This pre-print was published as

Moreno, A.I. (1997). Genre constraints across languages: causal metatext in Spanish and English Research Articles" *ESP Journal*, 16 (3):161-179.

Present contact details:

Ana I. Moreno,
Departamento de Filología Moderna,
Facultad de Filosofía y Letras
Universidad de León, 24071 León (Spain),
E-Mail: ana.moreno@unileon.es
Phone No: Work: 34-87-291095,
Fax No: 34-87-291099

Genre Constraints Across Languages: Causal Metatext in Spanish & English RAs **Ana I. Moreno**

Abstract

The present paper starts out by assuming that, despite a relative uniformity of research articles (RAs) imposed by the requirements of the genre, there will be significant intercultural variation in the rhetorical preferences of national cultures. Its aim is to find evidence for or against this assumption. To do so, it focuses on one micro-level feature of text rhetoric, the use of causal metatext (or text about text) in orienting readers in the interpretation of cause-effect intersentential relations (CEISRs). An empirical contrastive analysis of 36 RAs in English and 36 RAs in Spanish on business and economics written by native speakers of each language is carried out. In fact, the results show that both language groups seem to make CEISRs explicit with similar frequency. In addition, they use similar strategies for expressing CEISRs, as reflected in the amount of emphasis given to the causal relation, the basic mechanism of coherence used and the choice of peripheral or integrated signals. Moreover, those strategies appear similarly distributed. The only differences across the two languages are shown in their tendencies towards verbal or nominal anaphoric and anaphoric-cum-cataphoric signals. Thus, overall these results tend to suggest that it is the writing conventions of the RA genre, and not the peculiarities of Spanish and English writing cultures, that govern the rhetorical strategies preferred by writers to make the CEISR explicit and the frequency with which these are made explicit.

Keywords

Causal relations, metatext, metadiscourse, coherence relations, academic writing, discourse analysis, contrastive rhetoric, cross-cultural, cohesion, cause-effect, research articles, business and economics, genre conventions, rhetorical strategies, explicitness

Introduction

During the last three decades there has been an increasing interest in the study of rhetorical patterns across languages and cultures. The term Contrastive Rhetoric¹ (henceforth CR) was first introduced by Kaplan (1966) influenced by the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis which proposes a close connection between language and our view of the world. The ultimate objective of researcher activity in this field is to prove the hypothesis that different languages have different rhetorical systems which manifest themselves in different ways of organising ideas. However, as the results obtained so far do not always point in the same direction, this area of research has generated a great deal of controversy².

On the one hand, CR has been received enthusiastically by many researchers. This is not surprising especially if we realise that, as shown by several studies, it is not only highly different cultures which vary in their discourse preferences, but also those cultures which have had frequent contacts and whose languages and cultures are superficially relatively similar to one another (Mauranen 1993). For instance, studies on academic discourse have found recognisable intercultural differences between European cultures. We find several examples of this in Clyne (1987), Régent (1985), and Shröder (1986), who pin down some of the characteristic differences in academic writing styles between Western cultures such as French, German and English. Ylönen et al. (1988) also suggest that interesting differences may be found between medical articles in English, German and Finnish.

On the other hand, CR has also been the focus of heavy criticism. In fact, some researchers have conducted studies to question the CR hypothesis. Some of these studies have centred on student compositions (see Pak 1995 for a revision). For instance, Ouaoouicha (1986) examines argumentative essays written by US and Moroccan college students and notes that both groups used a *claim-data-warrant* structure, showing no significant difference in the structure of discourse. Cook (1988) focuses on paragraph structure and overall organisation of content and he finds no significant difference between Spanish and English texts written by Spanish-speaking graduate students taking ESL. Another group of studies has been carried out on research articles (RAs), using Swales' (1981) Four Move Model. For example, Najjar (1990) examines Arabic RA introductions, and Taylor & Tinguian (1991) explore Chinese RA introductions. The results

¹ For the present study, the term CR research will be referred to as those studies which examine rhetorical patterns, both at macro and micro-levels among cultures using different languages.

of these two works, together with those of López (1982), one of the very few studies contrasting Spanish and English in genres other than student compositions, indicate that the type of information included, the amount and the way in which the introductions are organised in this genre seem broadly similar across languages.

The latter results, i.e., those pertaining to RAs, might be taken to suggest that there might be some factor, more powerful than the writing culture of different language groups, that is able to unify the nature of discourse patterns across languages. The present paper explores whether such one possible factor is the RA genre (Swales 1990), following Widdowson's claim that there is a universal rhetoric of scientific exposition which is structured according to a certain discourse pattern which "with some tolerance for individual stylistic variation, imposes a conformity on members of the scientific community no matter what language they happen to use" (Widdowson 1979: 61). In other words, the assumption which will be explored is whether the discourse community identified by the RA genre shares a common writing culture which shapes the discourse produced by its members according to similar rhetorical patterns.

To do so, the present paper focuses on one micro-level feature of text rhetoric, the use of cause-effect intersentential metatext (henceforth *cause-effect metatext*) in orienting readers in the interpretation of discourse. It carries out an empirical contrastive analysis of 36 RAs in English and 36 RAs in Spanish on business and economics written by native speakers. Thus, this work explores whether use of metatextual devices used to express cause-effect intersentential relations (CEISR's) is more directly subject to writing conventions of the RA genre or to restrictions imposed by the cultural peculiarities of the language groups involved in the study. The following section reviews briefly the studies most relevant to the present discussion.

