

RESEARCH ARTICLE INTRODUCTIONS IN CULTURAL STUDIES: A GENRE ANALYSIS EXPLORATION OF RHETORICAL STRUCTURE

Dana Chahal

Victoria University, Australia

Phone: +99194404, E-Mail: dana.chahal@vu.edu.au

Abstract. *Academic writing has been recently conceptualized as “collective social practices” (Hyland 2004, 1) constructed through particular genre types and discipline-specific discourses. A significant body of the literature examining genre and disciplinarity has focused on the research article (RA) as a central type of academic writing practice. However, the RA genre has been principally investigated in Science-based disciplines and comparatively overlooked in the Humanities. This paper is an exploratory textual genre analysis study of the rhetorical structure of RA Introductions (RAIs) in Cultural Studies (CS). It considers whether Swales’ (1990) widely accepted Create a Research Space model (CARS) can be applied to the RAIs of this relatively little studied Humanities area. The findings show that while the examined RAIs can be considered to generally conform to the CARS model, they display noteworthy variation in relation to the obligatory status of moves; the occurrence and realization of the steps used; and the means of referring to the literature. The paper argues that the observed variation may be interpreted as embodying the languages of legitimation of CS (Maton 2000a, b) as produced in the writing of its experts; and discusses the results according to their implications on English for Specific/Academic Purposes pedagogy. The study thus reiterates the critical interplay between genre and disciplinarity in the social construction of written knowledge.*

Key words: *research article introductions, genre, humanities academic writing, cultural studies, ESP, EAP*

1. INTRODUCTION

Recent scholarly work has highlighted the importance of viewing academic writing as historical and “collective social practices” (Hyland 2004, 1) constructed through different discipline-specific discourses and genre types. In some English for Specific/Academic Purposes (ES/AP) contexts (e.g. genre-based approaches), teaching academic writing has accordingly been reconceptualized as an endeavor to develop discursive competence in students - their ability to participate in the different discourse modes of their academic community (Bhatia 1993). Such emphasis on academic discourse has seen a body of research which analyzes the different genre types used by academic experts and how such specialized texts are realized in particular disciplines.

A central type of expert academic writing which has been considerably investigated is the research article (RA). The RA has been studied textually in terms of the use of linguistic features such as tense, voice, personal pronouns and citational form (e.g. Pho 2010 and references therein). It has also been examined in terms of its macro-structure

and the discursual features of component parts such as Introductions, Methods, Results and Discussions (e.g. Bruce 2009; Hopkins and Dudley-Evans 1988; Yang and Allison 2003). Particular attention has been paid to Introductions through the widely used Create a Research Space model (CARS) (Swales 1981, 1990, 2004).

As acknowledged in Swales (2004), however, RAs have been principally investigated in Science-based disciplines (e.g. Kanoksilapatham 2007; Nwogu 1997) while comparatively little has been said about RAs found in the more interpretative disciplines of the Humanities. This paper is an exploratory genre study of the discourse structure of six RA Introductions (RAIs) from the field of Cultural Studies (CS). It investigates whether the CARS model can be applied to the examined introductions of this relatively recent and little studied Humanities area¹ and discusses the implications the findings may have on conceptions of written knowledge construction in CS and on ES/AP teaching pedagogy. The paper is outlined as follows: the next two sub-sections respectively - 1) summarize the CARS model and its application across disciplines, focusing on the steps which display significant divergence from the model; and 2) review Maton's (2000a, b) examination of the languages of legitimation of CS in the field's construction of its written knowledge. Section 2 describes the methods used in the collection and analysis of the present data while section 3 reports on the results. Section 4 analyzes the observed rhetorical structure findings in CS according to Maton's languages of legitimation framework and discusses their implications on ES/AP teaching pedagogy.

