLA and BLA, i.e., -3.73 and -3.72, respectively, are almost the same in producing non-narrative discourse. The results indicate that on D3, all the countries produce Explicit discourse on positive polarity. SLA (10.18) is the most explicit among others, and BLA, with a mean score of 7.86, is the least explicit. SELTA, with a mean score of 9.88, is more explicit than BELTA (8.57) in producing discourse.

Table 3. *Descriptive statistics of ELT and Linguistics abstract section across Old textual dimensions*

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Dim_1	Abstract_-ELT_UK	100	-15.6487	6.17866	.61787	-16.8747	-14.4227	-28.87	.31
	Abstract_-Linguistic-UK	100	-17.3626	5.73594	.57359	-18.5007	-16.2245	-28.24	.77
	Abstract_-ELT_SA	100	-18.6770	4.79496	.47950	-19.6284	-17.7256	-29.78	-7.62
	Abstract_-Linguistic_SA	100	-18.0850	5.12229	.51223	-19.1014	-17.0686	-29.29	-3.83
Dim_2	Abstract_-ELT_UK	100	-2.7580	3.71114	.37111	-3.4944	-2.0216	-7.38	11.01
	Abstract_-Linguistic-UK	100	-3.7281	2.41754	.24175	-4.2078	-3.2484	-7.38	3.60
	Abstract_-ELT_SA	100	-3.8735	2.27746	.22775	-4.3254	-3.4216	-7.38	2.92
	Abstract_-Linguistic_SA	100	-3.7328	2.95397	.29540	-4.3189	-3.1467	-7.38	6.56
Dim_3	Abstract_-ELT_UK	100	8.5744	5.24650	.52465	7.5334	9.6154	-5.10	34.89
	Abstract_-Linguistic-UK	100	7.8690	5.23045	.52305	6.8312	8.9068	-7.56	25.31
	Abstract_-ELT_SA	100	9.8884	5.27544	.52754	8.8416	10.9352	-1.74	28.79
	Abstract_-Linguistic_SA	100	10.1885	5.02741	.50274	9.1910	11.1860	.97	25.32

Dim_4	Abstract_-ELT_UK	100	-4.0458	3.66045	.36604	-4.7721	-3.3195	-9.27	5.04
	Abstract_-Linguistic-UK	100	-3.6519	3.38008	.33801	-4.3226	-2.9812	-9.27	7.16
	Abstract_-ELT_SA	100	-3.5893	3.73068	.37307	-4.3295	-2.8491	-9.27	7.82
	Abstract_-Linguistic_SA	100	-3.7519	3.37986	.33799	-4.4225	-3.0813	-9.27	6.80
Dim_5	Abstract_-ELT_UK	100	3.3904	6.66973	.66697	2.0670	4.7138	-3.92	36.05
	Abstract_-Linguistic-UK	100	2.8203	4.93934	.49393	1.8402	3.8004	-3.92	25.54
	Abstract_-ELT_SA	100	3.0245	4.37645	.43764	2.1561	3.8929	-3.33	17.59
	Abstract_-Linguistic_SA	100	4.2550	5.74769	.57477	3.1145	5.3955	-3.92	39.68

As far as D4 is concerned, the abstracts of both countries from both disciplines produce non-argumentative discourse. As far as BELTA (-4.04) is concerned, it is the most non-argumentative among others. On the other hand, SELTA, with a mean score of -3.58, is the least non-argumentative. BLA and SLA (-3.65 and -3.75, respectively) produce non-argumentative discourse with very little difference in their mean scores. On D5, the categories from both countries produce abstract discourse. SLA produces abstract discourse on positive polarity with a mean score of 4.25. BLA produces the least abstract discourse with a minimum mean score of 2.82. SELTA and BELTA, with mean scores of 3.02 and 3.39, respectively, produce abstract discourse to a varying degree.

Linguistic Variation between Saudi and British Introduction Section

Table 4 shows that, like the abstract section, the introduction section produces informational discourse. BELTI, with a mean score of -18.54, is the most informational, while SELTI, with a mean score of -17.00, is the least informational. In contrast, regarding the introduction sections from the area of linguistics, SLI (-18.37) is more informational than BLI (-17.77).

Table 4. *Descriptive statistics of ELT and Linguistics introduction section across five textual dimensions*

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Dim_1	Introduction_ELT_UK	100	-18.5441	4.28109	.42811	-19.3936	-17.6946	-25.75	1.08
	Introduction_Linguistic-UK	100	-17.7736	3.63739	.36374	-18.4953	-17.0519	-24.52	-8.07
	Introduction_ELT_SA	100	-17.0097	4.25920	.42592	-17.8548	-16.1646	-28.14	-6.50
	Introduction_Linguistic_SA	100	-18.3776	4.44018	.44402	-19.2586	-17.4966	-27.01	-3.16