Review of the literature

As noted above, metatext is essentially text about the text itself. This concept, sometimes referred to as metadiscourse, was somewhat vaguely defined by Vande Kopple (1985:83) as the linguistic material of texts that does not add propositional content but rather signals the presence of the author. According to the definition of Halliday (1973), metadiscourse fulfils the textual and interpersonal functions of the language. This author defined the textual function in the words "an enabling function, that of creating a text" and followed with "it is this component that

² A comprehensive review of this situation is provided by Pak (1995).

enables the speaker to organise what he is saying in such a way that it makes sense in the context and fulfils its function as a message" (Halliday 1973:6). Concerning the interpersonal function, this author states that this would include "all that may be understood by the expression of our own personalities and personal feelings on the one hand, and form of interactions and social interplay with other participants in the communication situation on the other hand" (Halliday 1973:6). In other words, metatext would allow the writer to introduce him/herself into the text in two ways: a) by organising what has been said (textual function) and b) by expressing personal feelings and attitudes and by interacting with the reader (interpersonal function).

Other studies addressing metatext are Markkanen et al. (1993) and Crismore et al. (1993). There are also other studies that have -sometimes partially, sometimes completely- dealt with the same type of linguistic-textual material, using different terms. For example: *gambits* in Keller (1979); *metatalk*, in Schiffrin (1980); *metatext*, in Enkvist (1978); *signalling* and *non-topical material*, in Meyer (1975) and Lautamatti (1978); *explicit signalling*, in Hyde (1990) and, in works on Spanish, *discourse signals (marcadores del discurso)*, in Portolés (1993). The present study recognises the two planes of metatext -the textual and the interpersonal- but limits itself to the textual function of metatext in intersentential levels since to aim at covering all the expressions that could be classified as metatext (Vande Kopple 1985) in a text *corpus* as large as the one analysed here would be an almost impossible task.

There is little comparative work on use of metatext at global levels of discourse organisation (e.g. above sentence level) between Spanish and English. Thus it will be necessary to consider what has been found between English and other languages. Some of the most relevant studies -Mauranen (1991), (1992b) and Ventola & Mauranen (1991), all of them referred to in Mauranen (1993)- compare English and Finnish. However, looking at their results from the perspective of the hypothesised universality of the RA genre reveals that the evidence they provide is negative. In particular, these authors found differences in such variables as thematic development, use of references, and use of connecting devices between the academic discourse of Finnish- and English-speaking writers.

The results obtained from the above-mentioned studies, especially those related to connectors, led Mauranen (1993) to investigate metatext use more thoroughly. In particular, Mauranen (1993) explores cultural differences between texts written in English by Finnish and Anglo-American academics with respect to metatext use in papers from economic journals. She

understands metatext as the rhetorical resources used by writers in orienting readers and engaging them in a dialogue with the writer. This author assumes that, despite a relative uniformity of academic papers imposed by requirements of the genre, there is significant intercultural variation in the rhetorical preferences of writers. The reason for this originates, in turn, in the assumption that writing is a cultural object which is very much shaped by the educational system in which a writer has been socialised. Her results indicate that Anglo-American writers use more metatext than Finnish authors. With these results, Mauranen demonstrates that Anglo-American writers show more interest in guiding and orienting readers in the process of interpretation and make their presence known in the text more explicitly than Finnish authors when writing in English. Mauranen (1993) concludes that, although both rhetorical strategies can be perceived as polite and persuasive in appropriate cultural contexts, such differences may result in unintentionally inefficient rhetoric when the target audience does not share the same attitudes and assumptions as the writer.

The present study focuses on a single functional-relational category of metatext: CEISRs³. Since no contrastive study centred on the use of metatext at above-sentence levels has been conducted between Spanish and English, any attempt to do so must begin by comparing this text-linguistic variable as it is used by competent native speakers of both languages. As Reid (1988) put it, texts written by non-native speakers do not constitute "a sufficient data sample for valid analysis because they use second language texts to investigate first language rhetorical patterns" (Reid 1988: 19). We should therefore attempt to describe and explain differences or similarities in rhetorical patterns across cultures on the basis of representative samples of text written by native speakers of each particular language.

Thus, the main purpose of the present work is to determine whether in English RAs on business and economics use of cause-effect metatext is similar or different from its use in comparable Spanish texts, both written by native speakers, and -if it does differ- to what extent. This will allow us to explore whether cause-effect metatext use is more subject to the restrictions imposed by the RA genre or to the rhetorical conventions of each writing culture⁴.

Defining cause-effect metatext

³ This small-scale study is part of a larger Spanish-English contrastive work on the expression of causal intersentential relations in RAs on business and economics.

Let us consider the following example taken from the *corpus* analysed⁵, in which the "<>" symbol represents the boundary between the two propositions linked by a CEISR, *C* being the cause, and *E*, the effect:

- [1a] *C* {Many American companies have embraced a form of decentralisation that involves highly autonomous business units and limited information flows both vertically and horizontally}. <> *As a consequence*. *E* {top management has become distanced from the details of the business}. (Porter 1992)

In [1a], the CEISR expression is *as a consequence*. Since it does not add anything to the propositional content of either one of the related semantic units, it can be considered as an example of *metatext*. Its only function is to help the reader recognise that the previous discourse segment is functioning as the cause of the following segment, which will be interpreted as the effect. In other words, its only function is to indicate that a CEISR should be interpreted between the two related semantic units. However, as demonstrated by Hyde (1990) and Moreno (1995), metatext can be textually realised by other types of expressions that are not necessarily text connectives, or, in Hyde's terminology, peripheral signals. Let us consider the following example:

- [1b] *C* {As Busch and Bush (1978, p. 443) suggest, "women may be less willing to ask for help and to ask questions [from their sales managers] because of fear that their inquiries may be perceived as signs of incompetence and weakness." Further, to the extent that the female salesperson is not able to fraternize effectively with her male counterparts, she may miss opportunities to discuss "what each person is or is not doing in the performance of the job" (Busch and Bush, 1978, p. 443)}. <> *The net effect of these circumstances would be* *E* {reduced role clarity (i.e., higher role ambiguity)}. (Schul & Wren 1992)

In [1b] the CEISR expression is the whole of the underlined segment: that is, *the net effect of these circumstances would be*. This segment is equally considered to be an example of *causal metatext* since it adds no propositional content to any of the related semantic units, *C* and *E*. Its only function is to help the reader to appreciate how the discourse is organised. In this case, the preceding text is interpreted as the *cause* of the *effect* expressed in the focal statement, where the CEISR expression is to be found.

