

[LEARN] Submission Acknowledgement Inbox x



 **Supakorn Phoocharoensil, Ph.D. via Thai Journals Online (ThaiJO)** <admin@tci-thaijo.o... Sat, Jun 22, 2019, 10:37 PM
to me ▾



Ahmad Amin Dalimunte:


Thank you for submitting the manuscript, "Genres Classification and Generic Structures in the English Language Textbooks of Economics and Islamic Economics in an Indonesian University" to LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network. With the online journal management system that we are using, you will be able to track its progress through the editorial process by logging in to the journal web site:

Manuscript URL: <http://www.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/LEARN/authorDashboard/submission/196881>

Username: amindalimunte

If you have any questions, please contact me. Thank you for considering this journal as a venue for your work.

Supakorn Phoocharoensil, Ph.D.

edited version of the manuscript  Inbox x



Amin Dalimunte


 Tue, Jul 9, 2019, 10:31 PM



Dear Ajarn, Please, find the new version of our manuscript in the attachment. A few minor things were missed indeed. I am sorry for that. Minor corrections have



Amin Dalimunte

 Wed, Jul 10, 2019, 9:03 PM




----- Forwarded message ----- From: Amin Dalimunte <aldmunthe@gmail.com> Date: Tue, Jul 9, 2019 at 10:31 PM Subject: edited version of the manuscript T



istum istum <istum11@hotmail.com>

to supakorn.p@litu.tu.ac.th, me ▾

 Wed, Jul 10, 2019, 11:04 PM



Dear Dr Supakorn,

Following our previous email, now my student and I would like to submit our reformatted manuscript for your consideration to be published in LEARN Journal.

You can find his personal message of apologies in his email to me below.

We would appreciate it if you could acknowledge the receipt of this revised manuscript krub when you can.

Looking forward to hearing from you..

With best regards,

Issra

LEARN Journal Review Result Inbox x



 **Supakorn Phoocharoensil** <supakorn.p@litu.tu.ac.th>
to me, issra ▾

 Thu, Sep 12, 2019, 5:05 PM



Dear Authors

Thank you for your submission to our journal. The reviewers' decision is "Accept with Major Revision".

Attached please find the reviewers' comments. Please revise the manuscript according to the reviewers' feedback and provide us with a table summarizing all the points having been revised. After this, we can provide a letter of acceptance for you.

Best regards

Supakorn Phoocharoensil, Ph.D.

—
Supakorn Phoocharoensil, Ph.D.

Assistant Professor

Vice Director for Administrative Affairs and Graduate Studies

Language Institute of Thammasat University

Re: Submitting our revised version for your final consideration Inbox X

 **Issra Pramoolsook** <issra@sut.ac.th>

 to Supakorn, me 

 Tue, Nov 5, 2019, 5:18 PM



Dear Dr Supakorn,

I hope this email finds you well and it is not too busy at your desk as the Editor-in-Chief of LEARN.

I'm writing to you today to submit the final version of our revised manuscript following valuable comments from the two reviewers. Attached with this email are 6 files including:

1. The final revised version. The texts in bold are the revised parts for your consideration.
2. The revision record sheets summarising the actions we have taken in response to the comments from Reviewers 1 and 2.
3. The Tables of Content of the two textbooks under investigation, which are to support the given responses both in Revision Records 1 and 2.
4. The excerpts of the key chunks of text

We have tried our best to address and handle all the comments. Therefore, we sincerely apologise for the slight delay of this resubmission. I hope this doesn't cause much inconvenience for your publication process or doesn't affect your decision on our manuscript.

Thank you for your kind consideration on this revised version. Please do not hesitate to let us know if we can do anything further in order for you to reach the final positive decision on publishing our manuscript in LEARN.

We are looking forward to hearing your final decision whenever it is convenient for you.

With best regards,

Letter of Acceptance_LEARN Journal

Inbox x



Supakorn Phoocharoensil <supakorn.p@litu.tu.ac.th>

Sun, Jan 12, 1:14 PM



to Issra, me

Dear Dr.Issra and Amin

Attached please find the official letter of acceptance. Your article will be published by the end of January. Your contribution to our journal as authors is much appreciated.