1.1. The Create A Research Space (CARS) model and cross-disciplinary variation

The CARS model, particularly Swales' 1990 version, has been the predominant analytical tool used in the examination of the Introduction component of RAs. CARS outlines the rhetorical work authors of RAs employ in introducing their research. It uses an ecological metaphor to describe the content schema structure (Moves/Steps) of RAIs whereby an author begins by establishing a territory (Move 1); establishes a niche within that territory (Move 2); and occupies that niche (Move 3). Each of these moves is obligatory and minimally consists of one component step. For example, Move 1 can be realized by claiming centrality (Move 1 Step 1 or 1-1 for short) and/or making topic generalizations (1-2) and/or reviewing items of the literature (1-3). Steps are characterized by particular linguistic realizations. For example, authors who establish a niche by indicating a gap in the literature (2-1B) can do so linguistically through the use of such devices as adverse sentence connectors (e.g. "however", "nevertheless"), negative quantifiers (e.g. "no"; "little") and lexical negation (e.g. use of verbs such as "fail" and "overlook"). The following table summarizes the CARS model as proposed in Swales (1990).

¹ Since CS "has often been characterized as actively opposed to notions of disciplinarity" (Maton 2000b, p. 81) and is usually referred to as cross- or trans-disciplinary, the label "discipline" has been avoided here.

Table 1 A CARS model summary based on Swales (1990)

Moves	Steps	Move-Step Abbreviation	
Move 1: Establishing a Territory	1	Claiming Centrality and/or	1-1
	2	Making topic generalization(s) and/or	1-2
	3	Reviewing items of previous research	1-3
Move 2: Establishing a Niche	1	A Counter-claiming or	2-1A
		B Indicating a gap or	2-1B
		C Question-raising or	2-1C
		D Continuing a tradition	2-1D
Move 3: Occupying the Niche	1	A Outlining purposes or	3-1A
		B Announcing present research (no reference to aim or purpose)	3-1B
	2	Announcing principal findings	3-2
	3	Indicating RA structure	3-3

While this three-part Move model seems to display general explanatory power, particularly in the Sciences, studies examining the applicability of the model across disciplines have found notable variation in the realization of CARS moves, with certain additions of steps, as well as differences in step frequency and realization, being necessary to account for discipline-specific rhetorical structures. For example, in a study of introductions in Software Engineering RAs, Anthony (1999) finds that an additional Move 3 Evaluation of Research step is needed to account for sections of the introduction where authors appeal to the audience by positively evaluating their research. Anthony also observes that Steps 2-1A and 2-1C never occur in his twelve RA corpus while Steps 1-1, 2-1D and 3-1A are used in less than half of the introductions. Similarly, Samraj's (2002) comparison of RAIs in Conservation Biology and Wildlife Behaviour suggests the need to incorporate two additional steps representing discipline-specific features: Move 2 Step 2 Presenting Positive Justification and Move 3 Step 2B Predicting Results. The study also finds that while both disciplines commonly use Centrality Claims (1-1) in establishing a territory, Conservation Biology makes more use of claims to the real/phenomenal world while Wildlife Behaviour establishes the centrality of their territory by referring to research activity in the field.

Studies investigating the CARS model in the Humanities find similar discipline-specific variation. For example, in comparing RAIs in Applied Linguistics versus English Literature, Neff-Van Artselaer (2011) finds that an additional Move 1 step is needed to account for introductions in English Literature which involves inserting a literary example followed by a deeper discussion of the argument. The author also observes that while Applied Linguistics RAIs commonly realize Move 1 through Step 3 (Reviewing Items of Literature), their English Literature counterparts utilize this step much less frequently. Finally, while Samraj (2008) examines the Masters thesis (MT) genre, her CARS investigation of Philosophy introductions reveals that these introductions do not utilize Centrality Claims (1-1) as a major form of establishing a territory. Rather, they establish a territory primarily by stating generalizations regarding the philosophical topic/text/figure they are investigating (1-2). Similarly, establishing a niche (Move 2) is realised predominantly through an additional step which discusses a philosophical problem identified in society or by other philosophers (Indicating a Problem in the Real World).

In addition to the above differences, CARS Step 1-3 (Reference to Items of Literature) has been found to display particular cross-disciplinary variation according to the frequency with which sources are cited; the explicitness of the attribution method used; the structural location of references within RAIs; and the stance taken towards the cited literature². For example, Samraj (2008) finds that the Philosophy MT introductions display significantly less reference to research sources, averaging 4 citations per thesis introduction as opposed to 62 for Biology and 23 for Linguistics. The author explains the relative sparse reference to the literature as an “absence of disciplinary pressure to situate the current study within a body of related studies” (p. 59).

