

Scientific Research as a Multi-voiced Discourse A Textual Linguistic Approach

Aichouche Naima^{1,*}

¹ University of El Oued, (Algeria), aichouche-naima@univ-eloued.dz

Date of submission: 25/10/2025

Date of acceptance: 15/03/2026

Date of publication: 31/03/2026

Abstract:

This study assumes that scientific research is not merely a technical process but an academic discourse whose value arises from the interaction of three main poles: the researcher as the discourse producer who expresses intentionality and formulates the problem, the supervisor as the implicit reader who grants the text its communicative potential and redirects its arguments, and the sources and references as the intertextual field that provides the text with its cognitive memory and ensures its coherence.

From a textual-linguistic perspective, what is traditionally seen as external requirements (objectivity, organization, openness) are in fact internal textual conditions that define the identity and legitimacy of the research text. Thus, research succeeds as a living, multi-voiced discourse where the producer's intentionality interacts with the implicit reader's expectations and the intertextual network that embeds it within the scientific community.

Key words: scientific research , text linguistics, polyphony, discourse producer, implicit reader, intertextuality.

Introduction:

Scientific research occupies a central position in the production and circulation of knowledge. However, viewing it solely from a procedural perspective—as a set of methodological steps and documentation techniques—fails to explain the true nature of its success or determine its scientific value. Research work is only complete when it takes the form of an academic text that fulfills the conditions of scientific communication, transforming from a mental project into a living discourse that is read, discussed, and evaluated within the academic community.

From this perspective, this study aims to approach scientific research as a textual discourse within the framework of text linguistics—that is, as a text whose textuality is achieved through a set of conditions and standards that ensure its place in the academic sphere. Among these conditions are intentionality, representing the researcher's awareness of purpose and direction; acceptability, reflected in the implicit reader's readiness to receive the discourse according to the conventions of the scientific community; intertextuality, which allows the text to open up to previous or contemporary sources that provide it with cognitive memory; informativity, measured by its ability to offer a meaningful contribution to

knowledge; and coherence, which guarantees the semantic consistency and clarity of the text.

* Corresponding author.

Accordingly, this study is based on the hypothesis that the success of scientific research cannot be reduced to methodological or technical procedures. Rather, it is founded as an academic textual discourse characterized by polyphony, whose value is built through the interaction among three main poles: the researcher, as the discourse producer and source of intentionality; the supervisor, as the implicit and pragmatic reader who directs the text toward acceptability; and the sources and references, as the Intertextual field that grants the text its epistemic legitimacy and integration into the network of scientific discourses. Hence, the problem addressed in this paper revolves around the following question: How can scientific research be understood, in its essence, as a directed discourse? And in what sense does the interaction among its three poles reveal the conditions that grant it its scientific value and academic legitimacy?

1. Theoretical Framework: Text Linguistics and Its Perspective on Academic Research:

Text linguistics emerged in the 1970s as a branch of modern linguistics aiming to move beyond the boundaries of the sentence toward the study of the text as a complete communicative unit. The rise of this approach was linked to scholars' awareness that meaning is not constructed solely through isolated structures, but through the relationships that connect sentences and paragraphs within an integrated discourse that meets the conditions of comprehension and communication.

Based on this view, text linguists established what became known as the seven standards of textuality: intentionality, acceptability, cohesion, coherence, intertextuality, informativity, and situationality.

In light of this perspective, the text is not merely a sequence of sentences but a communicative event governed by internal conditions that ensure its "textuality." This means that, for scientific research to be read as an academic text, it must adhere to these conditions that define its identity and grant it legitimacy within the scientific community.

In this multi-voiced discourse, intentionality is manifested through the interaction between the discourse producer's purpose, the implicit reader's horizon of expectation, and the intertextual network that gives the text its pragmatic dimension and integrates it into the existing body of knowledge. Meanwhile, cohesion and coherence form the internal structure that makes the text clear and comprehensible.

