

Navigating Disciplinary Dialogues: An Exploratory Analysis of Dialogic Stance

Nur Yigitoglu Aptoula^a and Betul Bal Gezeğin^b

Abstract

A number of studies have focused on the analyses of theses, articles, and book reviews as academic genres, yet there are also other genres that have recently appeared in academic journals and need to be analyzed. One of these genres is the so-called "disciplinary dialogues," which are relatively short academic texts written by experts to discuss a specific issue rather than reporting research. This study focuses on authors' interaction in disciplinary dialogues. The data for the study is a specialized corpus comprised of 37 disciplinary dialogues published in a journal in the Applied Linguistics field. Discourse analysis was employed. The findings illuminate a rich array of writing strategies employed by authors to establish a dialogic stance, such as referring to other scholars/studies, asking rhetorical questions, explicitly showing disagreement/agreement, using hedging devices, using evaluative and reflective language, and suggesting future research ideas. The paper ends with the pedagogical and research implications of the findings.

Keywords: academic journals, author interaction, disciplinary dialogues, dialogic stance, corpus

Article info

Received: 22.02.2024

Revised: 12.03.2024

Accepted: 15.03.2024

Published online: 22.04.2024

Introduction

Researchers have been extensively addressing the theme of interaction in academic discourse over the past few decades. The question of how writers interact with their readers and the language they use to do so have been discussed under various concepts, such as metadiscourse (Crismore, 1989; Hyland & Tse, 2004), attitude (Halliday, 1994), epistemic modality (Hyland, 1998), appraisal (Martin, 2000; White, 2003), stance (Biber & Finegan, 1989) to name a few (Hyland, 2005). To reveal how interaction is constructed and performed through the use of language in different academic disciplines across a range of academic genres has been found valuable in the field of English for Specific Purposes, particularly in English for Academic Purposes.

Disciplinary dialogues are short academic texts published in academic journals and written to clarify a new concept, present perspectives on that concept, and discuss its future potential and implications. As its name suggests, "disciplinary dialogues" are anticipated to create a discourse by discussing a major topic in the field. A disciplinary dialogue constitutes a text that is written by scholars who engage in debate through written texts, given the impracticality of face-to-face discussions. Unlike research articles, these dialogues do not aim to report the results of research. As opinion papers, however, these pieces reflect the author's thoughts on a certain issue by covering this specific issue with a critical perspective. They provide the readers with an in-depth analysis of the issue by putting it in a larger context. Disciplinary dialogues are usually written on an issue or paper that was previously published, and, in some instances, several disciplinary dialogues are written on the same paper. For this reason, we believe that it is important to investigate disciplinary dialogues as a newly-emerged yet still unexplored genre within the field of second language writing.

While disciplinary dialogues seem to be a genre specific to Applied Linguistics, in other disciplines, similar types of writing under other labels, such as "colloquia" or "symposia" can also be found. Very few, if any, studies have focused on these genres. It is also possible to find similar "responses" as genres that are common,

^aCorresponding author, Boğaziçi University, Department of Foreign Language Education, nuryigitoglu@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0002-9039-6672

^bSamsun Ondokuz Mayıs University, Department of English Language Teaching, betulbal@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0001-9818-9347

and in these pieces, authors respond to a published piece. Similarly, there are "position papers," in which authors purposefully take a (perhaps controversial) stand on an issue, often to provoke discussion. The disciplinary dialogues section, on the other hand, includes both of these later types of texts, featuring a lengthier position paper and shorter responses from various authors. In fact, the disciplinary dialogues section includes two different genres - the position paper being one and the responses being another. That is why it is novel and still remains an underexplored genre within the field of Applied Linguistics.

Given the complexity of this specific genre, one can argue that disciplinary dialogues are research-professional genres that experienced scholars are invited to write. Atkinson (2012), when commenting on the initiation of the section of this specific genre in an Applied Linguistics journal, specifically describes the disciplinary dialogues section as focused on "debate," with a position paper detailing an "argument" and "responses" from others. He also notes that the disciplinary dialogues section focuses on "a major topic under discussion in the field." (p.1) As Atkinson noted, he felt "the debate needed to continue," and this idea has remained as the ultimate goal of the scholars writing disciplinary dialogues. Several themes have been debated in disciplinary sections throughout the years: L2 writing expertise, multimodal composing, argumentation, replication in second language writing, contrastive rhetoric, and plagiarism, to name a few. These topics remain subject to debate in the field of Applied Linguistics, but one should also note that the disciplinary dialogues contribute helpful perspectives on the field that will then generate a larger discussion in the field about these issues and establish it as an important component of applied linguistics scholarship.