Thank you

Supakorn Phoocharoensil, Ph.D.

Associate Professor

Editor-in-Chief

LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network

Supakorn Phoocharoensil, Ph.D.

Associate Professor

Vice Director for Administrative Affairs and Graduate Studies

Language Institute of Thammasat University

Editor-in-Chief

LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network



Amin Dalimunte <aldmunthe@gmail.com>

to Supakorn, Issra ▾

Sun, Jan 12, 2:38 PM



Dear Ajarn Supakorn Phoocharoensil, Editor in Chief of LEARN Journal

We are pleased to accept this most wanted note from you.

Thank you a lot for your kind supports during the important process of our article publication.

We would be more than pleased if we could pass our next contributions to the good advancement of LEARN in the future.

looking forward to having the published version of the article.

Our best regards,

Authors



Issra Pramoolsook <issra@sut.ac.th>

 to Supakorn, me ▾

Sun, Jan 12, 11:38 PM



Dear Dr Supakorn,

Your letter gives us such a pleasure! Amin and I really appreciate your kind support to have our manuscript appear in your journal. This publication has been a nice

LEARN Journal Reviewer's Form**Reviewer 1**

Title of Article: Genres Classification and Generic Structures in

the English Language Textbooks of Economics and Islamic Economics in an Indonesian University

Please note that numbers 1-5 represent the reviewer's judgment on the extent to which the paper meets the criterion indicated, with 1 indicating the **lowest** level of agreement and 5 the **highest** level of agreement. Please put a tick (✓) where appropriate. 'N/A' should be ticked if the particular statement cannot be judged relative to the article.

| Evaluation Criteria | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|------------|
| 1. The title accurately reflects the content of the article. | | | | ✓ | | |
| 2. The topic/theme is theoretically important. | | | | ✓ | | |
| 3. The abstract is consistent with the content. | | | | ✓ | | |
| 4. The rationale is clearly stated. | | | | ✓ | | |
| 5. The purported significance of the article is reasonable. | | | | ✓ | | |
| 6. Major issues in the review of the literature are adequately discussed. | | ✓ | | | | |
| 7. The research design is theoretically sound. | | | ✓ | | | |
| 8. The research method is clearly explained. | | ✓ | | | | |
| 9. The results are well presented. | | | ✓ | | | |
| 10. The conclusion sums up the main findings. | | | ✓ | | | |
| 11. The article contributes new knowledge in the area of foreign language learning and teaching. | | | | ✓ | | |
| 12. The quality of the writing is of high standard. | | | ✓ | | | |
| 13. The article is well-organized and coherent. | | | ✓ | | | |
| 14. The figures, tables and other graphics used are in support of the arguments made. | | | | ✓ | | |
| 15. This article is of interest to other practitioners in the same field. | | | | ✓ | | |

Strengths of the article (if any):

This article addresses the genre classification and generic structures of textbooks. This genre still lacks research in terms of generic structure even though it is one of the main genres essential for studying.

Comments and suggestions on how this article can be improved, for example, abstract, research design, research methods, discussion, etc.

List of comments/suggestions

1. On page 3, Bondi-Paganelli's (1996) study is not relevant because it looks at quantifiers while this study mainly focuses on generic structure. Also the author might want to look at Nesi and Gardner's (2012) book which aims directly at analyzing genres in higher education, using genre analysis and corpus linguistics.
2. On page 4, in the Method section, the author should have provided the titles of the books and their relevant detail earlier on. Secondly, the author wrote, "they are used [...] and **seem to be** compulsory reading [...]", which raises the question of whether they are compulsory reading or not.
3. The selection of the books seems to be quite problematic. Based on the title alone, it seems that these two books are of two different genres. The first textbook, Principles of Microeconomics, seems to be more strongly associated with Explanation genre as it deals with explaining the principles. The second textbook, Islamic Economics: A Short History, on the other hand is likely to be of History genre. As the author claims that ideological position results in different structures, these two books have an issue since they belong to different genres and such discrepancy seems to be a more likely explanation for their different structures.
4. Another issue is related to the number of textbooks. Works in Swalesian's genre analysis are based on a number of texts in order to make claims about the generic structure common across various texts of the same genre. This study is based on 2 texts, which seems rather limited. The author might want to reconceptualize the aim and scope of the article. Perhaps this paper aims to apply genre frameworks in SFL to the analysis of two textbooks with different structures, instead of making claims about the generic structure of textbooks.
5. In the Result section on page 7-9, it is unclear what the numbers in the total column represent. The author might want to provide more explanation how these numbers are determined.
6. In relation to new genres and extra stages in Table 11, the author needs to provide more explanation or some excerpts. Currently, they do not seem different from existing genres in other frameworks. For instance, the Responsive Explanation seems quite similar to the genre of Critiquing an Academic Text (Rose, 2012: 212). The genres of Historical Categorizing Report, Compositional Historical Period Studies and Compositional Historical Site Studies might be grouped under a broad