Thus, the term *cause-effect metatext* is used to refer to the set of CEISR expressions and the term *CEISR signal* is reserved to refer more precisely to the element of such expressions that plausibly has more responsibility in the generation of the causal inference. In example [1a], the

⁴ See Mauranen (1993: 4-6) for a discussion of these concepts.

⁵ See the section on the design of the empirical research for a description of the corpus.

signal will be the actual expression *as a consequence*. In example [1b], the most plausible signal will be *effect*. This study will compare the frequency and use of all kinds of lexico-grammatical devices used by writers to render cause-effect intersentential relations explicit.

Method of analysis

Cause-effect metatext may be classified into various categories according to semantico-pragmatic criteria at different levels of analysis, that may be crucial in the rhetorical strategies of writers. These semantico-pragmatic aspects are inevitably realised through text and depend on the signals and expressions themselves. Since it is the status of the signal, or of the expression, in its linguistic environment which permits the realisation of the different semantico-pragmatic aspects considered, the distinctions among types of causal metatext will be made as a function of that status.

The textual criteria for making such distinctions, which will be briefly explained below, have been combined in a taxonomy so that we can appreciate all the possibilities they may give rise to. The taxonomy of *cause-effect metatext*, shown below, is illustrated with examples taken from the *corpus* analysed, which are presented schematically⁶.

A taxonomy of cause-effect metatext

Intrinsic

Peripheral (Anaphoric)

[2a] C. <> *Como consecuencia*, E.

[2b] C. <> *As a consequence*, E.

Integrated

Anaphoric

Nominal

[3a] C. <> El *resultado* es E.

[3b] C. <> The *result* is E.

Verbal

[4a] C. <> Rearly has this led to E

[4b] C. <> Todo ello podría conducir a E.

⁶C represents a proposition where a cause is expressed; E represents a proposition where an effect is expressed; <> represents the boundary between the two propositions; the fragment of text in each example is a case cause-effect metatext; italics are used to highlight the CEISR signals; the underlined words are means of modalising the meaning of the causal relation.

Cataphoric**Nominal**[5a] The *effects* of C. <> E.[5b] *Resultados* de C. <> E.**Verbal**[6a] C *leads to* the following result. <> E.[6b] Resultante de C *se obtienen* los siguientes valores... <> E.**Extrinsic (Integrated)****Nominal**[7a] C. <> The *results* are presented in table 1. <> E.[7b] C. <> Las *consecuencias* no se han hecho esperar. <> E.**Verbal**[8a] C. <> This difference *produces* two effects. <> E.[8b] C. <> Así *surgen* dos grandes grupos. <> E.

One of the textual criteria used to classify cause-effect metatext refers to a pragmatic principle of crucial importance in the rhetorical strategy of the writer: the emphasis on the causal relation that s/he wishes to establish. One of the most tangible ways in which this phenomenon is manifested in textual realisation is through the textual status of the CEISR expression. In some cases, the signals are contained within the domain of either one of the two semantic units related: intrinsic metatext, as in examples [2a-6b]. In other cases, the signals are part of a expression which, by itself, constitutes an independent sentence: extrinsic metatext, as in examples [7a-8b] (c.f. Crombie 1985:73; Hyde 1990:212, and Moreno 1994, 1995). As Hyde (1990) points out, "the main pragmatic ingredient of these extrinsic signals would seem to be the especially marked emphasis or prominence that is conferred by full sentence status and its associated informational and intonational features" (Hyde 1990: 457).

A second criterion focuses on the possibility that the causal relation may or may not be modified semantically and pragmatically. Because of the status of cases of metatext with respect to the sentence in which they appear, this criterion has been given the name of sentential status of the signal. According to this criterion, there are two groups of metatext: peripheral and integrated. In the first case, the metatextual expression is peripheral to the rest of the structure of the sentence and it does not permit any modification of the basic meaning of the causal relation- (see examples [2a-2b]). In cases of integrated metatext, metatextual signals are integrated in the structure of the sentence in which they appears, or, in the words of Hyde (1990), "they are

expressed by elements which constitute the central categories of sentence structure, mainly nominal and verbal elements" (Hyde 1990: 211). Integrated signals do permit such modification (see examples [3a-8b], although only [4a-4b] show some kind of modification). Note that all extrinsic signals are integrated. This criterion is of great importance since it attempts to reflect the interpersonal plane of the rhetorical strategy of the writer in which the other way used by the writer to introduce him/herself into his/her own text can be appreciated: by expressing feelings and personal attitudes about the actual content of the text and about the readers.