In terms of the attribution method used, while Swales (1990) considers the use of overt (integral/non-integral) citation as the principal attribution method for referring to the literature in Step 1-3, across different disciplines, less obvious means of signaling reference to previous research are documented. For example, in her examination of Literature RAs, Jacoby (1987) points to a type of reference to sources where “no particular research predecessor is named, as a rule, but clear reference to the state of previous research as a whole or to the state of consensus knowledge can be identified” (p. 55). Hood (2009) reveals similar findings of implicit reference to items of literature in CS. While the article examines two PhD thesis introductions in Applied Linguistics (AL) and CS from a Systemic Functional Linguistics perspective, it shows that in the AL thesis introduction, theoretical contributions from other scholars are incorporated mainly through explicit reference to the literature, as opposed to CS where references to theory are not indicated overtly (i.e. they are not cited either integrally or non-integrally). Instead, the writer signals a connection to a particular reference/theory through the use of key terms/phrases employed by theorists or even through mimicry of their style of writing.

As for the location of references within RAIs, a number of studies have found that references to the literature are not restricted to a single Move 1-3 step but can occur frequently throughout different parts of the RAI. Samraj (2002), for example, notes that towards the beginning of the introduction, reference to the literature may be used to highlight the importance of a topic and therefore establish territory (1-1), while later in the introduction, it may be used to indicate a gap and therefore establish a niche (2-1B). To account for the appearance of references to the literature in different introduction moves, scholars have also proposed the notion of cyclicity which allows for apparent cycles of Move 1-3 and Move 2 steps to occur throughout RAIs (e.g. Crookes 1986).

Making reference to items of literature additionally varies according to the type of stance taken by the writer towards the cited literature. The notion of writer stance is indirectly addressed in the CARS model in its treatment of Move 2: According to Swales (1990), the most common methods of establishing a niche utilize “adversative” steps such as indicating a gap in the cited literature (2-1B) and counter-claiming research assertions/findings (2-1A) while less frequent are steps providing weaker challenge such as Question-Raising (2-1A) and Continuing a Tradition (2-1D). Writer stance which offers significantly less challenge to the literature has been documented in a number of Humanities investigations cited above. Samraj (2008), for example, finds that in the Philosophy introductions writer stance is seldom adversative. Writers do not refer to the

² Making reference to items of literature is a central feature of RAs which has been extensively investigated in various discourse analysis work (e.g. Hyland 2004; Thomas and Hawes 1994; Thompson and Yiyun 1991). Due to limitations of space, however, the discussion here has been restricted mainly to findings based on CARS studies.

literature by counter-claiming or identifying gaps but position themselves predominantly with less opposition through discussing a philosophical problem identified in society or by other philosophers. Similarly, Hood's (2009) detailed analysis of writer stance in AL and CS indicates that, in contrast to the AL PhD thesis introduction, where the author's stance toward previous research is signaled by placing theories or references to theories in opposition to one another, in CS, the author's stance is indicated by subsuming the different voices referred to in the thesis. "There are no dissenting researcher/theoretical voices, that is, there is no positioning of one in relation to another [...] In the CS text all referenced theoretical voices are represented as in alignment with the writer" (pp. 189-190).

Given the above displayed variability in move/step realization across diverse disciplines, Swales (2004) proposed a revised version of the CARS model which incorporates the observed need for additional steps (mainly in Move 3), the variable structural location of Step 1-3, and the notion of cyclicity.

1.2. CS and Languages of Legitimation

Central to investigations of the relationship between writing and disciplinarity is the notion of a discipline's languages of legitimation (Maton 2000a, b)-- "the claims made on behalf of intellectual fields by their members" which not only provide "the conditions of existence of intellectual fields" but also explain their "epistemologically powerful claims to truth" (Maton 2000a, 149). In other words, languages of legitimation constitute the discourses which practitioners use in legitimating their field and knowledge claims. They are produced by various means, particularly in genres such as the RA which, by addressing a discipline's members in the academic community, thus present "'the voice' of the intellectual field" (Maton 2000a, 152), and construct its *raison d'être* as well as its claims to knowledge.

According to Maton, the languages of legitimation of CS center around two themes: 1) CS positioning itself as crossing multiple disciplinary boundaries and displaying cautious, if not openly oppositional, views of disciplinarity; purposefully resisting the delimitation of its object of study and methods of enquiry; and defining itself with breaks and disjunctures with its own intellectual tradition rather than with a continually progressing canon; and 2) CS privileging primary lived experience and subjective knowledge as opposed to detached knowledge and positivistic notions of scientific truths³. As discussed in section 4 below, these languages of legitimation may be critical to understanding the rhetorical work carried out in the examined CS RAIs.