Accordingly, text linguistics provides an appropriate theoretical framework for studying scientific research not merely as a method or a technical procedure, but as a multi-voiced text produced within a specific communicative context and constructed

through the interaction of its constitutive poles: the researcher, the supervisor, and the sources and references.

Following this theoretical introduction to text linguistics and its standards, it becomes necessary to reconsider scientific research itself—to define it, outline its essential requirements, and then analyze how its textuality is achieved through the interaction of these three poles."

2. Research Work: Nature and Characteristics from the Perspective of Text Linguistics:

2.1. Definition of Scientific Research:

Many scholars define scientific research as a systematic effort aimed at discovering, examining, and verifying knowledge through careful investigation and critical analysis, exploring and developing it, and then presenting it coherently with intelligence and understanding¹. Specialized studies in research methodology agree that research is not limited to collecting data or listing facts, but rather seeks to build profound knowledge that approaches truth as closely as possible. The ultimate purpose of research is "to deepen understanding, seek truth, and extract a genuine idea about the essence of any subject²."

Despite the importance of these definitions and the metaphysical dimension they may imply, they clearly highlight the procedural nature of scientific research as an extra-textual process that aims to construct an integrated body of knowledge. However, achieving this goal is only possible by viewing the research as an academic text, not merely as an external process. Accordingly, this study proposes approaching scientific research from the perspective of text linguistics, viewing it as a discourse governed by specific standards that make it a communicative event. A text acquires its scientific quality only when it fulfills the conditions of cohesion, coherence, intertextuality, and communicative relevance³. From this standpoint, successful scientific research depends not only on rigorous methodology but also on the researcher's ability to construct a text that establishes effective communication within the academic community.

This is what makes the relationship between scientific research and text linguistics an organic one, since the attainment of a scientific goal is inseparable from the research text's ability to achieve coherence. Coherence is not merely a formal feature; it is a condition that enables the reader to perceive the deep semantic relations connecting the parts of the text⁴. Accordingly, the success of a researcher is measured by their ability to transform collected data into an organized discourse that allows the reader to construct a comprehensive understanding of the research topic. Without such coherence, the work remains closer to a mechanical compilation of information than to a genuine scientific production capable of contributing to the advancement of human knowledge.

Accordingly, it can be said that scientific research is a dual process: on one hand, it is a cognitive achievement governed by precise methodological steps; on the other, it is

a textual discourse whose value is built through the fulfillment of textuality conditions that grant it its academic identity and communicative legitimacy. Thus, successful scientific research is not merely a technical accomplishment based on a strict method, but a living, multi-voiced discourse that ensures its internal coherence through the researcher's intentionality, achieves its acceptability through the supervision of the implicit reader, and becomes embedded in the broader scientific network through intertextual relations with sources and references.

3. The Characteristics of Scientific Research in Light of Text Linguistics:

Specialized studies in research methodology emphasize that the success of any scientific research depends on several essential requirements, the most important of which are objectivity, organization, intellectual openness, and avoiding hasty judgments⁵⁵. These elements, which seem at first to be technical rules for guiding the research process, can be viewed in the light of text linguistics as textual standards that ensure the cohesion and communicative effectiveness of the academic text.

For example, objectivity is not limited to the researcher's neutrality in selecting the research material; it is also reflected in the neutrality of the text itself when presented to the reader. In this sense, the academic discourse is responsible for establishing its arguments independently of personal biases. This gives objectivity a communicative function, since the scientific text addresses a specialized reader who expects a discourse based on evidence rather than personal beliefs.

As for organization, it represents the textual dimension of what is known as methodological sequencing. It thus becomes one of the manifestations of textual cohesion, in the sense defined by Halliday and Hasan, who highlighted how internal links between sentences and paragraphs are constructed to ensure clarity of meaning and smooth reading⁶⁶. The absence of such organization deprives the text of its clarity and turns it into a mere collection of adjacent sentences lacking an internal structure.