The third textual criterion attempts to capture the type of basic mechanism used for maintaining the coherence of the discourse. According to Sinclair (1993), the two basic mechanisms of coherence are encapsulation (or anaphoric reference) and prospection (or cataphoric reference). This aspect is intimately linked to the direction of the causal inference, be it retrospective or prospective. This principle is important because as encapsulation, or retrospection, is the basic mechanism of coherence by default, use of the prospective strategy - which will be a marked feature- has pragmatic repercussions in the rhetorical strategy of the writer. This type of criterion will be called the phoric direction of the inference and from its application will emerge three large groups of metatext: anaphoric (see examples [2a-4b]), cataphoric (see examples [5a-6b]) (cf. Crombie 1985:74) and anaphoric-cum-cataphoric (see examples [7a-8b]). Anaphoric signals are contained within the domain of the second conjoin, forming part of the same sentence (or block of sentences) which expresses the semantic content of that conjoin (cf. Hyde 1990: 212). Cataphoric signals are contained within the domain of the first conjoin, forming part of the same sentence (or block of sentences) which expresses the semantic content of that conjoin (cf. Hyde 1990: 212). Anaphoric-cum-cataphoric signals are not contained within the domain either of the first conjoin or of the second conjoin, but form part of an independent sentence.

The fourth criterion has to do with the type of modification which the relation may undergo through use of integrated signals. This is a crucial semantico-pragmatic aspect in the rhetorical strategy of the writer. Since the type of modification depends on the formal-functional status of the signal, this criterion has been given precisely that name: formal-functional status of the signal. On applying this criterion, two large groups of causal metatext arise, which are realised by: nominal elements (examples [3a-3b, 5a-5b, 7a-7b]) or verbal elements (examples [4a-4b, 6a-6b, 8a-8b]). The main modifications that the basic meaning of a causal coherence

relation may undergo, which directly affect one or another type of signal, are modality and attribution. Examples of modified cause-effect relations which appeared in the corpus are the following, in which the modifying words are underlined:

Spanish

El *resultado* final es

El *resultado* sería

El mayor *resultado* de estos trabajos fue

English

An immediate *result* is

The *result* might be

The most likely *result* of
this reform would probably be

The four previous textual criteria are considered to be relevant for the present analysis since they allow a given metatextual element to bear, or not, different semantic and pragmatic nuances. Thus, with this taxonomy as our basis, each of the cases of CEISR expression located in the corpus selected was classified.

Design of the empirical research

The starting assumption of the present work is that both language cultures contrasted have the *cause-effect* coherence relation for connecting sentences or blocks of sentences (Hobbs 1979 and Mann & Thompson 1986, 1988). That is, the cause-effect coherence relation is considered as a common feature for both languages compared (cf. Crombie 1985 and Hume 1911). In addition, following Mauranen (1993), it is expected that similar means of expressing such relations are available in both languages. However, assuming the results of Mauranen (1993) might be translated to other languages, it is hypothesised that, even when one is dealing with the same genre, the RA, and the same academic discipline, business and economics, both language cultures show differences in the frequency of appearance of cause-effect metatext and in the preferences of use of the different means available, that is, in their relative frequency of use. This hypothesis may be split into two different parts:

1) The frequency of use of metatextual devices for expressing CEISRs in the genre defined is different for Spanish and English.

2) The preference of use of the various means available among metatextual devices for expressing CEISR in the genre defined is different for Spanish and English.

To demonstrate or refute the corresponding null hypotheses, it was necessary to select a *parallel corpus* of Spanish and English from where a sample of explicit CEISRs could be extracted. The theoretical-descriptive nature of the study implied that an independent analysis had to be carried out in each language, the parallel texts to be compared being related to each other by some principle of sufficiently unifying homogeneity. It was assumed that such homogeneity was provided by the hypothesised universality of the RA genre and a common subject matter. In the present study two independent subsamples of 75 RAs on business and economics were first selected following conventional sampling procedures.

However, in order to control as many contextual variables as possible (cf. Hymes 1964: 31) so that both independent subsamples of RAs might be considered as samples of a universal population and the writing culture of each language might be considered as the independent variable of the study, it was decided that each *subcorpus* should be balanced in terms of *topic* and *superstructure* (van Dijk & Kinstch, 1983: 54). Thus the original sample was reduced to a sample of 36 RAs in each language. As regards topic, 18 RAs were about marketing-management and 18 RAs were about finance-economy in each subsample. As for superstructure, 11 RAs in each language followed the overall pattern of Introduction-Procedure-Discussion and 25 RAs in each language showed more variable superstructures: Problem-Analysis-Solution; Situation-Explanation; Situation-Analysis-Forecast and Problem-Solution-Evaluation.

Other common features for all RAs in the sample were that they were written to be taken seriously (*tone*) and they all had the same overall *purpose*: to persuade the readership to accept the author's point of view or believe his or her conclusions (by proving a theory, discussing the advantages of applying a certain theory, discussing the advantages of a certain business practice, demonstrating the accuracy of a forecast or explaining the reasons for a certain situation). The predominant *text type* used in all of them was the argumentative type and the *text form* was that of scientific, or objective, argumentation as opposed to subjective argumentation (Werlich, 1976: 106). All RAs were taken to be written in Standard Spanish or English since they had been published by some of the most widely-read academic journals on business and economics in the main Spanish university libraries⁷. The *participants* in these communicative events were mostly

⁷ I wish to thank the following journals for having given me permission to reproduce fragments of text from the RAs included in the sample to illustrate the exposition and to convert those RAs into electronic format so that the analysis might be computer-assisted: *The Accounting Review*, *Journal of Marketing*, *California Management Review*, *Harvard Business Review*, *Journal of Finance*, *Journal of Industrial Economics*, *Journal of*

researchers and professors belonging to some department of a university. *Text length* ranged from 2,000 to 16,000 words of core text. All texts were published between 1990 and 1993.