2. METHODS

This study is exploratory in nature. It offers a textual discourse analysis of the rhetorical structure of a preliminary sample of RAIs in the hitherto little investigated area of CS. It thus adopts a qualitative approach based on a small number of texts and requires detailed top-down analysis of the structure, content, and context of use of the chosen sample and textual units therein. The methodology employed reflects that of numerous textual genre studies utilizing the CARS analysis. As pointed out in Biber et al. (2007, 36), "discourse analysis in general, and move analysis in particular, has typically been a qualitative approach to analyzing discourse, with studies focusing on only a few texts".

³ See foundational textbooks such as Johnson, Chambers, Raghuram and Tincknell (2004) and references therein for similar claims made by CS specialists.

While corpus-based methodologies (as opposed to their above mentioned discourse analysis counterparts) are expected to address issues of corpora size, frequency and representativeness and allow for quantitative analyses of results (e.g. McCarthy and O’Keefe 2010), given the exploratory nature of this study and its adoption of pragmatic non-probability sampling measures in the collection of texts, it does not make claims as to the size, frequency and representativeness of the data or the generalizability of the findings beyond the scope of the examined articles. Rather, the detailed textual analysis of a small number of introductions may serve as a preliminary indication of some trends displayed in RAI writing in CS as observed in the examined texts. Future research is needed to validate these findings across purposefully designed corpora containing more sizable and diverse compilations of CS texts.

2.1. Data

As indicated above, in the present exploratory study, texts were collected using the pragmatic non-probability sampling measures⁴. Accordingly, the first six contributions which classified as RAs (out of a total of twelve such texts) in the 2000 volume, issue 1, of the journal *Public Culture* were chosen for analysis⁵.

Public Culture is a leading journal in CS with a five-year impact factor of 1.070, placing it as the second highest ranking journal in the field (Thomson Reuters Journal Citation Reports 2012). The decision to analyze CS RAs from a single high-profile journal issue was taken in order to represent the writing of world-known experts in the field at a particular cross-section in time. It therefore controls for differences in level of expertise of authors and period of publication. Furthermore, the volume is a special issue focused on the theme of globalization. The study thus further controls for topic as an additional potential variable.

Table 2 outlines the author and the title of each RA in the order that they appear in the journal. As can be seen from the table, the authors approach the theme of globalization from a range of perspectives including anthropology, politics, media, ethics, economy, and music. This indicates that, despite the controls for level of expertise, publication time, and topic, the chosen articles display a diversity illustrative of the characteristic trans-disciplinarity of CS.

Table 2 Author and title information for the six analyzed RAs in CS

Author	Title
Appadurai	Grassroots Globalization and the Research Imagination
Huysen	Present Pasts: Media, Politics, Amnesia
Binde	Toward an Ethics of the Future
Zhen	Mediating Time: The “Rice Bowl of Youth” in Fin de Siècle Urban China
Tsing	Inside the Economy of Appearances
Feld	A Sweet Lullaby for World Music

⁴ The non-probability sampling techniques of judgment and convenience were employed. For a detailed discussion of how such techniques are used in both small and large scale corpora, see Meyer (2002).

⁵ Further contributions in the issue formed photo-essays and were thus beyond the scope of the present study.

2.2. Procedure

The collected RAIs were analyzed in terms of their rhetorical structure using Swales' (1990) version of the CARS model. The Move/Step analysis and manual coding of the introductions was initially carried out by the author using the abbreviations indicated in Table 1. To ensure inter-rater reliability, two additional experienced coders were consulted and independently classified the six RAI Move/Step structure. An 87% agreement rating was obtained across the three analyzes (measured as the percentage of the number of agreements divided by the total number of coding judgments made). The 13% rater discrepancy centered mainly on distinctions between steps such as 1-1 and 1-2; the identification of some references to research as 1-3; and the step classification of the final sentences of RAIs lacking a Move 3 (see section 3 below)⁶. These differences were resolved through discussion amongst the coders. The Move/Step structure reported in the following sections thus represents the agreed classification reached by all three annotators.