Intellectual openness, on the other hand, can be interpreted through the lens of intertextuality, since the research text does not merely present a single, closed perspective but rather engages in dialogue with previous or parallel texts — reviewing, discussing, and reusing them as building blocks in the construction of its argument. Hence, openness is not only a personal trait of the researcher but also a textual condition that ensures the integration of the research into the broader discursive network of the scientific community.

From this perspective, the characteristics of scientific research are not merely technical standards that correspond to external methodology, but rather internal textual criteria that define the identity of academic discourse. The more the researcher succeeds in integrating these criteria into the production of their text, the more capable the research becomes of merging into the cognitive fabric of the scientific community—and of being read as a fully developed scientific text, rather than a mere informational presentation.

4. The Poles of Research Work and the Relationships Between Them

4.1. The First Pole: The Researcher as the Producer of the Text:

The researcher is defined, from the perspective of research methodology, as the person who carries out the research work and possesses a set of qualities, the most important of which are:

The desire to work: Desire is not something innate or hereditary; rather, it can be acquired through long practice. It is nourished by the pleasure of knowledge⁷ and the sense of joy the researcher feels upon making a discovery.

Patience: Research is an intellectual journey of hardship that demands much of the researcher's time, effort, and nerves. Without patience, perseverance, and determination to achieve goals⁷, the researcher may feel fatigue and lose the motivation to continue this work.

Breadth of knowledge: It is one of the most important qualities a researcher should possess, as it enables them to renew and deepen their knowledge, develop themselves, and recognize the differences in viewpoints among previous authors on the discussed issue⁸. Through this, the researcher forms an independent and mature perspective. In other words, the researcher must be familiar with everything written about their topic, since being well-informed indicates thorough investigation and mastery of the material⁹. It would be a shortcoming for a researcher to be confronted with a study, a published book, or an opinion related to their topic that they have not reviewed.

Logical and organized thinking: A researcher must have the ability to arrange, organize, and connect ideas coherently. They should possess a sense of organization^{10,10} that allows them to structure their information in a way that makes it easy to access and benefit from when needed.

Ability to express ideas: A person may be well-read, deep in thought, and possess many intellectual and moral qualities, yet still lack the ability to express ideas fluently and coherently. This is an unforgivable shortcoming in the field of theoretical scientific research. The ability to express oneself with strength, beauty, and clarity is the researcher's means of presenting ideas to others and of following the meanings required by the topic—without hesitation or fear of lacking the appropriate linguistic forms¹¹ to convey those meanings, no matter how subtle or precise they may be.

Ability to distinguish, analyze, and criticize:

The ability to collect and organize scientific material is not enough to produce a good research paper. A researcher must also possess the ability to distinguish between information that is relevant to the topic and that which is not. They should not be deceived by the glamour of titles^{12,12}, nor should they rush to quote without understanding, as that leads to mistakes, misinterpretations, and consequently, false conclusions. Moreover, a researcher should not be misled by the reputation of an author or a book; sometimes, valuable insights can be found in an obscure work that

are absent from a well-known one. At the same time, they must not underestimate others' opinions, but should avoid taking them as absolute truths—since many views are based on unsound foundations¹³. Therefore, during reading or referencing, the researcher should maintain a critical, discerning, and cautious mindset, always engaging with ideas analytically and thoughtfully.

Scientific integrity: It is an ethical quality that a researcher must possess. "The researcher should attribute every statement to its original author¹⁴¹⁴ without distortion, misrepresentation, or manipulation to serve their own viewpoint, and without disrespecting the original author."

Objectivity and impartiality: Scientific neutrality is one of the most important moral qualities a researcher should possess. It means that the researcher presents and discusses opinions independently of any persona¹⁵, ideological, or emotional affiliations. Acceptance or rejection of ideas should be based on logical reasoning and rational principles, leaving no room for bias, passion, or subjectivity.