As can be seen in table 1 below, a total of 72 academic articles was analysed. This involved more than 433,000 words of core text (over 192,000 words in Spanish and over 241,000 words in English). Regarding the number of sentences, close to 6,000 sentences in Spanish and more than 10,300 in English were analysed. Thus, an empirical contrastive study between Spanish and English was performed on the *corpus* of text chosen. To compare the data, the Chi-square non-parametric statistical test was used.

Table 1. Description of the corpus

	Spanish	English	Total
Nº of research articles	36	36	72
Nº of sentences in corpus	6,090	10,322	16,412
Nº of words in corpus	192,086	241,643	433,729

Results

In order to confirm whether in fact the assumption that CEISRs are a common feature for Spanish and English RAs is true, let us consider table 2 below.

Table 2. Sentences containing an explicit CEISR

Spanish		English		Comparison	
n	%	n	%	diff.	p <
127	2.1%	150	1.5%	-0.6	0.59

Note: The percentage is calculated from the total number of sentences in each subcorpus.

As may be seen, a considerable number of cases of this category can be found in both languages (127 in Spanish and 150 in English). Since all of these cases of metatext are signalling the same type of relation, we are dealing with cases that can be compared. The next question then is whether the frequency of appearance of this relation in both *subcorpora* displays statistically significant differences. To answer this question, the ratios for this category were

calculated from the overall number of sentences in each *subcorpus*. The right-hand side column in table 2 shows the degree of significance obtained in the test: $p < 0.59$. This clearly indicates that the difference obtained is not statistically significant for $p < 0.05$. Thus, it may be accepted that there is homogeneity in the frequency of appearance of the relational category analysed.

In view of the above, there is empirical evidence to the effect that explicit CEISRs are very similar from the quantitative point of view in the corpus. In other words, the present comparison has not managed to demonstrate that the writing culture is responsible for differences in this parameter and, until the opposite can be demonstrated, the total sample can still be considered homogeneous for both language groups. Thus, these results tend to support the hypothesised universality of the RA genre for Spanish and English, at least in the parameter analysed, and allow us to conclude that it is the writing conventions of the RA genre (and not the peculiarities of Spanish and English writing cultures) that govern the degree of responsibility for making CEISRs explicit.

These results, in contrast to Mauranen (1993) in her study of Finnish and Anglo-American academic papers on economics, provide evidence that Spanish- and English-speaking academics are similarly explicit in the expression of CEISRs when developing their argumentation. Thus, the mere awareness of this similarity in their rhetorical habits might place these academics at an advantage when writing in Spanish or English as an L2. It would only be a matter of knowing which explicit devices are used in each language to render the cause-effect relation explicit. The question now arises as to whether Spanish academics would have the same or different preferences of use of the rhetorical means available to express CEISRs. We are now investigating the second hypothesis formulated above. Let us consider Figure 1.

Figure 1. Comparison of devices for expressing CEISRs (%). (IPANAP): anaphoric peripheral intrinsic CEISR signals realized by an adverbial phrase; (IIANN): anaphoric integrated intrinsic CEISR signals realized by a noun; (IIANV): anaphoric integrated intrinsic CEISR signals realized by a verb; (IICAN): cataphoric integrated intrinsic CEISR signals realized by a noun; (IICAV): cataphoric integrated intrinsic CEISR signals realized by a verb; (EIACN): anaphoric-cum-cataphoric integrated extrinsic CEISR signals realized by a noun; (EIACV): anaphoric-cum-cataphoric integrated extrinsic CEISR signals realized by a verb.

As may be seen in Figure 1, both subcorpora reveal in fact a highly similar range of metatextual devices for expressing CEISRs. Therefore, our assumption that both writing cultures used similar resources for expressing CEISRs is confirmed. A comparative classification between Spanish and English of the textual data according to metatextual criteria is given in the appendix. Each group of signals has been organised in descending order of relative frequency of appearance. An important aspect that should not be overlooked is that the signals presented in the table are not unequivocal signals of the *cause-effect* relation: some may also be used to express other causal subcategories such as, for example, *premise-conclusion* or *explanation-action*. These other uses have not been considered in the present work. What is not shown in these tables is the actual expressions in which these signals appear. Examples of such expressions have been given in previous sections. Let us now look at table 3 below, which describes quantitatively how the different categories of metatextual devices are distributed in each subcorpus.

Table 3. Relative frequency of use of devices for expressing CEISRs.

Metatextual category	Spanish		English		Comparison	
	n	%	n	%	dif.	p <
Intrinsic	91	71.7%	117	78.0%	6.3	0.13
Peripheral	21	23.1%	24	20.5%	-2.6	0.53
Integrated	70	76.9%	93	79.5%	2.6	0.53

Anaphoric	56	80.0%	76	81.7%	1.7	0.66
Noun	14	25.0%	31	40.8%	15.8	0.01
Verb	42	75.0%	45	59.2%	-15.8	0.01
Cataphoric	14	20.0%	17	18.3%	-1.7	0.66
Noun	7	50.0%	10	58.8%	8.8	0.07
Verb	7	50.0%	7	41.2%	-8.8	0.07
Extrinsic	36	28.3%	33	22.0%	-6.3	0.13
Noun	21	58.3%	29	87.9%	29.5	0.01
Verb	15	41.7%	4	12.1%	-29.5	0.01
Total CEISRs	127	100.0%	150	100.0%	0.0	

Note 1: The percentages within each subcategory are relative to the total of the category immediately above.

Looking at it from the point of view of the emphasis given to the CEISR, the two subcorpora show similar preferences (about 75%) towards intrinsic devices, with no statistically significant differences ($p < 0.13$). Only about 25% of cases in both corpora are extrinsic.