Dim_2	Introduction_ELT_UK	100	-3.2008	1.97600	.19760	-3.5929	-2.8087	-6.72	3.25
	Introduction_Linguistic-UK	100	-3.2849	2.19376	.21938	-3.7202	-2.8496	-6.36	4.48
	Introduction_ELT_SA	100	-2.7759	2.21240	.22124	-3.2149	-2.3369	-6.42	5.47
	Introduction_Linguistic_SA	100	-3.5973	1.84673	.18467	-3.9637	-3.2309	-7.22	1.69
Dim_3	Introduction_ELT_UK	100	7.3748	3.71309	.37131	6.6380	8.1116	.14	20.39
	Introduction_Linguistic-UK	100	6.5112	3.08548	.30855	5.8990	7.1234	1.01	16.74
	Introduction_ELT_SA	100	9.2789	3.30419	.33042	8.6233	9.9345	2.57	19.14
	Introduction_Linguistic_SA	100	9.5809	4.44557	.44456	8.6988	10.4630	2.04	30.44
Dim_4	Introduction_ELT_UK	100	-3.3070	2.13144	.21314	-3.7299	-2.8841	-8.07	2.03
	Introduction_Linguistic-UK	100	-2.6100	2.17078	.21708	-3.0407	-2.1793	-7.59	3.31
	Introduction_ELT_SA	100	-2.7082	2.70440	.27044	-3.2448	-2.1716	-9.27	8.12
	Introduction_Linguistic_SA	100	-3.8160	2.38922	.23892	-4.2901	-3.3419	-9.27	6.93
Dim_5	Introduction_ELT_UK	100	5.2733	3.67644	.36764	4.5438	6.0028	-3.00	14.03
	Introduction_Linguistic-UK	100	5.8319	3.45458	.34546	5.1464	6.5174	-2.68	14.66
	Introduction_ELT_SA	100	4.9081	4.32371	.43237	4.0502	5.7660	-.95	20.36
	Introduction_Linguistic_SA	100	5.1165	3.72976	.37298	4.3764	5.8566	-2.03	17.18

On D2, both countries produce non-narrative discourse on negative polarity. SLI, with a mean score of -3.59, and BLI, with a mean score of -3.28, produce non-narrative discourse to a varying degree. BELTI (-3.20) is more non-narrative than SELTI (-2.77). On D3, both countries produce explicit discourse on positive polarity. There is a significant difference in the mean scores of SELTI (9.27) and BELTI (7.37) in producing explicit discourse. There is a substantial difference in the mean score of SLI (9.58) and BLI (6.51) in producing discourse on this dimension. On D4, both the countries produce non-evaluative discourse. SLI (-3.81) is more non-evaluative than BLI (-2.61). However, regarding the introduction section of linguistics, BELTI, with a mean score of -3.30, is more non-evaluative than SELTI (-2.70). As far as D5 is concerned, BLI (5.83) is more abstract than SLI (5.11). Likewise, BELTI, with a mean score of 5.27, is more abstract than SELTI (4.90). The findings based on mean dimension scores provide evidence that introductions from both countries in both disciplines differ in their discourse production.

Linguistic Variation between Saudi and British Literature Review Section

Like other sections, the literature review section also produces informational discourse to varying degrees. BLL (-19.00) produces the highest informational discourse, while SLL, with a mean score of -16.64, produces the least informational discourse. Table 5 indicates less difference

between the mean scores of SELTL (-17.85) and BELTL (-17.00). On D2, all the countries fall on the negative polarity of the continuum and produce non-narrative discourse. Generally, narrative discourse states past events and non-narrative discourse presents a first-hand account of the events (Nijk, 2022). On this dimension, like dimension 1, BLL with mean scores of -3.82 again produces the most non-narrative discourse. The mean score of SLL, i.e., -2.98, shows a significant difference from BLL. Like D1, again, there is significantly less difference on this dimension between the mean scores of SELTL (-2.69) and BELTL (-2.54).

Table 5. *Descriptive statistics of ELT and Linguistics literature review section across five textual dimensions*

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Dim_1	Literature Review_-ELT_UK	100	-17.0026	3.87477	.38748	-17.7714	-16.2338	-25.75	-5.77
	Literature Review_-Linguistic-UK	100	-19.0031	3.94748	.39475	-19.7864	-18.2198	-39.62	-10.98
	Literature Review_ELT_SA	100	-17.8530	4.94834	.49483	-18.8349	-16.8711	-27.87	-5.60
	Literature Review_-Linguistic_SA	100	-16.6436	4.69079	.46908	-17.5744	-15.7128	-28.56	-6.21
Dim_2	Literature Review_ELT_UK	100	-2.5484	2.11950	.21195	-2.9690	-2.1278	-6.30	3.54
	Literature Review_–Linguistic-UK	100	-3.8284	.95580	.09558	-4.0181	-3.6387	-7.38	-1.32
	Literature Review_ELT_SA	100	-2.6944	1.74694	.17469	-3.0410	-2.3478	-7.38	3.47
	Literature Review_–Linguistic_SA	100	-2.9812	1.67404	.16740	-3.3134	-2.6490	-6.91	1.55
Dim_3	Literature Review_ELT_UK	100	7.5324	3.68593	.36859	6.8010	8.2638	-1.13	17.07
	Literature Review_–Linguistic-UK	100	6.2221	2.03624	.20362	5.8181	6.6261	1.62	13.03
	Literature Review_ELT_SA	100	8.9769	2.78658	.27866	8.4240	9.5298	.23	16.37
	Literature Review_–Linguistic_SA	100	8.5147	3.81885	.38189	7.7570	9.2724	.39	23.30