In order to push the area forward and to gain a deeper understanding of the norms of academic writing within Applied Linguistics, the norms of disciplinary dialogues as a genre need to be addressed. Although it could be argued that this is a genre of experienced scholars, we believe that this genre should be dealt with in university writing courses for a number of reasons. Firstly, disciplinary dialogues as a genre require synthesis and dialogic communication, which are skills needed for critical thinking skills. In addition, graduate students are not always expected to produce argumentative essays or research papers in all their content courses; they might be expected to respond to content or reading materials in different ways. Disciplinary dialogues as a research-professional genre require a deeper level synthesis and contributes to the arguments in the field. Graduate students typically transition from being primarily knowledge consumers to becoming knowledge producers as they advance in their academic and professional careers. However, even as they generate new knowledge, they continue to consume and integrate existing knowledge to inform their work. For this reason, we believe it is important to help our students "unpack textual norms" (Hyland, 2018, p. 383) and transcend their ingrained presumptions about the serious tone and formulaic ways of academic writing. Teaching disciplinary dialogues, in particular, may promote graduate students' critical thinking development as they engage in this genre and critically analyze and evaluate the existing research. Also, as new comers to the academic discourse community, graduate students may be more aware of disciplinary norms and arguments within the field. Lastly, although contributing to intellectual discourse by participating in disciplinary dialogues may be an expert writing task, it is important for graduate students to become aware of outgoing debates within the field and engage in debates surrounding hot topics related to their expertise.

Creating a Dialogic Stance in Disciplinary Dialogues

The incorporation of interaction into texts has been an issue of all academic genres, yet some genres need to be more dialogic due to their generic features. Although it is common to come across the use of the word "dialogic" or expressions like "dialogic pedagogy" and "dialogic teaching" mostly in spoken contexts, it needs to be discussed in written discourse as well. The authors of certain texts are expected to use more critical, expressive, evaluative, and interactive language due to the academic text type they are writing.

Dialogic communication in this paper is used as a way of interaction that the authors create while they "detail their views in print," "provide written responses on focus articles," be in "meta-level discussions" (Atkinson, 2012, p.283). With these responsibilities in mind, the authors of disciplinary dialogues position themselves in a triangulated communication of authors themselves, readers, and focus article authors. We believe how this interaction among the three parties is realized needs to be investigated to understand this academic genre better.

With this goal in mind, this paper aims to investigate how a dialogic stance is achieved in disciplinary dialogues. In this paper, we follow Hyland's (2008) interactional model of voice that consists of stance and engagement and his perspective that authors reflect their presence in their texts and construct a relationship with their readers. He states that "every successful academic text displays the writer's awareness of both its readers

and its consequences” (p. 6). Authors of academic texts present their awareness of their authors and manage their interaction with them by relying on certain strategies. Rather than a quantitative approach to identifying patterns of authorial voice, this study adopts a macro level and holistic qualitative analysis of authorial voice in “disciplinary dialogues,” which have not been investigated as a genre before.

Method

Selection of Texts

In order to examine dialogic stance in disciplinary dialogues, 37 target texts published in an Applied Linguistics journal were collected. The corpus under consideration encompasses a total of 44,934 words. Notably, each individual text within this corpus exhibits a similar word count and adheres to the established criteria, obviating the necessity for the exclusion of any specific target texts from its composition. It should be noted that since this is a relatively new genre, the number of journals publishing disciplinary dialogues is limited. The first disciplinary dialogue was published in 2012 in the *Journal of Second Language Writing*, and since then, the journal has kept on publishing and promoting this new academic genre. To ensure that similar texts are not missed to be included in this special corpus, a list of prestigious journals in the field was checked to determine whether they include texts that have been written and published with similar purposes. It is found that it is not a common academic genre published in most journals. In addition to a manual check of the journals and personal recommendations, queries in the search engines with different keywords such as “disciplinary dialogues,” “short communication,” “short report,” and “scholarly discussions” were conducted to ensure that similar texts that were written for the same purpose with a similar structure are not missed. The inclusion criteria of texts are as follows:

- Question and answer types of texts are excluded.
- Texts that report a research study are excluded.
- A similar text length is ensured (too short and too long texts are excluded)
- Only single-author dialogue texts are included.
- Meta-analyses are excluded.