Let us now take into account the basic mechanism of coherence used to establish the cause-effect inference. As shown in table 3, CEISR peripheral devices are 100% anaphoric in both subcorpora and extrinsic devices are 100% anaphoric-*cum*-cataphoric also in both subcorpora. As regards the integrated devices, the preferences in both languages are fairly clear towards anaphoric devices (around 81%), with no statistical differences ($p < 0.66$).

If we now consider the possibility that the CEISR meaning is modified, the two subcorpora show the same tendencies towards integrated metatext (approximately 78%), no significant differences being observed ($p < 0.53$). Peripheral devices are used less in both languages (approx. 22%) to express this particular causal ISR.

As regards the formal-functional status of the integrated signal, the distribution of integrated cataphoric devices in both corpora is split evenly between nominal and verbal elements, with no significant differences ($p < 0.07$). However, within integrated anaphoric metatext significant differences are seen in the distribution of use of verbal and nominal elements ($p < 0.01$). Whereas in English the distribution is more even, Spanish tends towards verbal signals. Concerning extrinsic devices, there are also significant differences in the distributions of use of nominal and verbal devices ($p < 0.01$) between both languages. Spanish

seems to *spread out* its preferences, although there is a slight predominance of nominal elements (58%), whereas English clearly tends towards nominal elements (88%).

From all the foregoing it may be inferred that, indeed, both languages use a similar range of *metatextual* devices for the expression of CEISRs. From the quantitative point of view there are more similarities than differences. The latter are only found in the distribution of use of two groups at the lowest levels of analysis: that of integrated anaphoric signals and that of the extrinsic ones between nominal and verbal elements. Accordingly, the hypothesis that *metatextual* devices for the expression of CEISRs are different in Spanish and in English cannot be demonstrated from the quantitative point of view for most levels of analysis.

Conclusions

Application of the comparative model used in this work has led to the determination of more areas of similarity than differences between two writing cultures of the Western World, the Anglo-American and the Spanish, with respect to one rhetorical aspect of texts, the metatextual devices used to express CEISRs, which were predicted to show differences owing to the peculiarities of each writing culture.

Both language groups seem to make CEISRs explicit with similar frequency. In addition, they use similar strategies for expressing CEISRs, as reflected in the amount of emphasis given to the causal relation, the basic mechanism of coherence employed, and the choice of peripheral or integrated signals. Moreover, those strategies appear similarly distributed. So, it may be stated that the present comparison has not managed to demonstrate that the writing culture is responsible for differences in these parameters and until the opposite can be demonstrated, the total sample can still be considered homogeneous for both language groups. Thus, these results tend to support the hypothesised universality of the RA genre for Spanish and English in this respect, and allow us to conclude that it is the writing conventions of the RA genre, and not the peculiarities of Spanish and English writing cultures, that govern the rhetorical strategies preferred by writers to make the CEISR explicit and the frequency with which these are made explicit.

A possible explanation for these similarities might rest in the extent to which Spanish business education is influenced by English-speaking academia. For instance, it is a fact that a large number of graduate-level business texts and materials in Spanish business schools are

translations from the English. Besides, many Spanish academics in the business and economics fields have more or less frequently had to use English-written sources for their research and teaching purposes. Some of these materials are RAs. However, to substantiate this explanation a further investigation on such type of influence -which is out of the scope of this paper- should be carried out.

The only differences across the two languages are shown in their tendencies towards verbal or nominal integrated anaphoric and extrinsic signals. Since it is the formal-functional status of the signal in the sentence which determines the type of modification to be used, these results leave the way open to exploring the possibility of a difference between the two language cultures in their frequency and preferences of use of the different means of modifying the basic meaning of the CEISR by means of modality and attribution. Another area of possible interest would be a comparison of the devices used by both language groups to encapsulate the semantic content of the previous discourse segment and of those used to prospect the up-coming discourse segment.

The conclusions drawn in this paper, of course, refer to a very small subfeature of RAs, CEISRs. Thus this study does not permit any inference about the RA genre variable in controlling the rhetoric of text organisation in Spanish and English. In other words, these conclusions do not mean that the RA genre variable is powerful enough to control every rhetorical aspect of text organisation in Spanish and English. In fact, there are already studies which suggest that differences do exist. For instance, López (1982) and Swales (1981) seem to agree that an important number of Spanish RAs lack one of the moves in the four move structure or have them in a different sequence (St John 1987: 115). In addition, Pak (1995) reviews a considerable number of contrastive studies between Spanish and English that already show differences in aspects such as sentence length, number of sentences per paragraph, length of introductions, digressive paragraphs, style, and so on. Another thing that remains to be determined is which aspects of text rhetoric are more subject to restrictions of the RA genre and which aspects are more subject to the peculiarities of each language culture. However, to explore this in depth more studies of other genres and other text-rhetorical variables are still needed.

Acknowledgements - I would like to express my gratitude to Professor John Swales (Director of the ELI, University of Michigan) for his valuable comments and encouragement in the reporting of this research. Thanks also to Maria Parker for her helpful comments. Any absurdities which remain are, of course, my own.