genre of "Classifying Genre" (Rose, 2012, 212) but they are merely different instantiation of specific classification. The genre of Gradual Explanation is not very clear. The author might want to reconsider whether these new genres are actually new or not.

7. In Table 10, the author could have made it clear which genres are shared by both texts and which ones are unique.

8. All the extra stages in Table 11 already exist in previous frameworks and it is unclear what point the author wants to make by providing them here.

9. On pages 12 and 13, the author discusses the ideological differences between the two books and argues that such differences result in different generic structures. It seems that, based on the title of the books, the textbooks belong to different genres and thus this explains their different generic structures.

10. On page 13, in the Conclusion section, two last sentences of the first paragraph make a claim that does not seem plausible to be drawn from genre analysis alone. Furthermore, the claim here does not seem to explain the differences between the two textbooks.

Reviewer's Decision:

- Accept without revisions
- Accept with minor revisions
- Accept with major revisions
- Resubmit with major revisions
- Reject

Revision Record of LEARN Journal: Reviewer 1

| No | Comments of Reviewer 1 | Response | Page |
|----|--|--|------|
| 1 | <p>On page 3, Bondi-Paganelli's (1996) study is not relevant because it looks at quantifiers while this study mainly focuses on generic structure. Also the author might want to look at Nesi and Gardner's (2012) book which aims directly at analyzing genres in higher education, using genre analysis and corpus linguistics.</p> | <p>Following the kind suggestion, Bondi-Paganelli (1996) is removed and Nesi and Gardner (2012) is reviewed, instead on page 3.</p> | p.3 |
| 2 | <p>✓ On page 4, in the Method section, the author should have provided the titles of the books and their relevant detail earlier on.</p> <p>✓ Secondly, the author wrote, "they are used *...+ and seem to be compulsory reading *...+", which raises the question of whether they are compulsory reading or not.</p> | <p>The textbooks titles indeed have been mentioned on p.4 which are Principles of Microeconomics (the first book) and Islamic Economics: A Short History (the second book). The given titles were also followed by the details of each of the books; namely, the author's names and their academics roles, the years, the number of chapters and pages as well as that of the books' running words.</p> <p>Secondly, the words seem to be has been deleted. The books are indeed compulsory reading for students in the given university.</p> | p.4 |
| 3 | <p>The selection of the books seems to be quite problematic. Based on the title alone, it seems that these two books are of two different genres. The first textbook, Principles of Microeconomics, seems to be more strongly associated with Explanation genre as it deals with explaining the principles. The second textbook, Islamic Economics: A Short History, on the other hand is likely to be of History genre. As the author claims that ideological position results in different structures, these two books have an</p> | <p>The given textbooks were indeed not selected by the researchers, rather they were chosen and recommended by the economics teachers alone who used them for pedagogic purposes. In other words, the choice was not due to any genre similarity of the books. The reasons of the book's selection have been detailed in Data section on page 4. Regardless of the different ideological position or the genre, both textbooks cover quite a lot of common subject matters in basic economics which made them</p> | p.4 |