Despite the importance of the qualities outlined for the researcher in methodological studies, the researcher's true value does not lie merely in collecting or organizing data, but in being the actual producer of the academic text that gives the research its existence. Without the act of writing, research remains an incomplete mental project and gains legitimacy only when it takes shape as a text that is read, shared, and evaluated within the scientific community. From this perspective, the researcher is not an external observer of data but the internal shaper of the text's structure—defining its objectives, outlining its argumentative path, and guiding its discursive strategies¹⁶.

What the researcher presents in the text is not read as a reflection of their real self, but as a textual image constructed through what is known in textual criticism as the implied author—the entity created by the text to represent its producer. The reader does not interact with the researcher as a real person, but with this textual image formed through the style of presentation, logic of argumentation, and selection of concepts and references¹⁷. This image is what grants the research its academic character and ensures its acceptance within the field of scholarly discourse.

If we consider the qualities traditionally attributed to researchers—such as motivation, patience, breadth of knowledge, academic integrity, and critical ability—we realize that these are not merely personal traits but are transformed within the text into genuine textual standards. Genuine motivation, for instance, is not just a psychological drive; it manifests in the text as clear intentionality, allowing the reader to sense the relevance and importance of the topic. Similarly, patience and perseverance are not merely ethical virtues but are reflected in the structure of the argument when the text is constructed with a gradual logic that respects the connection between premises and conclusions, thereby ensuring coherence among its parts. Breadth of knowledge is not limited to extensive reading—it becomes a network of intertextuality, through which the text establishes dialogue with other discourses, granting it legitimacy within the academic field. In the same vein,

academic integrity extends beyond respecting others' intellectual rights; it is expressed textually through acceptability, the condition that ensures the research is acknowledged by the academic community—since any violation of citations or references would remove it from the sphere of scholarly exchange.

Finally, the ability to analyze and critique produces a text with a high degree of informativity, as scientific research does not merely reproduce existing data but reinterprets and reorganizes it into a new and original perspective¹⁸.

This textual approach reveals that the researcher is the true guarantor of the “textuality” of their work. A text written without intentionality, coherence, cohesion, intertextuality, or acceptability remains merely a compilation of information that falls short of being genuine scientific discourse. In this context, van Dijk emphasizes that the production of discourse is always conditioned by the interaction between the producer's individual knowledge and the shared knowledge with the reader. This means that the researcher writes within a specific communicative context, addressing a specialized reader who expects coherence and persuasiveness¹⁹. Thus, the researcher's competence is reflected in their ability to manage knowledge textually, producing a text that is internally coherent while simultaneously responding to the reader's horizon of expectation.

Accordingly, the researcher's presence within the text grants the research its academic identity. When a text is written without textual awareness, it turns into a mere informational report. In contrast, a text produced by a researcher who is conscious of the strategies of cohesion, coherence, intertextuality, and communicability is read as a fully developed scientific discourse, capable of integrating into the knowledge fabric of the academic community.

4.2. The Supervisor as a Dialogic and Pragmatic Reader:

The supervisor represents the second pole in the research triad, and his role is no less important than that of the researcher, as he ensures the scientific direction and regulates the research text in accordance with academic standards. His role is primarily both scientific and ethical, reinforcing the credibility of the advanced academic degree and preserving the integrity of knowledge. The supervisor is also considered a pedagogical pillar within the professor's academic function²⁰. Moreover, the relationship between the supervisor and the researcher is based on shared responsibility²¹: the supervisor provides guidance without undermining the student's autonomy, while the latter remains the primary agent responsible for the scientific outcome.

However, examining the supervisor from the perspective of text linguistics reveals deeper dimensions. When the student-researcher begins writing, they do not address an unknown reader only, but rather evoke an internal reader who shapes the structure of their discourse. This reader, whom Eco calls the implied reader, is an entity constructed within the text itself to test its comprehensibility and interpretability²². Similarly, Iser explains that the text presupposes a model reader who guides its

expectations and explores its horizons²³. In academic practice, the supervisor embodies this reader, as they are the first to engage with the text during its formative stages, assessing its coherence and redirecting its arguments to align with the standards of the academic community.