References

- Cook, M. (1988). *The Validity of the Contrastive Rhetoric Hypothesis as it Relates to Spanish-speaking Advanced ESL students*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, Stanford University.
- Clyne, M. (1987). Cultural differences in the organization of academic texts. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 11, 211-247.
- Crismore, A., Markkanen, R. & Steffensen, M. (1993). Metadiscourse in Persuasive Writing. *Written Communication*, 10 (1), 39-71.
- Crombie, W. (1985). *Process and Relation in Discourse and Language Learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- van Dijk, T.A. & Kintsch, W. (1983). *Strategies of Discourse Comprehension*. New York: Academic Press.
- Enkvist, N.E. (1978). *Tekstilingvistiikan peruskäsitteitä*. Jyväskylä: Gaudeamus.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1973). *Explorations in the Functions of Language*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Hobbs, J.R. (1979). Coherence and coreference. *Cognitive Science*, 3, 67-90.
- Hume, D. (1911). *A Treatise of Human Nature*. London: J.M. Dent and Sons Ltd. (Everyman's Library)
- Hyde, J. (1990). *Aspects of Discourse Analysis: The Explicit Signalling of Intersentential Relations in English*. Unpublished PhD. Thesis. Universidad de Salamanca. Salamanca.
- Hymes, D. (1964). Towards ethnographies of communication: the analysis of communicative events, In Giglioli (Ed.), *Language and Social Context*, 21-44. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Kaplan, R. (1983). Cultural thought patterns in intercultural communication. *Language Learning* 16, 1-20.
- Keller, E. (1979). Gambits: conversational strategy signals. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 3, 219-228.
- Lautamatti, L. (1978). Observations on the development of the topic in simplified discourse. In Kohonen, V. & Enkvist, N.E. (eds.) *Text Linguistics. Cognitive Learning and Language Teaching*. Turku: University of Turku.
- López, G. (1982). *Article Introductions in Spanish: A Study in Comparative Rhetorics*. Unpublished masters thesis, University of Aston.
- Mann, W.C. & Thompson, S.A. (1986). Relational propositions in discourse. *Discourse Processes*, 9, 57-90.
- Mann, W.C. & Thompson, S.A. (1988). Rhetorical structure theory: Toward a functional theory of text organization. *Text*, 8, 243-281.
- Markkanen, R., Steffensen, M.S., & Crismore, A. (1993). Quantitative contrastive study of metadiscourse. *Papers and Studies in Contrastive Linguistics*, 28, 137-151.
- Mauranen, A. (1991). Reference in textual rhetoric. Paper presented at the 6th International L.A.U.D. Symposium, Duisburg.

- Mauranen, A. (1992). *Reference in academic rhetoric. A textlinguistic study*. PhD thesis, University of Birmingham, England.
- Mauranen, A. (1993). Contrastive ESP Rhetoric: Metatext in Finnish-English Economics Texts. *English for Specific Purposes*, 12, 3-22.
- Meyer, B.J.F. (1975). *The Organization of Prose and its Effects on Memory*. Amsterdam: North Holland.
- Moreno, A.I. (1995). Causal intersentential relations: A discourse as process view. *Estudios ingleses de la Universidad Complutense*, 3, 55-68. Madrid: Editorial Complutense.
- Moreno, A.I. (In press). *Estudio Contrastivo Inglés-Español de la Expresión de las Relaciones de Coherencia Causal Interoracional: el Artículo Académico sobre Economía y Empresa*. Published PhD Thesis. Universidad de León. León.
- Najjar, H.J. (1990). *Arabic as a Research Language: The Case of the Agricultural Sciences*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Ouaouicha, S. (1986). *Contrastive Rhetoric and the Structure of Learner-produced Argumentative Texts in Arabic and English*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Texas at Austin.
- Pak, C. (1995). *Editorials in Mexico, Spain and the USA: A Comparative Rhetorical Analysis*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Porter, M.E. (1992). Capital disadvantage: America's Failing Capital Investment System. *Harvard Business Review*, 70 (5), 65-82.
- Portolés, J. (1993). La distinción entre los conectores y otros marcadores del discurso en español. *Verba*, 20, 141-170.
- Régent, O. (1985). A comparative approach to the learning of specialized written discourse. In P. Riley (Ed.), *Discourse and Learning. Papers in Applied Linguistics and Language Learning from the Centre de Recherches et d'Applications Pedagogiques en Langues (C.R.A.P.E.L.)*, 105-120. Longman: London.
- Reid, J. (1988). *Quantitative Differences in English Prose Written by Arabic, Chinese, Spanish, and English Students*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, Colorado State University.
- Schiffrin, D. (1980). Metatalk: organizational and evaluative brackets in discourse. *Sociological Inquiry: Language and Social Interaction*, 50, 199-236.
- Schöder, H. (1986). Teksti-argumentaatio kulttuuri. Ajatuksia tieteellisen tekstin kontrastiivisesta diskursiasianalyysista. In L. Lautamatti & S. Takala (Eds.), *AFinLA Yearbook 1986* (Publications de L'Association Finlandaise de Linguistique Appliquée No.43, 91-109). Jyväskylä, Finland: Association Finlandaise de Linguistique Appliquée.
- Shul, P. & Wren, B. (1992). The emerging role of women in industrial selling: a decade of change. *Journal of Marketing*, 56 (3), 38-54.
- Sinclair, J.M. (1993). Written discourse structure. In Sinclair, J.M., Hoey, M. & Fox, G. (eds.) *Techniques of Description: Spoken and Written Discourse*, a Festschrift for Malcolm Coulthard, 6-31. London: Routledge.
- St. John, M.J. (1987). Writing processes of Spanish scientists publishing in English. *English for Specific Purposes*, 6 (2), 113-120.
- Swales, J. M. (1981). *Aspects of Article Introductions*. Birmingham, U.K.: The University of Aston, Languages Studies Unit.
- Swales, J.M. (1990). *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Vande Kopple, W.J. (1985). Some exploratory discourse on metadiscourse. *College Composition and Communication*, 36, 82-93.
- Ventola, E. & Mauranten, A. (1990). *Tutkijat ja Englanniksi Kirjoittaminen [Researchers and Writing in English]*. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press.
- Ventola, E. & Mauranten, A. (1991). Non-native writing and native revising of scientific articles. In Ventola, E. (ed.). *Recent Systemic and Other Functional Views on Language*, 457-492. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Werlich, E. (1976). *A Text Grammar of English*. Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer.
- Widdowson, H. (1979). *Explorations in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ylönen, S., Neuendorff, D., & Effe, G. (1989). Zur kontrastiven Analyse von medizinischen Fachtexte. Eine diachrone Studie. In C. Laurén & M. Nordman (Ed.s), *Special Language: From Humans thinking to Thinking Machines*, 203-224. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Appendix