Dim_4	Literature Review_ELT_ UK	100	-2.8857	2.61893	.26189	-3.4054	-2.3660	-7.37	5.37
	Literature Review_–Linguistic-UK	100	-3.9750	1.53272	.15327	-4.2791	-3.6709	-9.27	1.26
	Literature Review_ELT_ SA	100	-3.3711	2.72060	.27206	-3.9109	-2.8313	-8.24	13.56
	Literature Review_–Linguistic_SA	100	-3.7801	2.32669	.23267	-4.2418	-3.3184	-9.27	4.06
Dim_5	Literature Review_ELT_ UK	100	6.4602	3.92245	.39225	5.6819	7.2385	-3.09	21.33
	Literature Review_-Linguistic-UK	100	3.9349	2.33913	.23391	3.4708	4.3990	-3.92	8.73
	Literature Review_ELT_ SA	100	5.0836	3.46112	.34611	4.3968	5.7704	-.06	21.59
	Literature Review_-Linguistic_SA	100	5.9433	4.54923	.45492	5.0406	6.8460	-.85	25.00

According to the analysis, SELTL produces the most explicit discourse on dimension D3, with a mean score of 8.97. BELTL produces less explicit discourse than SELTL, with a mean score of 7.53 for the same dimension. The analysis shows a significant difference in mean scores between SLL and BLL, with 8.51 and 6.22, respectively. On dimension D4, all countries produce non-argumentative discourse. BLL produces the most non-argumentative discourse, with a mean score of -3.97, whereas (-3.78) produces less non-argumentative discourse. On the same dimension, BELTL scores a mean score of -2.88, which is fewer non-argumentative scores than SELTL (-3.37). On dimension D5, there is a significant difference between the literature review sections of ELT and linguistics from Britain. BELTL is the most abstract, with a mean score of 6.46, while BLL is the least abstract, with a mean score of 3.93. SELTL (5.08) produces less abstract discourse than SLL (5.94). As far as D3 is concerned, SELTL, with a mean score of 8.97, produces the most explicit discourse. BELTL (7.53) is less explicit than SELTL on this dimension. There is a significant difference in the mean scores of SLL and BLL, i.e., 8.51 and 6.22, respectively. On D4, all the countries produce non-argumentative discourse. BLL produces the most non-argumentative discourse with a mean score of -3.97 (-3.78), producing less non-argumentative discourse than BLL. BELTL, with a mean score of -2.88, shows fewer non-argumentative scores than SELTL (-3.37). On D5, there is a significant difference between the mean scores of the literature review sections of ELT and linguistics from Britain. BELTL, with a mean score of 6.46, is the most abstract, while BLL, with a mean score of 3.93, is the least abstract. SELTL (5.08) shows less abstract discourse than SLL (5.94).

Linguistic Variation between Saudi and British Methodology Section

Table 6 shows that both countries' methodology sections produce informational discourse. SELTM, BELTM, and BLM, with mean scores of -18.84, -18.14, and -18.80, respectively, show

informational discourse to a varying degree. SLM, with a mean score of -16.94, shows the least informational discourse.

Table 6. *Descriptive statistics of ELT and Linguistics methodology section across five textual dimensions*

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Dim_1	Methodology_ ELT_UK	100	-18.1413	5.64502	.56450	-19.2614	-17.0212	-28.17	1.52
	Methodology_ Linguistic-UK	100	-18.8039	4.06869	.40687	-19.6112	-17.9966	-30.64	-11.53
	Methodology_ ELT_SA	100	-18.8452	4.37437	.43744	-19.7132	-17.9772	-40.03	-5.09
	Methodology_ Linguistic_SA	100	-16.9474	4.98288	.49829	-17.9361	-15.9587	-26.33	.62
Dim_2	Methodology_ ELT_UK	100	-2.5120	2.16418	.21642	-2.9414	-2.0826	-6.75	10.12
	Methodology_ Linguistic-UK	100	-3.4359	1.73155	.17315	-3.7795	-3.0923	-7.38	.76
	Methodology_ ELT_SA	100	-3.2102	1.96183	.19618	-3.5995	-2.8209	-7.38	5.22
	Methodology_ Linguistic_SA	100	-3.2492	1.89568	.18957	-3.6253	-2.8731	-7.03	4.14
Dim_3	Methodology_ ELT_UK	100	6.7529	3.36257	.33626	6.0857	7.4201	-1.68	21.39
	Methodology_ Linguistic-UK	100	5.9185	2.92707	.29271	5.3377	6.4993	.67	16.54
	Methodology_ ELT_SA	100	7.9844	2.91411	.29141	7.4062	8.5626	1.62	14.89
	Methodology_ Linguistic_SA	100	7.5848	4.43638	.44364	6.7045	8.4651	1.80	22.69
Dim_4	Methodology_ ELT_UK	100	-3.5993	2.96344	.29634	-4.1873	-3.0113	-9.27	6.07
	Methodology_ Linguistic-UK	100	-3.7778	2.02541	.20254	-4.1797	-3.3759	-9.02	1.44
	Methodology_ ELT_SA	100	-3.0141	2.71345	.27135	-3.5525	-2.4757	-9.27	7.41
	Methodology_ Linguistic_SA	100	-2.9139	2.80342	.28034	-3.4702	-2.3576	-9.27	5.90
Dim_5	Methodology_ ELT_UK	100	3.3667	3.47389	.34739	2.6774	4.0560	-3.92	13.16
	Methodology_ Linguistic-UK	100	4.7647	3.49118	.34912	4.0720	5.4574	-3.92	14.36
	Methodology_ ELT_SA	100	3.7728	3.63490	.36349	3.0516	4.4940	-3.92	24.92
	Methodology_ Linguistic_SA	100	5.2715	4.09994	.40999	4.4580	6.0850	-1.88	25.00

