



LUND UNIVERSITY

A comparison of data commentary in chemical engineering research papers and master theses – exploring the intersemiosis of written and visual material for applied purposes.

Nordrum, Lene

2014

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Nordrum, L. (2014). *A comparison of data commentary in chemical engineering research papers and master theses – exploring the intersemiosis of written and visual material for applied purposes..* Abstract from ICAME 35, Nottingham, United Kingdom. <http://www.nottingham.ac.uk/conference/fac-arts/english/icame-35/documents/icame35-book-of-abstracts.pdf>

Total number of authors:

1

General rights

Unless other specific re-use rights are stated the following general rights apply:

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

Read more about Creative commons licenses: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

LUND UNIVERSITY

PO Box 117
221 00 Lund
+46 46-222 00 00

A comparison of data commentary in chemical engineering research papers and master theses – exploring the intersemiosis of written and visual material for applied purposes.

In the field of English for Specific Purposes, data commentary, the written comment on visual material has been recognized as a particularly complex area that presents problems even for fairly advanced university students (Blåsjö 2011; Wharton 2012). Yet, few studies focus on it. In approaching data commentary from a pedagogical perspective, two problems emerge 1) practices tend to vary depending on disciplinary field and on the type of visual presented (Stoller and Robinsson, 2013), and 2) teachers in the various science fields find it challenging to teach data commentary, possibly because they are too entrenched in disciplinary practices (Blåsjö, 2011). To uncover areas of particular difficulty for ESP students, there is thus a need for investigation of disciplinary variance of how the written and visual modes are integrated in disciplinary texts as well as of studies comparing expert and student writing (Gilquin et al, 2007).

In a first step towards addressing these needs, this study investigates differences in data commentaries in master theses written by Swedish advanced learners of English and published research articles written by native and non-native disciplinary experts. All data commentaries are extracted from the result and/or result & discussion section of papers from chemical engineering and compose a small discipline-specific *learner* (master theses) and *expert* (published research articles) corpus, where the definition of learner is motivated by a distinction between *apprentice* and *expert* writers. The data commentaries are annotated for rhetorical moves (Swales, 1990) according to the Biber-Connor-Upton approach (Biber et al., 2007) and by means of the UAM corpus tool, developed by Michael O'Donnell.

Preliminary results indicate that expert and novice writers differ in their choices both at the level of discourse, in terms of selection of rhetorical moves, and at the level of lexicogrammar, in terms of the phraseology associated with specific moves. An intriguing finding concerns differences in the lexicogrammatical realization of the rhetorical move addressing the most important result, or trend, displayed in a visual. Expert writers in chemical engineering commonly use a lexical nominalization for this move, whereas students overwhelmingly rely on *that*-clauses. I argue that the experts' use of lexical nominalization is similar to the well-known rhetorical function of lexical nominalization to condense Given information (Halliday and Martin, 1993) in science discourse, but here the Given information is first presented in a visual. This finding is of importance for ESP courses addressing the intersemiosis (O'Halloran, 2005) of visual and written material in the multi-modal presentation of results in chemical engineering, and is an interesting topic for further studies of data commentary and multimodality across disciplines.

References

- Biber, D., U. Connor, J. Jones & T. Upton. 2007. *Discourse on the Move*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Blåsjö, M. 2011. From percentage to prediction: University students meeting a parallel language of visuals and numerals. *Ibérica* 22, 123-140.
- Gilquin, G., S. Granger, M. Paquot. 2007. Learner corpora: The missing link in EAP pedagogy. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 6, 319-335.
- Halliday, M.A.K. and J. Martin. 1993. *Writing Science. Literacy and Discursive Power*. London: Falmer Press.
- O'Halloran, K.L. 2005. *Mathematical Discourse: Language, Symbolism and Visual Images*. London: Continuum.

- Stoller, F-L. & M.S. Robinson. 2013. Chemistry journal articles: An interdisciplinary approach to move analysis with pedagogical aims. *English for Specific Purposes* 32, 45-57.
- Swales, J.M. 1990. *Genre Analysis. English in Academic and Research Settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge university press.
- Wharton, S. 2012. Epistemological and interpersonal stance in a data description task: Findings from a discipline-specific learner corpus. *English for Specific Purposes* 31, 261-270.