Data Analysis

Discourse analysis was undertaken to analyze and interpret the gathered data. A discourse can be defined as a system of texts that brings objects into being (Parker, 1992). The researchers carried out a manual and cyclical analysis of each text to identify the strategies used by the authors to create the dialogic stance. In this discourse analysis, the researchers individually analyzed the possible patterns that indicate the dialogic and interactive tone of the authors. Each strategy found was tagged and checked by two researchers for reliability. The data analysis was carried out by following these steps:

1. Searching for depictions and cues related to dialogic or interactive markers within the texts.
2. Annotating and categorizing the interpretation of these depictions, with a specific emphasis on discerning the functions of the descriptions and their associated linguistic features within the text.
3. Bringing together all relevant instances from each text and formulating a comprehensive compilation of the recurring strategies identified.

Findings

The analysis of 37 disciplinary dialogues revealed that authors use common strategies to reach a dialogic tone and interact with the readers as well as the authors of focus articles. These can be listed as follows:

1. Citing other sources/scholars
2. Asking rhetorical questions
3. Showing agreement/disagreement
4. Using hedging devices

5. Suggesting future research ideas
6. Using reflective language
7. Using evaluative language

Citing Other Sources/Scholars

It has been observed that authors of disciplinary dialogues frequently refer to other scholars to support their evaluations. By citing the works of other researchers, they strengthen their dialogic tone and evaluations. Some examples can be found below:

"As highlighted by Smith et al. (2018), the role of environmental factors cannot be overlooked in this context."

"An early, and important work is Derewianka (1991) exploring how texts work in which she unpacks features of systemic functional language description..."

As can be seen from the examples, the authors cite other scholars to make their dialogic tone stronger in the disciplinary dialogues.

Asking Rhetorical Questions

As the name suggests, disciplinary dialogues provide the readers with the author's disciplinary expertise in the form of a dialogue. A common strategy used by the authors to build this dialogue is integrating questions in their texts. This strategy helps to engage with the readers in the form of dialogue and prompts reflection.

"For instance, in what specific aspects of source use do students and experts differ most and least?"

"Then, how can (should) we establish multimodal literacy research..."

"But why is that important?"

The examples above show these rhetorical questions in disciplinary dialogues serve as a way to build their own arguments and to engage the readers in their disciplinary dialogues.

Showing Agreement/Disagreement

The most frequent feature that helps to create a dialogic stance in the texts is showing agreement or disagreement. Particularly, agreements were found in all of the texts, and it is observed that expressing agreement with the authors of the articles discussed signals a willingness to find common ground and fosters a cooperative tone in the dialogue. Unlike other academic genres, explicit expressions of agreement and disagreement indicate that there are generic features of disciplinary dialogues, and the authors of these texts foster a conversational tone and create a scholarly exchange, which is the objective of writing these texts. Some examples of agreement can be found below:

"I agree with Pecorari that avoiding plagiarism is largely about learning."

"Let me first confirm the authors' point that, with some caveats and cautions, quasi-replications are needed..."

"I agree with Li that the greatest collective strength and impact of contrastive/ cross-cultural/intercultural studies have been in the comparative analyses of texts..."

"Therefore, I agree wholeheartedly with her assertion that we should apply ourselves to disseminating our research and to educating our institutional colleagues."

As can be seen from the examples above, the authors use agreements to create dialogic engagement. The authors also use disagreement to build their dialogic tone better. Below are some examples of disagreements found in the disciplinary dialogues:

"Porte and Richards seem to take a narrow view of L2 writing research..."

"Oddly, however, in attempting to mix Confucian and Aristotelian approaches in her writing, Professor Li is supporting the idea that culture is complex and hybrid..."

"Space limitations only allow me to rebut her accusation that I fail to provide evidence in making my arguments."

It should be noted that disagreements and agreements appear together most of the time, as seen in the following examples:

"I am not as convinced as she is that L2 instructors are behind the curve on this, but I agree this is an important challenge for all language and literacy educators."