List of CEISR signals ordered by metatextual categories and relative frequency of use

SPANISH			ENGLISH		
Anaphoric peripheral intrinsic CEISR signals realised by an adverbial phrase (IPANAP)					
SIGNAL	n	%	SIGNAL	n	%
COMO CONSECUENCIA	4	19.0%	AS A RESULT	6	25.0%
EN CONSECUENCIA	4	19.0%	AS A CONSEQUENCE	5	20.8%
POR ELLO/ESTO	3	19.0%	HENCE	3	12.5%
ASI	3	14.3%	CONSEQUENTLY	2	8.3%
COMO RESULTADO	2	9.5%	BECAUSE OF ...	2	8.3%
DE ESTA FORMA/ESTE MODO	2	9.5%	FOR...REASON	2	8.3%
POR...MOTIVO	2	4.8%	...AS AN EFFECT	1	4.2%
DE AHI	1	4.8%	THEREBY	1	4.2%
TOTAL	21	100.0%	THEREFORE	1	4.2%
			THUS	1	4.2%
			TOTAL	24	100.0%

Anaphoric integrated intrinsic CEISR signals realised by a noun (IIANN)					
SIGNAL	n	%	SIGNAL	n	%
RESULTADO	6	42.9%	RESULT	18	58.1%
CONSECUENCIA	5	35.7%	EFFECT	4	12.9%
EFFECTO	2	14.3%	WHY	4	12.9%
OUTPUT	1	7.1%	FINDING	3	9.7%
TOTAL	14	100.0%	CONSEQUENCE	1	3.2%
			EXPLANATION	1	3.2%
			TOTAL	31	100.0%

Anaphoric integrated intrinsic CEISR signals realised by a verb (IIANV)					
SIGNAL	n	%	SIGNAL	n	%
SURGIR	6	14.3%	RESULT	8	17.8%
HACER	5	11.9%	CREATE	6	13.3%
DAR LUGAR A	4	9.5%	PRODUCE	5	11.1%
OBTENER	4	9.5%	YIELD	4	8.9%
CONducIR A	3	7.1%	LEAD TO	4	8.9%
RESULTAR	3	7.1%	CONTRIBUTE TO	3	6.7%
CONTRIBUIR A	2	4.8%	EMERGE	3	6.7%
SUPONER	2	4.8%	MOTIVATE	2	4.4%
OCURRIR	1	2.4%	FOLLOW	2	4.4%
TENER (EFFECTO)	1	2.4%	GENERATE	2	4.4%
PRODUCIR	1	2.4%	EXPLAIN	2	4.4%
ORIGINAR	1	2.4%	ARISE	1	2.2%
TENERSE	1	2.4%	MEAN	1	2.2%
NACER	1	2.4%	BE RELEVANT TO	1	2.2%
LLEVAR A	1	2.4%	OBTAIN	1	2.2%
JUSTIFICAR	1	2.4%	TOTAL	45	100.0%
GENERAR	1	2.4%			
EMPUJAR	1	2.4%			
DERIVAR EN	1	2.4%			
CREAR	1	2.4%			
TRADUCIRSE EN	1	2.4%			
TOTAL	42	100.0%			

Cataphoric integrated intrinsic CEISR signals realised by a noun (IICAN)

SIGNAL	n	%	SIGNAL	n	%
RESULTADO	7	100.0%	EFFECT	9	90.0%
			RESULT	1	10.0%
			TOTAL	10	100.0%

Cataphoric integrated intrinsic CEISR signals realised by a verb (IICAV)

SIGNAL	n	%	SIGNAL	n	%
OBTENER	5	71.4%	EMERGE	2	28.6%
DAR	1	14.3%	ARISE	1	14.3%
RESULTAR	1	14.3%	HAVE (EFFECTS)	1	14.3%
TOTAL	7	100.0%	LEAD TO	1	14.3%
			OBTAIN	1	14.3%
			YIELD	1	14.3%
			TOTAL	7	100.0%

Anaphoric-cum-cataphoric integrated extrinsic CEISR signals realised by a noun (EIACN)

SIGNAL	n	%	SIGNAL	n	%
RESULTADO	17	81.0%	RESULT	25	86.2%
CONSECUENCIA	4	19.0%	FINDING	2	6.9%
TOTAL	21	100.0%	CONSEQUENCE	1	3.4%
			EFFECT	1	3.4%
			TOTAL	29	100.0%

Anaphoric-cum-cataphoric integrated extrinsic CEISR signals realised by a verb (EIACV)

SIGNAL	n	%	SIGNAL	n	%
OBTENER	11	73.3%	ARISE	1	25.0%
SURGIR	2	13.3%	GENERATE	1	25.0%
RESULTAR	1	6.7%	HAVE (REPERCUSSIONS)	1	25.0%
TENER REPERCUSION	1	6.7%	PRODUCE	1	25.0%
TOTAL	15	100.0%	TOTAL	4	100.0%

Ana I. Moreno is a Lecturer of business English in the Department of Modern Languages of The University of León (Spain), where she has been involved in ESP since 1990. She finished her PhD in 1995 and her main research interests are contrastive rhetoric and business and economic discourse analysis. She has also written papers on business English teaching methodology and needs analysis.