On D2, the methodology section has been found to produce non-narrative discourse. BLM, i.e., -3.43 have, scored the highest mean scores. Comparatively, BELTM (-2.51) is the least non-

narrative. SLM (-3.21) is a little less non-narrative than BLM. There is less difference in SLM and SELTM mean scores (-3.21). McEnery and Xiao (2010) find that internal comparisons of genres are important indicators of differences. The comparison of the mean scores on D3 indicates the methodology sections from both the disciplines of the research articles as explicit and elaborative in style. The degree of explicitness varies across disciplines. SELTM produces the most explicit discourse, with a mean score of 7.98, while BLM produces the least explicit discourse with a mean score of 5.91. SLM (7.58) is slightly less explicit than SELTM. BELTM (6.75) is somewhat more explicit than BLM. On D4, the mean scores reveal the non-argumentative style of ELT and Linguistics methodology sections with minor variations. BLM, with a mean score of -3.77, is the most non-argumentative. On the other hand, SLM (-2.91) is the least non-argumentative. BELTM (-3.59) is less non-argumentative than BLM. BELTM (-3.01) is more non-argumentative than SLM. On D5, both countries produce abstract discourse. SLM (5.27) is the most abstract, and BELTM (3.36) is the least abstract. BLM, with a mean score of 4.76, is more abstract than SELTM. SLM (5.27) is more abstract than BLM.

Linguistic Variation between Saudi and British Analysis and Discussion Section

On D1, SELTD, with a mean score of -18.75, is the most informative, while BELTD, with a mean score of -14.00, is the least informative. Table 7 indicates that SLD (-14.86) is slightly more informational than BELTD. BLD (-15.31) also shows informative discourse. On D2, both countries produce non-narrative discourse. There is a slight difference between the mean scores of SLD (-3.26) and BLD (-3.25). BELTD (-2.47) and SELTD (-2.94) produce less non-narrative discourse.

Table 7. *Descriptive statistics of ELT and Linguistics analysis and discussion section across five textual dimensions*

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Dim_1	Analysis & Discussion_-ELT_UK	100	-14.0028	4.35504	.43550	-14.8669	-13.1387	-22.51	6.71
	Analysis & Discussion_-Linguistic-UK	100	-15.3100	4.66173	.46617	-16.2350	-14.3850	-29.48	-.40
	Analysis & Discussion_-ELT_SA	100	-18.7540	4.04695	.40469	-19.5570	-17.9510	-25.76	.15
	Analysis & Discussion_-Linguistic_SA	100	-14.8687	3.79872	.37987	-15.6224	-14.1150	-21.85	-8.56
Dim_2	Analysis & Discussion_-ELT_UK	100	-2.4709	1.91220	.19122	-2.8503	-2.0915	-6.76	6.93
	Analysis & Discussion_-Linguistic-UK	100	-3.2515	1.55868	.15587	-3.5608	-2.9422	-6.41	1.55

	Analysis & Discussion_-ELT_SA	100	-2.9446	1.86950	.18695	-3.3155	-2.5737	-6.08	4.96
	Analysis & Discussion_-Linguistic_SA	100	-3.2653	1.99735	.19973	-3.6616	-2.8690	-6.64	4.34
Dim_3	Analysis & Discussion_-ELT_UK	100	6.0983	2.65056	.26506	5.5724	6.6242	-.10	19.19
	Analysis & Discussion_-Linguistic-UK	100	5.2606	2.79137	.27914	4.7067	5.8145	-4.06	13.90
	Analysis & Discussion_-ELT_SA	100	8.3498	2.98242	.29824	7.7580	8.9416	3.32	17.03
	Analysis & Discussion_-Linguistic_SA	100	6.2925	2.94830	.29483	5.7075	6.8775	-2.38	15.65
Dim_4	Analysis & Discussion_-ELT_UK	100	-2.1721	2.47550	.24755	-2.6633	-1.6809	-5.99	9.00
	Analysis & Discussion_-Linguistic-UK	100	-2.8376	2.49939	.24994	-3.3335	-2.3417	-8.03	3.81
	Analysis & Discussion_-ELT_SA	100	-2.9942	2.61459	.26146	-3.5130	-2.4754	-7.34	4.14
	Analysis & Discussion_ Linguistic_SA	100	-2.7757	2.90134	.29013	-3.3514	-2.2000	-7.98	8.17
Dim_5	Analysis & Discussion_ ELT_UK	100	5.1148	3.11347	.31135	4.4970	5.7326	-1.42	17.79
	Analysis & Discussion_ Linguistic-UK	100	5.7628	3.90611	.39061	4.9877	6.5379	-3.92	14.83
	Analysis & Discussion_ ELT_SA	100	4.6168	3.70973	.37097	3.8807	5.3529	-1.97	24.86
	Analysis & Discussion_ Linguistic_SA	100	4.9363	3.57326	.35733	4.2273	5.6453	-.82	18.87