From this perspective, the supervisor's role goes beyond formal oversight to a pragmatic intervention. **Van Dijk** emphasized that discourse is not produced in a vacuum, but within a communicative context defined by the roles of the speakers and the horizon of reception²⁴. While the researcher provides the text with intentionality, the supervisor ensures acceptability, meaning that the text is readable and acknowledged within the scientific community. In this sense, the supervisor acts as an internal pragmatic authority, whose task is to assess the text's capacity for scientific persuasion according to academic conventions.

Moreover, the supervisor's function is not limited to pragmatics but extends to dialogicity. As **Bachtin** explains, the research text is not a monologic discourse but a fabric of interacting voices, each defined in relation to the others²⁵. The supervisor is one of the most prominent of these voices, providing comments, raising objections, and reshaping certain trajectories. However, they do not silence the researcher's voice; rather, they push it to refine its argument in response to critique. This multiplicity of voices enriches the text, gives it greater flexibility, and prepares it for the scrutiny of academic reading during the moment of discussion.

Supporting this view, **Mainqueneau** argues in his analysis of the author-text relationship that a text cannot be read as the expression of an isolated individual voice, but rather as the product of the interaction between the writer and the horizon of reception²⁶. In this light, the supervisor emerges as an actual textual partner, participating in the construction of the conditions of reception from within the text and readjusting it to ensure its integration into the network of scientific discourses.

Thus, it becomes clear that the supervisor is not merely an administrative guide or an external reader, but a genuine textual pole in the research process. They function as a pragmatic reader, assessing the text's acceptability, and as a dialogic reader, enriching its voice through critical interaction. Without the supervisor, the text remains vulnerable to confusion or isolation; with their presence, it gains academic legitimacy and becomes capable of persuading the scientific community to which it is addressed.

4.3. The Third Pole: Sources and References:

The third pole of the research triad consists of sources and references, which constitute the essential condition that grants the research text its epistemic legitimacy and its belonging to the realm of knowledge. Without these prior or contemporary texts, the researcher remains confined to their own impressions, unable to integrate their voice into a broader knowledge community. Classical writings in research methodology have emphasized the distinction between a source and a reference: the source is the original text or raw material from which information is directly drawn,

whether it is a document, a historical text, or a contemporary testimony of the studied phenomenon. A reference, on the other hand, is a later text that reinterprets, simplifies, or makes that material accessible to the researcher²⁷. **Ahmed Badr** clarifies this distinction by describing a reference as a book not meant to be read continuously, but consulted for specific information or facts, such as dictionaries, encyclopedias, and reference works²⁸.

However, relying solely on this traditional view remains limited, as it considers sources and references only from a technical perspective. Text linguistics, however, reveals deeper dimensions that make them a textual component no less important than the researcher or the supervisor. Scientific research, in essence, is not the production of knowledge from a vacuum, but the integration of a new voice into a network of prior and contemporary voices. **Kristeva** explained that a text is not a closed structure; rather, it is always an “**absorption**” or “**transformation**” of other texts, with its meaning determined through the network of interactions it establishes with them²⁹. In this sense, sources and references are not merely repositories of information; they constitute the intertextual field that allows the scientific text to be written and grants it the ability to introduce new insights into a dialogue with the past³⁰.

As for **Bachtin’s** idea of discourse as a dialogic field shaped by the voices it intersects, the research text, therefore, cannot be monologic³¹. It is always founded on a dialogue between the researcher and the voices of previous texts that they invoke in their work. Here, it becomes clear that sources and references are not merely an external appendage used to document the researcher’s academic integrity; rather, they form the underlying structure on which the text relies in its dialogue with knowledge.