| | | | |
|---|---|--|------|
| | issue since they belong to different genres and such discrepancy seems to be a more likely explanation for their different structures. | compulsory to be read. Please find the table of contents of each book in the attachments along with this revision. | |
| 4 | Another issue is related to the number of textbooks. Works in Swalesian's genre analysis are based on a number of texts in order to make claims about the generic structure common across various texts of the same genre. This study is based on 2 texts, which seems rather limited. The author might want to reconceptualize the aim and scope of the article. Perhaps this paper aims to apply genre frameworks in SFL to the analysis of two textbooks with different structures, instead of making claims about the generic structure of textbooks. | Generic structure is an SFL term widely known in most of SFL genre studies. The term utilized in this present study is not meant to generalize the analysis findings of simply the two textbooks that might be hard to be done. The obtained results presented under the label of generic structure are mainly to show that they vividly confirm the existing theories definitely after they are checked against the given frameworks. However, when the results turn out to be different from the given theories, they are labelled as potential rather than generic. In this way, the researchers might clearly indicate the novelty of this present research. | |
| 5 | In the Result section on page 7-9, it is unclear what the numbers in the total column represent. The author might want to provide more explanation how these numbers are determined. | The numbers in the total column are to show the frequency of occurrences of any found genre within the analyzed passage of the textbooks. | p.7 |
| 6 | <p>✓ In relation to new genres and extra stages in Table 11, the author needs to provide more explanation or some excerpts.</p> <p>✓ Currently, they do not seem different from existing genres in other frameworks. For instance, the Responsive Explanation seems quite similar to the genre of Critiquing an Academic Text (Rose, 2012: 212).</p> | <p>The excerpts of the extra stages are provided in Table 11.</p> <p>Probably the genre that is meant by Reviewer is genre of Critical Review not genre of Critiquing an Academic Text. Unfortunately, there is no clear description of how this genre looks like. Rose (2012) put the genre under Response genres which have also been used in this present study. According to Christie and Derewianka (2010), all kinds of Response genres simply initiate with a text to be interpreted and then evaluated.</p> | p. 8 |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|-------------|
| | <p>✓ The genres of Historical Categorizing Report, Compositional Historical Period Studies and Compositional Historical Site Studies might be grouped under a broad genre of “Classifying Genre” (Rose, 2012, 212) but they are merely different instantiation of specific classification.</p> <p>✓ The genre of Gradual Explanation is not very clear. The author might want to reconsider whether these new genres are actually new or not.</p> | <p>Based on Christie and Derewianka (2010), the framework of the present study has reviewed four main sub-genres of Response: Personal Response, Book Review, Character Analysis, and Theme Interpretation. This mechanism certainly is different from the newly proposed genre: Responsive explanation which initiates with a particular problematic phenomenon to be responded or solved rather than a text (literary works). Instead, this genre may look identical to causal explanation (Veel, 1997). For a clear description, discussion of this genre is provided within the paper (page 8) and the complete excerpt is provided in the attachment.</p> <p>The key basic criteria in classifying various genres under their genre family is to look at their social purposes. The purposes at least cover two aspects: the way of how the genre is constructed (mechanism) and the subject matters (field). Several different genres could have similar mechanisms as in the given genres. Yet their subject matters (e.g. Compositional Historical Period Studies and Compositional Historical Site Studies) are different. A wide range of subject matters constructed in many different ways cause the classification of the genres in the present study to become highly complex.</p> <p>Description of genre of Gradual Explanation is given on page 13. The newness of the genre is proposed because it has a quite different purpose from that in Cyclical Explanation (Derewianka and Jones, 2012). The new genre is to explain particular phenomena that happened in linear and gradual mechanism rather than the cyclical one since the phenomena have encountered a particular escalation.</p> | <p>p.13</p> |
|--|---|--|-------------|