On D3, all the countries produce explicit discourse. Table 7 shows that SELTD produces the most informative discourse with a mean score of 8.34. There is a slight difference in the mean scores of BELTD (6.09) and SLD (6.29). BLD (5.26) produces the least explicit discourse. In the field of journalism, primarily argumentative style of writing is used (Steensen, 2018). However, the results show that third-person pronouns, private verbs, and hedges produce non-argumentative discourse in this study. On D4, both countries' discourses fall on negative polarity, producing non-argumentative discourse. BELTD, BLD, SELTD, and SLD, with mean scores of -2.17, -2.83, -2.99, and -2.77, respectively, produce non-argumentative discourse with a varying degree on this dimension. On D5, all the countries produce abstract discourse. BLD produces the most abstract

discourse with a mean score of 5.76. SELTD (4.61) produces the least abstract discourse. BELTD (5.11) and SLD (4.93) also produce abstract discourse.

Linguistic Variation between Saudi and British Conclusion Section

Table 8 shows that both countries produce informative discourse on D1. SLC produces the most informative discourse with a mean score of -16.58. BELTC (-12.96) produces the least informative discourse. There is a slight difference in the mean score of BLC (-14.28) and SELTC (-14.76). Like other sections, the conclusion section also produces non-narrative discourse on D2. There is a slight difference in the mean scores of BLC (-3.02), SELTC (-3.37), and BLC (-3.77). BELTC, with a mean score of -2.94, is the least non-narrative.

Table 8. *Descriptive statistics of ELT and Linguistics conclusion section across five textual dimensions*

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Dim_1	Conclusion_ELT_UK	100	-12.9673	5.65299	.56530	-14.0890	-11.8456	-22.47	8.41
	Conclusion_Linguistic-UK	100	-14.2899	5.90948	.59095	-15.4625	-13.1173	-35.38	4.95
	Conclusion_ELT_SA	100	-14.7605	6.89206	.68921	-16.1280	-13.3930	-28.06	12.59
	Conclusion_Linguistic_SA	100	-16.5810	5.44535	.54454	-17.6615	-15.5005	-27.58	-3.73
Dim_2	Conclusion_ELT_UK	100	-2.9472	2.30103	.23010	-3.4038	-2.4906	-7.38	4.93
	Conclusion_Linguistic-UK	100	-3.0266	2.38414	.23841	-3.4997	-2.5535	-7.38	3.03
	Conclusion_ELT_SA	100	-3.3729	2.34205	.23421	-3.8376	-2.9082	-7.19	7.65
	Conclusion_Linguistic_SA	100	-3.7711	2.19187	.21919	-4.2060	-3.3362	-7.38	4.44
Dim_3	Conclusion_ELT_UK	100	7.1226	4.55665	.45566	6.2185	8.0267	-7.75	17.50
	Conclusion_Linguistic-UK	100	5.9959	3.88473	.38847	5.2251	6.7667	-4.09	21.15
	Conclusion_ELT_SA	100	9.3530	4.03562	.40356	8.5522	10.1538	-1.23	20.71
	Conclusion_Linguistic_SA	100	9.8378	4.65385	.46538	8.9144	10.7612	1.81	25.88
Di	Conclusion_ELT_UK	100	-.9010	3.51036	.35104	-1.5975	-.2045	-7.86	7.96

	Conclusion _Linguistic -UK	100	-1.3558	3.46630	.34663	-2.0436	-.6680	-9.27	10.65
	Conclusion _ELT_SA	100	-.8086	4.28909	.42891	-1.6596	.0424	-9.27	12.34
	Conclusion _Linguistic _SA	100	-1.5570	4.56790	.45679	-2.4634	-.6506	-9.27	12.18
Dim_5	Conclusion _ELT_UK	100	5.2564	4.47927	.44793	4.3676	6.1452	-3.92	16.39
	Conclusion _Linguistic -UK	100	4.0554	4.79204	.47920	3.1046	5.0062	-2.67	16.32
	Conclusion _ELT_SA	100	4.6610	4.30400	.43040	3.8070	5.5150	-3.92	16.66
	Conclusion _Linguistic _SA	100	4.4952	4.52528	.45253	3.5973	5.3931	-3.92	18.91