If we turn to textual criteria, it becomes clear that sources and references play a direct role in fulfilling two essential conditions: informativity and coherence. Informativity means that the text provides a qualitative contribution to the scientific field, and this contribution is measured not in isolation but in relation to what has been previously produced. The new has no meaning unless it is placed in comparison with the old, highlighting the value of references in allowing the researcher to locate their text within the knowledge map and justify the legitimacy of their contribution as an addition rather than mere repetition³². Coherence is achieved when the researcher integrates these texts into their arguments in a way that aligns with the overall discourse, making them appear neither forced nor alien, but woven into the fabric of the research as voices that contribute to constructing its internal logic.

These theoretical dimensions become apparent in the researcher’s practical engagement with references through various methods. Direct quotation highlights the presence of another voice within the text, but it remains of limited value if not followed by analysis that reveals its significance within the argument. Summarizing and condensing demonstrate the researcher’s ability to master the material and reorganize it according to the needs of the topic. Explanation and critique reflect the researcher’s awareness of the limits of previous works and their readiness to surpass

them and contribute something new. These practices are not merely formal techniques; they are textual strategies that show the researcher's capacity to insert their text into a dialogue with previous texts, transforming them from a mere faithful transmitter into a producer of new text. This aligns with *Van Dijk's* view that discourse is a cognitive act, produced not in isolation from its contexts³³ but through the retrieval and reorganization of existing knowledge to serve new purposes³⁴.

Accordingly, sources and references cannot be reduced to a mere formal list at the end of the research; rather, they constitute a fundamental textual component upon which the scientific text is built from the outset. They determine its position within the knowledge map, allow it to provide a contribution measured by its informativity relative to prior work, and grant it internal coherence that makes it convincing and acceptable to the scientific audience. Without this third vertex, the research loses its textual condition, as the researcher's voice would remain isolated and unable to integrate into the ongoing dialogue that forms the essence of scientific knowledge.

This interaction among the three vertices represents **the polyphonic structure** of research discourse, where the researcher's voice is not heard in isolation but interwoven with voices of guidance, correction, and scholarly reference.

Conclusion:

This analysis reveals that scientific research, at its core, is not merely a methodological practice but a textual discourse whose scientific value is realized through the organized interaction of its three vertices. The study highlighted that these vertices are not merely adjacent elements but textual components that establish the research's identity and determine its legitimacy. The findings can be summarized as follows:

- **Researcher / Producer of the Discourse:** Plays a fundamental role in embodying intentionality, that is, transforming the mental project into an academic text with a clear problematic horizon and a coherent argumentative trajectory. Their competence is measured by their ability to achieve internal coherence in the text and to guide its rhetorical strategies.
- **Supervisor / Implied Reader:** Represents an internal, discursive reader who evaluates the text before it enters public circulation. They ensure acceptability and push the researcher to refine their argument within a critical dialogical framework. Without this function, the text lacks academic legitimacy.
- **Sources and References / Intertextual Field:** They are not merely a repository of information but the infrastructural basis that grants the text informativity and coherence. They determine its position within the knowledge network and validate its qualitative contribution compared to prior work.

Traditional Conditions for Research Success (objectivity, organization, openness, etc.) are, in essence, internal textual standards, not merely external rules. They provide the text with its academic character and determine its capacity to integrate into the scientific domain.

Thus, it becomes clear that, from a text linguistics perspective, scientific research is a living, multi-voiced academic discourse, constructed through the interaction of the researcher's intentionality, the implied reader's horizon, and the intertextual network that ensures informativity and coherence. Its value is grounded in the internal dialogue among these three vertices, achieving both coherence and legitimacy within the scholarly community.