| | | | |
|---|---|--|-----|
| | | Its complete excerpt can be found in the attachment. | |
| 7 | In Table 10, the author could have made it clear which genres are shared by both texts and which ones are unique. | Based on the given suggestion, Table 10 has been rearranged to show the clear-cut similarities and differences of the two textbooks. | p.9 |
| 8 | All the extra stages in Table 11 already exist in previous frameworks and it is unclear what point the author wants to make by providing them here. | <p>Only four of the extra stages in Table 11 already existed in the given frameworks: Background, Evaluation, Reinforcement, and Deduction (please see Table 1 until Table 5).</p> <p>Table 11 is to put their functions into more detailed because the stages were found in wider range of aspects that they dealt with and more varied types of genre in which the stages were found as you could see in Table 6, Table 8, and Table 9.</p> <p>On the other hand, the other four extra stages are not available in the given frameworks. They are Significance, Implication, Summary, and Conclusion. Thus, they are considered necessary to be presented and detailed in this present research.</p> | |
| 9 | On pages 12 and 13, the author discusses the ideological differences between the two books and argues that such differences result in different generic structures. It seems that, based on the title of the books, the textbooks belong to different genres and thus this explains their different generic structures. | <p>Response of this comment is still related to the given response in No.3. We can not tell the differences of the two books simply from their titles. The drawn conclusion might indicate a hasty simplification.</p> <p>In the initial steps of the study, the researchers indeed did not assume them to have different genres, rather we regarded them as similar since both are in the same main discipline of Economics and they are used by the same university teacher in the Islamic Economics pedagogy. Despite their differences, the contents of the books also have many similarities in terms of their subject matters. The similar subject matters do not</p> | |

| | | | |
|----|---|--|------------|
| | | necessarily mean to have similar genres. They could be presented or written in different ways depending upon the authors of the textbooks as well as the specified purposes. For instance, the subject matter of <i>production</i> is delivered in both textbooks. In the Islamic economics, <i>production</i> is written through genre of Classifying Report (IEC2S13) whereas in the Economics, it is through Conditional Explanation (EC13S6). This vividly shows that despite the commonality of the subject matters of the two books, they use different genres to portray. | |
| 10 | On page 13, in the Conclusion section, two last sentences of the first paragraph make a claim that does not seem plausible to be drawn from genre analysis alone. Furthermore, the claim here does not seem to explain the differences between the two textbooks. | The words the two Economics here do not refer to the two books yet the two sub-Economics fields to which the books belong. Thus, the wording has been fixed. | Page 16 |

LEARN Journal Reviewer's Form**Reviewer 2****Title of Article: Genres Classification and Generic Structures in the English Language Textbooks of Economics and Islamic Economics in an Indonesian University**

Please note that numbers 1-5 represent the reviewer's judgment on the extent to which the paper meets the criterion indicated, with 1 indicating the **lowest** level of agreement and 5 the **highest** level of agreement. Please put a tick (✓) where appropriate. 'N/A' should be ticked if the particular statement cannot be judged relative to the article.

| Evaluation Criteria | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|------------|
| 1. The title accurately reflects the content of the article. | | | | | ✓ | |
| 2. The topic/theme is theoretically important. | | | | ✓ | | |
| 3. The abstract is consistent with the content. | | | | | ✓ | |
| 4. The rationale is clearly stated. | | ✓ | | | | |
| 5. The purported significance of the article is reasonable. | | | ✓ | | | |
| 6. Major issues in the review of the literature are adequately discussed. | | ✓ | | | | |
| 7. The research design is theoretically sound. | | ✓ | | | | |
| 8. The research method is clearly explained. | | ✓ | | | | |
| 9. The results are well presented. | | | ✓ | | | |
| 10. The conclusion sums up the main findings. | | | | ✓ | | |
| 11. The article contributes new knowledge in the area of foreign language learning and teaching. | | | ✓ | | | |
| 12. The quality of the writing is of high standard. | | | ✓ | | | |
| 13. The article is well-organized and coherent. | | | ✓ | | | |
| 14. The figures, tables and other graphics used are in support of the arguments made. | | | | ✓ | | |
| 15. This article is of interest to other practitioners in the same field. | | | | ✓ | | |

Strengths of the article (if any):

The article features religious/cultural traditions as the main factor in genre analysis of textbooks. On the one hand, this is a sensitive issue and needs to be dealt with very carefully, but at the same time using a religion-related/ culture-related factor in genre analysis can throw insightful light in the field as not much work, if any, has been done on the relationship between religion-related factors and genre analysis. The research project and manuscript must be carried out with great care, though.