On D3, both the countries produce explicit discourse. SLC (9.83) is the most explicit, while BLC (5.99) is the least explicit. SELTC (9.35) is slightly less explicit than SLC. BELTC (7.12) also produces explicit discourse. On D4, BELTC and SELTC produce mixed-purpose discourse with mean scores of -0.90 and -0.80, respectively. The closeness to the zero mean score means that the function of discourse is mixed purpose. BLC (-1.35) and SLC (-1.55) produce non-argumentative discourse. On D5, both countries' disciplines fall on positive polarity, thus producing abstract discourse. Passives are the main linguistic features for producing abstract discourse. Passives like "by-passives and agentless passive have the same discourse function: to switch the focus of action in the active clause from subject/ actor to object/ patient or the action itself" (Westin, 2002, p. 118). BLC (4.05), SELTC (4.66), and SLC (4.49), with a slight difference in their mean scores, produce abstract discourse. BELTC, with a mean score of 5.25, is slightly more abstract than others.

Conclusion

The findings show that Saudi English research papers differ remarkably from Britain's on all five textual dimensions. Saudi ELT abstracts are more informational, non-narrative, and explicit than British ELT abstracts. At the same time, they are less non-argumentative and abstract than British ELT abstracts. Saudi linguistics abstracts are more informational, non-narrative, explicit, non-argumentative, and abstract than British ones. Saudi ELT introductions are less informative, non-narrative, non-argumentative, and abstract than British ELT. In contrast, they are more explicit than the British ELT introduction section. The Saudi linguistics introduction section is more informational, non-narrative, explicit, and non-argumentative than the British. They are less abstract than the British introduction section from the linguistics discipline.

Regarding the literature review section, Saudi ELT articles are less abstract and more informational, non-narrative, explicit, and non-argumentative than British research articles. Saudi linguistics articles are more explicit and abstract than British linguistic articles. On the other hand, they are less informational, non-narrative, and non-argumentative than British linguistic articles in their discourse production. The methodology section of Saudi and British research papers also shows remarkable differences regarding all the five dimensions. Saudi ELT articles are less non-

argumentative and more informational, non-narrative, explicit, and abstract than British ELT articles. So far, as far as Saudi linguistics articles are concerned, they are more explicit and abstract and less informational, non-narrative, and non-argumentative than British linguistic articles.

The analysis & Discussion section of both the disciplines from both countries shows slight differences on all the dimensions; they produce discourse to a varying degree, and none of the sections is similar in producing discourse. Saudi ELT articles are more informational, non-narrative, explicit, and non-argumentative than British articles. They are less abstract than that of British articles. Saudi and British linguistics articles are almost the same in producing non-narrative discourse. They are more explicit and less informational, non-argumentative, and abstract than British articles in producing discourse. The study results show the most prominent difference in the conclusion section of Saudi and British research papers; mainly, Saudi Linguistics articles are the most different compared to British articles in producing explicit discourse. They are more informational, non-narrative, explicit, non-argumentative, and abstract than British linguistics conclusion sections. Saudi ELT articles are less abstract and more informative, non-narrative and explicit than British ELT articles. Moreover, the ELT conclusion section of Britain and Saudi Arabia produces mixed-purpose discourse on dimension four.

The results confirm that both countries have shown differences in both disciplines in their discourse production. The analysis of variance (ANOVA) results also show statistically significant differences (as the p-value is less than 0.05) between all the sections and within sections of both countries. The research findings are significant in highlighting variation among the sections of Saudi and British research papers and achieving the research objective. The study provides a statistical basis for further research. Future researchers may probe the reasons behind these linguistic variations.

The study provides a list of linguistic features associated with each dimension for writing research articles in linguistics and ELT. It will enrich learners' understanding of how to use those linguistic features in their writings for publication. Further, ESP and EAP instructors could introduce linguistic features associated with a particular discourse to the students. Moreover, students can develop a variety of corpora to explore the frequently occurring linguistic features. The study's results can also be used to support the pedagogical practices in language teaching classrooms.

Funding
This study is supported via funding from Prince Sattam bin Abdulaziz University project number (PSAU/2024/R/1445).
Acknowledgments
This study is supported via funding from Prince Sattam bin Abdulaziz University project number (PSAU/2024/R/1445).
Conflicts of Interest
The authors declare no conflict of interest.
Authenticity
This manuscript is an original work.
Artificial Intelligence Statement:
AI and AI-assisted technologies were not used.