References

- ¹ Thuraya Abdel-Fattah Malhas, *Scientific Research: Its Foundations and Methods*, Dar Al-Nahda Al-Arabiya, Beirut, 1998, p. 25.
- ² Bouhouch, Ammar. *Research Methods and Techniques in Political Science and Media*, Dar Houma, Algiers, 2006, p. 17.
- ³ De Beaugrande, R.-A. & Dressler, W. U. (1981). *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. London: Longman, p. 3
- ⁴ van Dijk, T. A. (1980). *Macrostructures: An Interdisciplinary Study of Global Structures in Discourse, Interaction, and Cognition*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, p. 49.
- ⁵ Malhas, Thuraya Abdel-Fattah. *Scientific Research: Its Foundations and Methods*. Dar Al-Nahda Al-Arabiya, Beirut, 1998, p. 45.
- ⁶ Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman, p. 4 .
- ⁷ See: Al-Rubai bin Salama. *Al-Wajeez Guide to Literary Research Methodology and the Techniques of Scientific Research*, p. 86.
- ⁸ Abd Hamid Abdullah Al-Harama. *Papers on Research and Writing*. 1st ed. Tripoli: Publications of the College of Islamic Propagation, 2008, p. 20.
- ⁹ Ibid., p. 20
- ¹⁰ See: Yahya Wahib Al-Jubouri. *Research Methodology and Text Verification*. 1st ed. Tunis: Dar Al-Gharb Al-Islami, 2008, p. 25.
- ¹¹ Ibid., p. 26.
- ¹² Abd Hamid Abdullah Al-Harama. *Papers on Research and Writing*. 1st ed. Tripoli: Publications of the College of Islamic Propagation, 2008, p. 21
- ¹³ See: Al-Rubai bin Salama. *Al-Wajeez Guide to Literary Research Methodology and the Techniques of Scientific Research*, p. 87.
- ¹⁴ Yahya Wahib Al-Jubouri. *Research Methodology and Text Verification*. 1st ed. Tunis: Dar Al-Gharb Al-Islami, 2008, p. 25.
- ¹⁵ Ibid., p. 88.
- ¹⁶ Abd Hamid Abdullah Al-Harama. *Papers on Research and Writing*. 2008, p. 21
- ¹⁷ Eco, U. (1984). *The Role of the Reader: Explorations in the Semiotics of Texts*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, p. 28.

- ¹⁸ De Beaugrande, R.-A. & Dressler, W. U. (1981). *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. London: Longman, pp. 3–11.
- ¹⁹ Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press, p. 76.
- ²⁰ van Dijk, T. A. (2014). *Discourse and Knowledge: A Sociocognitive Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 22.
- ²¹ Melhas, Thuraya Abdel Fattah. (2001). *Scientific Research: Its Concept, Tools, and Methods*, p. 45.
- ²² Bouhouch, Ammar. (1990). *Research Methods in the Human Sciences*. Algiers: Diwan of University Publications, p. 57.
- ²³ Eco, U. (1984). *The Role of the Reader: Explorations in the Semiotics of Texts*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, pp. 9–10.
- ²⁴ Iser, W. (1980). *The Implied Reader: Patterns of Communication in Prose Fiction from Bunyan to Beckett*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, pp. 28–29.
- ²⁵ van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse and Context: A Sociocognitive Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 112–115.
- ²⁶ Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press, p. 293.
- ²⁷ Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press, p. 293.
- ²⁸ Maingueneau, D. (2007). *Discourse Analysis and the Problem of the Author*. *Études de Linguistique Appliquée*, 147, pp. 23–25.
- ²⁹ Tahar, Ali Jawad. (1984). *Literary Research Methods*. Beirut: Dar Al-Fikr, p. 34.
- ³⁰ Badr, Ahmed. (1985). *Fundamentals and Methods of Scientific Research*. Kuwait: Publications Agency, p. 52.
- ³¹ Kristeva, J. (1969). *Séméiotiké: Recherches pour une sémanalyse*. Paris: Seuil, pp. 146–147.
- ³² Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press, p. 293.
- ³³ de Beaugrande, R. & Dressler, W. U. (1981). *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. London: Longman, pp. 7–9.
- ³⁴ van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse and Context: A Sociocognitive Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 113–114