Comments and suggestions on how this article can be improved, for example, abstract, research design, research methods, discussion, etc.**1. Rationales:**

As the paper compares economics and Islamic economics textbooks, there should be clear statements of rationales why this sort of comparison is needed or worth being conducted, at least in 2 respects. First, the writer reviewed several studies on genre analysis of textbooks and indicated in paragraph 3 on page 3 (before spelling out the research questions) that: "The existing related studies can indicate that there is no previous research carried out in order to unfold the way texts of Economics in university level under two different paradigms, perspectives, or approaches are structured" – Why is it important to 'unfold the ways' in which textbooks in different 'paradigms, perspectives or approaches are structured'? The writer should not simply review what has been done but also make use of the previous studies to show what is missing or lacking in the field. (The fact that things have not been done doesn't necessarily mean that they should be done. It could be that it's not important to address the topics. If the writer believes that it is worth investigating, he/she should argue for its significance). Second, as the Islamic traditions are the major factor to consider in the study, the writer should provide detailed information about Islamic traditions in textbook design and the significance of considering them in genre analysis. This must be conducted with great care, though, as it can be seen as a sensitive issue.

2. Methodology

- I'm not sure if an analysis of only 2 textbooks can be considered as genre analysis. Or perhaps, the writer doesn't aim to do a genre analysis of these textbooks. If so, the writer might instead state clearly that it is a comparative textual analysis of textbooks, using analytical frameworks in SFL genre analysis.

- I was wondering if the researcher analysed the whole of the two textbooks. I can't find any parts of the paper saying that the analysis was carried out on some sections or chapters of the textbooks. If the whole textbooks were really investigated, explanations should be given how it was done as the data is huge and the analysis involved an inter-coder (who did the whole or parts of the analysis?) and macro and micro analyses.

- The writer should provide some background accounts of the SFL genre analysis tradition and framework. As I'm not familiar with the SFL-genre school, it was not very clear to me what it's meant by 'genre' or 'stage'. It's not clear at all what it means when the writer mentioned such terms as

'explanation genres', 'report genres' or history genres', 'stages' (which contains subcategories as 'background stages', evaluation stages', etc.). These terms, to me, sound more like 'rhetorical patterns', 'moves' and 'steps'. It would be help a lot if the writer explained the SFL genre-analytical traditions. Also, how are the terms used in the report of findings and tables related: genres, generic structures, potential structures, and stages?

3. Findings

The writer should provide some textual fragments to illustrate his/her labels of major genres so that it would be clearer what he/she means when referring to them. At the moment, the writer simply showed quantitative data, which simply shows similarities and differences in terms of proportions but doesn't help illustrate the generic characteristics of the two textbooks.

Reviewer's Decision:

- Accept without revisions
- Accept with minor revisions
- Accept with major revisions
- Resubmit with major revisions
- Reject