"Despite our many disagreements, I concur with Professor Li..."

Using Hedging Devices

The authors tend to use hedging devices to soften their tone. Such devices are varied, and in disciplinary dialogues, they were identified as modal verbs, certain verbs, nouns, adverbs, and adjectives. Here are some examples:

"I believe that when we explore..."

"However, it is pertinent to stress that..."

"The findings suggest a possible correlation between X and Y, though further research is warranted to confirm these tentative conclusions."

"Contrary to this view, we tend to think that the traditional incarnation of CR has been forced to go through a conceptual paradigm shift..."

As can be seen from the examples above, the authors use a variety of hedging devices to form their arguments in the disciplinary dialogues. These devices seem to help the authors create a dialogic stance and stimulate further discussions on the topic introduced and/or responded in the disciplinary dialogue.

Suggesting Future Research Ideas

The analysis of dialogic disciplinary dialogues has revealed that one of the features that contribute to creating a dialogic stance is the way the authors interact with the readers by drawing attention to possible future research ideas. By doing so, the authors open up space for continued conversation and motivate the researchers to think about potential directions for future studies. Some examples of such uses can be found below:

"Future research could delve into the impact that expert teachers have on nonexpert teachers, shedding light on the role of mentoring in the ongoing development of teacher expertise."

"Future research needs to pay adequate attention to classroom-based assessment issues by looking into how teachers and students conceptualize argumentative tasks, and also into scoring procedures used for judging resulting performance."

"One of the promising areas that future researchers can focus on is the impact that expert teachers have on nonexpert teachers."

These examples illustrate that the authors of disciplinary dialogues usually conclude with implications for future research in an attempt to shed light on the areas why future research needs to know more about the topic of the disciplinary dialogue and what can help move the discipline forward. This discussion helps the authors to build upon the continuation of the topic of the disciplinary dialogue in future research studies.

Using Reflective Language

The authors of disciplinary dialogues were observed to use reflective language, and common phrases, including the personal pronoun "I," were detected in almost all of the texts. The reflective language can create a more inclusive and participatory tone.

"I am keenly aware that argumentation also plays an important civic role."

"Then, as I read further into the paper, I could see that my own pondering on these issues were, in essence, echoing Hirvela and Belcher's proposal for the concept of adaptive expertise."

"I have been deliberately provocative in this essay because..."

"My position on this issue has been clear and consistent since around 1995 when I started my effort to help establish the disciplinary identity of second language writing."

The examples above show that the first-person pronoun *I* is frequently used in this genre. This makes sense because disciplinary dialogues typically consist of a focus paper that presents the author's (or authors') thoughts on the topic, followed by a series of responses by other authors. Given that the genre showcases the author's expertise on the topic of the disciplinary dialogue, the genre requires the presence of the author within the text and, thus, the use of the pronoun *I*.

Using Evaluative Language

Interpersonality and interactivity are observed to be essential features of dialogic academic texts, which are highly evaluative in nature. Evaluation can be defined as "expression of the speaker or writer's attitude or stance towards, viewpoint on, or feelings about the entities or propositions that he or she is talking about" (Thompson & Hunston, 2000, p. 5). Evaluation in the analyzed texts appeared to be positive, negative, and both positive and negative evaluations. The evaluative acts were identified based on the definition proposed by Suarez-Tejerina (2006):

"We have counted as an evaluative act any structural unit, irrespective of its lexico-grammatical configuration, that contains both the (sub)aspect commented upon and what is said about it, or what action is recommended" (p. 153)

The authors use positive evaluative language in the disciplinary dialogues to highlight their appreciation of the cited works. Some examples of this kind of positive evaluative language can be found below:

"I have admired Xiaoming Li's research and writing ever since I read her dissertation,"

"DePalma and Ringer argue for a very diverse, multidimensional, and multidisciplinary framework."

"With their contributions, these authors provide useful pointers to guide further discussion and inquiry."

In some other dialogues, the authors use negative evaluative language to highlight their ideas in contrast to the cited works or a related issue. Here are some examples of such negative evaluative language found in disciplinary dialogues:

"While I can understand the desire to call it a discipline, declaring it a discipline does not make it so."

"But from my perspective, it is quite irrelevant why they have plagiarized."