About the Authors:
Sadia Ali is an Assistant Professor at Prince Sattam bin Abdulaziz University, Al-Kharj, KSA. She published research articles in internationally reputable journals and presented research papers at international research conferences. She is also serving as a reviewer for international academic journals of popular publishers. Her research interests include discourse analysis, genre studies, corpus linguistics, linguistic variations, ELT, ESP, AI, World Englishes etc.
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0262-2909

Ebtesam Abdulhaleem is an Assistant Professor specializing in language testing and assessment and serves as the Director of the Assessment Development Unit at a Saudi Arabian government organisation. With a strong commitment to leadership and educator well-being, she advances language assessment practices and fosters professional development among educators nationwide. She is also interested in academic writing, corpus linguistics studies and empowering educators through research. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5589-6615

References

Afshar, H. S., Doosti, M., & Movassagh, H. (2018). A genre analysis of the Introduction section of Applied Linguistics and Chemistry research articles. *Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *21*(1), 149-196. https://ijal.khu.ac.ir/article-1-2856-fa.html

Alamri, B. (2020). A comparative study of Saudi and international journals of applied linguistics: The move–bundle connection approach. *Journal of Language and Education*, *6*(2), 9-30. https://doi.org/10.17323/jle.2020.10531

Albatsha, A., & Aleshinskaya, E. (2021). *Increasing awareness of the rhetorical structure of research paper introductions as a way to improve scientific second language writing*. In *EDULEARN Proceedings*. https://doi.org/10.21125/edulearn.2021.1008

Alharbi, L. M., & Swales, J. M. (2011). Arabic and English abstracts in bilingual language science journals. *Languages in Contrast*, *11*(1), 70-86. https://doi.org/10.1075/lic.11.1.06alh

Alhuqban, M. N. (2012, May). *A cross-cultural analysis of moves in Arabic and English police and security research article abstracts* [Paper presentation]. 2nd International Conference on Foreign Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics (FLTAL'12), Sarajevo.

Alhuqbani, M. N. (2013). Genre-based analysis of Arabic research article abstracts across four disciplines. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, *3*(3), 371–379. https://doi.org/10.5901/jesr.2013.v4n3p371

Alotaibi, H., & Pickering, L. (2013). Cultural divergence in academic writing: A case study of the research article introduction in Arabic. *The Global e-Learning Journal*, *2*(4), 1–19. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/262723331_Cultural_Divergence_in_Academic_Writing_A_Case_Study_of_the_Research_Article_Introduction_in_Arabic

Alqahtani, S. A., & Alhamami, M. (2024). The effect of movies on listening comprehension for Saudi EFL students. *Englisia: Journal of Language, Education, and Humanities*, *11*(2), 199-214.

Al-Qahtani, A. (2006). *A contrastive rhetoric study of Arabic and English research article introductions* (3211648) [Doctoral dissertation]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

Amnuai, W., & Wannaruk, A. (2013). Investigating move structure of English applied linguistics research article discussions published in international and Thai journals. *English Language Teaching*, *6*(2). https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v6n2p1

Aslam, I., & Mehmood, A. (2014). Genre analysis of conclusion sections of Pakistani research articles in Natural and Social Sciences. *Journal of Natural Sciences Research*, *22*(4), 106–112. https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/234655378.pdf

Atai, M. R., & Habibie, P. (2009). Exploring sub-disciplinary variations and generic structure of applied linguistics research article introductions using CARS model. *The Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *2*(2), 52–79. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/268293082_Exploring_Sub-Disciplinary_Variations_and_Generic_Structure_of_Applied_Linguistics_Research_Article_Introductions_Using_CARS_Model

Bhatia, V. K. (1993). *Analysing genre: Language use in professional settings*. Routledge.

Bhatti, I. A., Mustafa, S., & Azher, M. (2019). Genre analysis of research article abstracts in linguistics and literature: A cross disciplinary study. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, *9*(4), 42. https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v9n4p42

Biber, D. (1988). Variation across speech and writing. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bruce, I. (2008). Cognitive genre structures in methods sections of research articles: A corpus study. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *7*(1), 38-54. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2007.12.001

Cotos, E., Huffman, S., & Link, S. (2017). A move/step model for methods sections: Demonstrating rigour and credibility. *English for Specific Purposes*, *46*, 90-106. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2017.01.001

Darabad, A. M. (2016). Move analysis of research article abstracts: A cross-disciplinary study. *International Journal of Linguistics*, *8*(2), 125. https://doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v8i2.9379

Dhungana, S. (2024). Emotional subjectivity in English language teachers' professional development. *ELT Worldwide: Journal of English Language and Teaching*, *10*(2), 223-235. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.26858/eltww.v10i2.50517

Dobakhti, L. (2011). *The discussion section of research articles in applied linguistics: Generic structure and stance features* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of Malaya Kuala Lumpur.

Dobakhti, L. (2013). Commenting on findings in qualitative and quantitative research articles' discussion sections in applied linguistics. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, *2*(5), 145-154. https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.2n.5p.145

Fallatah, W. (2016). Features of Saudi English research articles abstracts. *Arab World English Journal*, *7*(2), 368-379. https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol7no2.25

Galaidin, A. (2021). A genre analysis of research article abstracts in linguistics and engineering: A cross disciplinary study based on a contrastive analysis of micro structures. *Language, Culture, Politics. International Journal*, *1*, 47-56. https://doi.org/10.54515/lcp.2021.1.47-56

Haidich, A. B. (2010). Meta-analysis in medical research. *Hippokratia*, *14*(1), 29-37. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3049418/

Hyland, K. (2000). *Disciplinary discourses: Social interactions in academic writing*. University of Michigan Press.