Revision Record of LEARN Journal: Reviewer 2

| No | Comments by Reviewer 2 | Response | Page |
|----|--|--|--------|
| 1 | <p>Rationales:</p> <p>As the paper compares economics and Islamic economics textbooks, there should be clear statements of rationales why this sort of comparison is needed or worth being conducted, at least in 2 respects.</p> <p>First, the writer reviewed several studies on genre analysis of textbooks and indicated in paragraph 3 on page 3 (before spelling out the research questions) that: “The existing related studies can indicate that there is no previous research carried out in order to unfold the way texts of Economics in university level under two different paradigms, perspectives, or approaches are structured” – Why is it important to ‘unfold the ways’ in which textbooks in different ‘paradigms, perspectives or approaches are structured’? The writer should not simply review what has been done but also make use of the previous studies to show what is missing or lacking in the field. (The fact that things have not been done doesn’t necessarily mean that they should be done. It could be that it’s not important to address the topics. If the writer believes that it is worth investigating, he/she should argue for its significance).</p> | <p>✓ The rationale of undertaking the present research is certainly not due to the lack of any related studies. The importance of unfolding the ways of the textbooks are structured has been mainly argued in the Introduction section. Its ultimate goal is to produce key knowledge of genre (text type) and their structure (generic structure) for pedagogical implications to equip the students with background on rhetorical structures of the texts they have to read. In reading research, knowledge of genre and the generic structure is known as formal schema and has been proved to be important to facilitate students to predict the major and supporting ideas, and also the process of making meaning of the given Economics texts.</p> | p. 1-2 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|------|
| | <p>Second, as the Islamic traditions are the major factor to consider in the study, the writer should provide detailed information about Islamic traditions in textbook design and the significance of considering them in genre analysis. This must be conducted with great care, though, as it can be seen as a sensitive issue.</p> | <p>✓ The researchers have a different view on providing detailed information of Islamic tradition in the textbook design. Any ideologies including Islam are claimed by several philosophers as implicit aspect embedded in the discourse, institutions, disciplines, etc. (Faircough, 1992; Foucault, 1972). However, the given analyses of the presented findings have heavily involved both ideological and disciplinary aspects within the Economics discipline to which textbooks belong. This can be found all the way through the Result and Discussion section.</p> | |
| 2 | <p>Methodology</p> <p>2.1 I'm not sure if an analysis of only 2 textbooks can be considered as genre analysis. Or perhaps, the writer doesn't aim to do a genre analysis of these textbooks. If so, the writer might instead state clearly that it is a comparative textual analysis of textbooks, using analytical frameworks in SFL genre analysis.</p> <p>2.2 I was wondering if the researcher analysed the whole of the</p> | <p>2.1 This reviewer's comment seems to be the result of comment 2.3. Therefore, the initial reading of response 2.3 on page 4 might illuminate the given comment. In the area of applied linguistics, three main approaches (traditions) to the genre analysis have emerged (Paltridge, 1997): the approach which is widely known as the New Rhetoric (please see Berkenkotter and Huckin, 1995), the approach based on John Swales' efforts which has been prominently recognized in the teaching English for Specific Purposes (ESP) (please see Swales, 1990; Bhatia, 2004), and the approach based on Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) which is applied in the present study. Therefore, the researchers would like to emphasize that the present research of the two university economics textbooks is also genre analysis by using one of the existing genre approaches: SFL. The given explanation on p.5 is the reason of why selecting the SFL approach.</p> <p>2.2 The whole passages of the two textbooks were analyzed.</p> | p. 4 |

| | | | |
|---|--|---|--|
| | <p>two textbooks. I can't find any parts of the paper saying that the analysis was carried out on some sections or chapters of the textbooks. If the whole textbooks were really investigated, explanations should be given how it was done as the data is huge and the analysis involved an inter-coder (who did the whole or parts of the analysis?) and macro and micro analyses.</p> <p>2.3 The writer should provide some background accounts of the SFL genre analysis tradition and framework. As I'm not familiar with the SFL-genre school, it was not very clear to me what it's meant by 'genre' or 'stage'. It's not clear at all what it means when the writer mentioned such terms as 'explanation genres', 'report genres' or history genres', 'stages' (which contains subcategories as 'background stages', evaluation stages', etc.). These terms, to me, sound more like 'rhetorical patterns', 'moves' and 'steps'. It would help a lot if the writer explained the SFL genre-analytical traditions. Also, how are the terms used in the report of findings and tables related: genres, generic structures, potential structures, and stages?</p> | <p>Altogether there were 521 sections that consist of 223 sections of the Economics textbook and 298 sections of the Islamic Economics one. As for the reliability checking, the intercoder did 68 sections both for the Economics and Islamic Economics ones. The given details can be found in the Data section.</p> <p>2.3 The key terms of genre, generic structure, stage have been clearly defined on page 4.</p> | <p>p.4</p> <p>p.4</p> |
| 3 | <p>Findings</p> <p>The writer should provide some textual fragments to illustrate his/her labels of major genres so that it would be clearer what he/she means when referring to them. At the moment, the writer simply showed quantitative data, which simply shows similarities and differences in terms of proportions but doesn't help illustrate the generic characteristics of the two textbooks.</p> | <p>The textual fragments (chunks of the passage) have been provided when necessary in the section of Results and Discussion.</p> | <p>p.8</p> <p>p.9</p> <p>p.12-13</p> <p>p.15</p> |