Porte and Richards seem to take a narrow view of L2 writing research, their few examples overly focusing on studies of feedback and teacher-student alignment.

While disciplinary dialogues include examples of negative and positive evaluations, findings also revealed that disciplinary dialogues include a combination of positive - negative evaluative language instances. In these examples, the positive evaluation helps the authors underline the niche found in the discipline. Below are some examples of negative-positive evaluations.

I appreciate her effort to reconstruct my position on the disciplinarity of second language writing, but it made me realize that I have not yet had the chance to fully articulate some of the fundamental concepts underlying my work on disciplinarity.

While some corrective feedback studies have indicated that revision can assist language learning (Chandler, 2003; Ferris, 2006; Shintani et al., 2014), clear evidence of the usefulness of revision itself is still very limited.

Discussion

This short report presents the language used in disciplinary dialogues by expert writers to form the interaction between the readers, the authors of the focused articles, and themselves as the authors of disciplinary dialogues. We believe that the exploration of this academic discourse will be a valuable contribution to the field of ESP, particularly EAP. As evidenced by the insights gleaned from this study, the deliberate choices the authors make and the writing strategies they employ in this specialized genre play a significant role in establishing a dialogic stance. Unveiling what the expert writers do to achieve their goal of discussing the target articles yielded the use of evaluative language. Employing evaluative language seemed to enrich academic communication and provide a platform for reader engagement and creating a dialogue. Exploring the shades of evaluative language within disciplinary dialogues can guide both novice and expert writers in honing their writing skills, enhancing the effectiveness of their communication within the academic discourse. Evaluation is an important yet neglected part of teaching academic writing. Most academic writing teaching books focus on the genre requirements as well as the language required in various parts of those genres. We think, however, that getting graduate students to create their own dialogues with examples like the ones provided here in this short report will make them think more carefully about what they write about others' views. These findings are in line with previous literature which reported that each genre exhibited specific characteristics (Biber & Finegan, 1989).

Pedagogically, the implications of these findings are of significance. Consistent with previous research on metadiscourse and academic writing, this study underlines the importance of understanding the conventions of disciplinary dialogues, informing both research and pedagogy in the field of applied linguistics and beyond. White (2003), for example, also discussed that metadiscourse plays a crucial role in helping writers to engage with their audience and negotiate their stance effectively and highlighted the importance of metadiscourse awareness in academic writing instruction, particularly for novice writers who may struggle with the conventions of disciplinary discourse.

Genre-specific instruction, therefore, is needed, particularly for graduate students who need the tools to write more effectively and to enhance their writing expertise in their academic disciplines. Therefore, integrating the identified writing strategies into writing courses could help those students. Teachers of academic writing for graduate students, for example, could use these examples as a starting point or model sentences in their classes. In these activities, they could ask their students to write their own disciplinary dialogue papers on a topic or paper of their choice. Similarly, for those academic writing classes that include students from different disciplines, teachers could make students analyze disciplinary dialogues from different disciplines to make their students more aware of disciplinary-specific uses of evaluative language used in this genre. After the students write their disciplinary dialogues, they can peer review each other's disciplinary dialogues following a guideline. An example set of questions for such a guideline is provided below:

- Does the disciplinary dialogue present a critical challenge to one or more aspects of the focal article, arguing for a position other than that taken in the focal article?
- Does it include a dialogic stance for each/one/some of the following?:
 - Citing other sources/scholars
 - Asking rhetorical questions
 - Showing agreement/disagreement
 - Using hedging devices
 - Suggesting future research ideas
 - Using reflective language
 - Using evaluative language
- Does it maintain a respectful tone critical to ideas or conclusions but not authors?
- Does it make a clear take-home message?

- Does it include a short title that emphasizes your key message?
- Does it use only essential citations?

In addition, looking at how scholarly authors debate in writing in disciplinary dialogues can be valuable in raising graduate students' awareness of how authors make different rhetorical choices across rhetorical contexts. For example, graduate students could compare how writers disagree in disciplinary dialogues and consider why they make these different choices and what the effects are. Such analysis can help highlight for students the broad range of writing choices that writers choose from and how those choices are connected to rhetorical aims.