Hyland, K. (2005). *Metadiscourse: Exploring interaction in writing*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Jalilifar, A. (2010). Research article introductions: sub-disciplinary variations in Applied Linguistics. *Journal of Teaching Language Skills, 2*(2), 29–55. https://tesl.shirazu.ac.ir/article_407.html

Jalilifar, A., & Kabezadeh, F. (2012). A comparative study of textual metadiscourse markers in introduction and method sections of applied linguistics research articles. *Journal of Language, Culture, and Translation, 1*(1), 17–31. https://iranjournals.nlai.ir/bitstream/handle/123456789/797461/A788DE4796D1A400967F3F71964EB23F.pdf?sequence=-1

Jalilifar, A., Baninajar, M., & Saidian, S. (2015). The rhetorical organization of research article discussion sections: An investigation into genre evolution in applied linguistics. *Global Journal of Foreign Language Teaching, 5*(1), 85. https://doi.org/10.18844/gjflt.v5i0.50

Khamkhien, A. (2015). Textual organisation and linguistic features in applied linguistics research articles: Moving from introduction to methods. *IJASOS- International E-journal of Advances in Social Sciences, 1*(2), 111. https://doi.org/10.18769/ijasos.28165

Khany, R., & Tazik, K. (2010). A comparative study of introduction and discussion sections of sub-disciplines of applied linguistics research articles. *Research in Applied Linguistics, 1*(2), 97-122. https://rals.scu.ac.ir/article_10425.html

Kwan, B. S. (2006). The schematic structure of literature reviews in doctoral theses of applied linguistics. *English for Specific Purposes, 25*(1), 30-55. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2005.06.001

Kwan, B. S. (2017). A cross-paradigm macro-structure analysis of research articles in information systems. *English for Specific Purposes, 45*, 14-30. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2016.08.002

Kwan, B. S., Chan, H., & Lam, C. (2012). Evaluating prior scholarship in literature reviews of research articles: A comparative study of practices in two research paradigms. *English for Specific Purposes, 31*(3), 188-201. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2012.02.003

Le, T. N., & Harrington, M. (2015). Phraseology used to comment on results in the discussion section of applied linguistics quantitative research articles. *English for Specific Purposes, 39*, 45-61. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2015.03.003

Lim, J. M. (2006). Method sections of management research articles: A pedagogically motivated qualitative study. *English for Specific Purposes, 25*(3), 282-309. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2005.07.001

Mangabeira, W. C., Lee, R. M., & Fielding, N. G. (2004). Computers and qualitative research. *Social Science Computer Review, 22*(2), 167-178. https://doi.org/10.1177/0894439303262622

McEnery, T., & Xiao, R. (2010). *Corpus-based contrastive studies of English and Chinese*. Routledge.

Morales, R. C. (2012). Conclusions in research articles: A Filipino-Japanese contrastive rhetoric study. *Philippines ESL Journal, 8*, 83–95. https://www.academia.edu/1887844/Conclusions_in_Research_Articles_A_Filipino_Japanese_Contrastive_Rhetoric_Study

Musa, N. F., Khamis, N., & Zanariah, J. (2015). The structure of method section in engineering research articles. *Asian Social Science, 11*(17), 74-82. https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v11n17p74

Nijk, A. A. (2022). *Tense-switching in Classical Greek: A cognitive approach*. Cambridge University Press.

Peacock, M. (2011). The structure of the methods section in research articles across eight disciplines. *Asian ESP Journal*, *7*(2), 97–124. https://scholars.cityu.edu.hk/en/publications/the-structure-of-the-methods-section-in-research-articles-across-eight-disciplines(5a833362-bb37-4f08-8927-536da662a0bb).html

Pho, P. D. (2008). Research article abstracts in applied linguistics and educational technology: A study of linguistic realizations of rhetorical structure and authorial stance. *Discourse Studies*, *10*(2), 231-250. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445607087010

Reza, A. M., & Rokhsareh, G. M. (2015). A comparison of moves in conclusion sections of research articles in psychology, Persian literature and applied linguistics. *Teaching English Language*, *9*(2), 167–191. https://www.sid.ir/en/Journal/ViewPaper.aspx?ID=599516

Schwemmer, C., & Wieczorek, O. (2019). The methodological divide of sociology: Evidence from two decades of journal publications. *Sociology*, *54*(1), 3-21. https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038519853146

Steensen, S. (2018, January 1). Feature journalism. In *Academia.edu - Share research*. Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Communication. https://www.academia.edu/38158041/Feature_Journalism

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

Swales, J. M., & Feak, C. B. (2004). *Academic writing for graduate students: Essential tasks and skills*. University of Michigan Press ELT.

Vuković, M., & Bratic, V. (2015). The rhetorical structure of conclusions in linguistic academic articles published in national and international journals. In I. Lakić, M. Vuković, & B. Živković (Eds.), *Academic discourse across cultures* (pp. 06-97). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Westin, I. (2002). *Language Change in English Newspaper Editorials*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: Rodopi