Conclusion

The data of this short report is a specialized corpus from an Applied Linguistics journal. The findings are, therefore, limited to the texts obtained from this journal. However, further investigations are needed to show whether the observed writing strategies are specific to this discipline or if they resonate across different disciplines. Comparative studies exploring variations in disciplinary dialogues can be conducted to reach a comprehensive understanding of academic interaction. In addition, as the disciplinary dialogues genre remains unexplored, future research studies could focus on the moves of the genre of disciplinary dialogues. We also believe that there is an interaction between writers' expertise and writers' use of evaluation in disciplinary dialogue sections. Future research studies could investigate this interaction in disciplinary dialogues. Lastly, we propose these analyses should be integrated with writers' views on their evaluative language use. For this reason, future researchers could also interview writers of disciplinary dialogues to tap into their cognitions regarding their own use of evaluative language in disciplinary dialogues.

References

- Atkinson, D. (2012). Disciplinary dialogues: Introduction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21, 283.
- Biber, D., & Finegan, E. (1989). Styles of stance in English: Lexical and grammatical marking of evidentiality and affect. *Text- Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse*, 9(1), 93-124.
- Crismore, A. (1989). Talking with readers: Metadiscourse as rhetorical act. *New directions in discourse processing*, 14, 147-175.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar*. Routledge.
- Hyland, K. (1998). *Hedging in scientific research articles*. John Benjamins.
- Hyland, K. (2005). *Metadiscourse*. Continuum.
- Hyland K. (2008). Disciplinary voices: Interactions in research writing. *English Text Construction*. 1(1), 5-22.
- Hyland, K. (2018). Sympathy for the devil? A Defense of EAP. *Language Teaching*, 51(3), 383-399. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444818000101>
- Hyland, K., & Tse, P. (2004). Metadiscourse in academic writing: A reappraisal. *Applied linguistics*, 25(2), 156-177.
- Martin, J. R. (2000). Beyond exchange: Appraisal systems in English. In S. Hunston & G. Thompson (Eds.), *Evaluation in text: Authorial stance and the construction of discourse* (pp. 142-175). Oxford University Press.
- Parker, I. (1992). *Discourse dynamics*. Routledge.
- Suarez-Tejerina, L. (2006). *Modes of evaluation and rhetorical patterns: a contrastive study of English and Spanish book reviews* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Universidad de León, Spain.
- Thompson, G., & Hunston, S. (2000). Evaluation: An introduction. In G. Thompson, & S. Hunston (Eds.), *Evaluation in Text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse* (pp. 1-27). Oxford University Press.
- White, P. R. R. (2003). Beyond modality and hedging: A dialogic view of the language of intersubjective stance. *Text & Talk*, 23(2), 259-284.

Disipliner Diyaloglar: Diyaloga Özgü Tutumun Keşifsel Bir Analizi

Öz

Bir dizi çalışma akademik türler olarak tez, makale ve kitap incelemelerinin analizine odaklanmıştır, ancak akademik dergilerde son zamanlarda ortaya çıkan ve analiz edilmesi gereken başka türler de vardır. Bu türlerden biri de "disipliner diyaloglar" olarak adlandırılan ve araştırma raporlamaktan ziyade belirli bir konuyu tartışmak üzere uzmanlar tarafından yazılan görece kısa akademik metinlerdir. Bu çalışma, yazarların disipliner diyaloglardaki etkileşimlerine odaklanmaktadır. Çalışmanın verisini, Uygulamalı Dilbilim alanındaki bir dergide yayınlanan 37 disipliner diyalogdan oluşan özel bir derlem oluşturmaktadır. Analiz yöntemi olarak söylem analizi kullanılmıştır. Bulgular, yazarlar tarafından diyalojik bir duruş oluşturmak için kullanılan, diğer akademisyenlere/çalışmalara atıfta bulunma, retorik sorular sorma, uzlaşma/anlaşmazlığı açıkça gösterme, kaçınma (yumuşatma) ifadeleri kullanma, değerlendirici ve yansıtıcı dil kullanma ve gelecekteki araştırma fikirlerini önerme gibi zengin bir dizi yazma stratejisini aydınlatmaktadır. Makale, bulguların pedagojik ve araştırma çıkarımlarıyla sona ermektedir.

Anahtar kelimeler: akademik dergiler, yazar etkileşimi, disipliner diyaloglar, diyalojik duruş, derlem