3. RESULTS

The CS RAIs examined fall into two main groups: Appadurai and Zhen form the two longest introductions and display a similar structure whereby they begin with a series of paragraphs (8 and 9 respectively) which function as Establishing a Territory (Move 1). These are followed by Move 2 and Move 3 steps in both RAs (but with Zhen displaying a non-typical order for these moves). The second group (Huysen, Binde, Tsing and Feld) also begins with a Move 1 but does so in fewer paragraphs (1 to 2). Move 1 is then followed by a Move 2 step and subsequent cycles of 1-2 and Move 2 steps. In this group, however, a clear Move 3 step does not occur, impacting upon the rhetorical work that is carried out in the introductions as well as the predictability of the purpose and organization of the RA. This will be discussed at more length in 3.4 below.

Table 3 summarizes the proposed Move-Step structure for each CS RA.

Table 3 The proposed Move-Step analysis of the six examined CS RAIs (par: paragraph)

Author	Introduction Move Structure						
Appadurai	1-2 (8 par)	2-1A	3-1B	3-3			
Huysen	1-1	1-2	2-1D	1-2	2-1A	1-2	2-1D
Binde	1-2	2-1B					
Zhen	1-2 (9 par)	3-1B	2-1C and 3-3				
Tsing	1-2	2-1C	1-2	2-1A	2-1D		
Feld	1-2	2-1C	1-2	2-1C			

⁶ The first two types of distinctions have been frequently found to constitute challenges to a CARS analysis (e.g. Anthony 1999; Samraj 2002).

3.1. Move 1

According to CARS, RAIs begin with a rhetorical move where authors establish their research area as significant (Move 1). This can be done by either

- claiming the centrality of the topic, through describing it as interesting, important, recent, well-known etc. (1-1)
- making topic generalizations related to the field's state of knowledge, practices, investigated phenomena (1-2)
- or reviewing items of previous research (1-3).

All of the six CS RAs examined begin their introductory section with such a Move, as illustrated in Example 1.

Example 1 Move 1 illustrations

- a) Globalization is certainly a source of anxiety in the U.S. academic world. And the sources of this anxiety are many... (1-2) (Appadurai)
- b) One of the most surprising cultural and political phenomena of recent years has been the emergence of memory as a key concern in Western societies... (1-1) (Huyssen)
- c) Modern societies suffer from a distorted relationship to time... (1-2) (Binde)
- d) Two popular mantras perhaps best capture the fin de siècle frenzy and anxiety of the market economy and consumerist China... (1-2) (Zhen)
- e) Indonesia's profile in the international imagination has completely changed. From the top of what was called a "miracle", Indonesia fell to the bottom of a "crisis"... (1-2) (Tsing)
- f) To begin, the music globalization commonplaces that are most broadly circulating in Western intellectual discourse... (1-2) (Feld)

Move 1 is achieved primarily through Step 1-2, where the author provides general information on the examined topic, highlighting their research area as significant partly through the use of emphatic lexical items or quantifiers such as "certainly" (1a), "one of the most" (1b), "popular" (1d), "completely" (1e), and "most broadly" (1f). Only Huyssen's introduction (1b) provides a clear-cut example of establishing a territory through Step 1-1, where the author claims the importance of the topic through the usage of the more traditional centrality terms "recent" and "key". No CS RAI utilizes reviewing an item of research as an initial means of establishing a territory⁷.

Interestingly, despite the above indicated emphatic lexical items and quantifiers, the examined CS authors establish their territory as significant primarily through presenting their topic as problematic or troubling (rather than in overtly positive terms such as "interesting" or "important"), a strategy documented in Hood's (2009) examination of CS PhD thesis introductions. This can be seen from the prevalence of the use of terms bearing relatively negative connotations such as "anxiety", "suffer", "distorted", "frenzy", and "crisis". Even in Example 1b above, which claims topic centrality through

⁷ The only initial Move 1 instance which shows some affinity to referring to the literature can be found in Appadurai (Example 1a) where the author summarizes a body of research but cites no references. See section 3.5 for the proposed analysis of these types of summary generalizations.

the usage of such words as “key”, the territory is framed more problematically by describing it as a “concern” and a “surprising” phenomenon.

Another significant characteristic of these RAIs is that, predominantly, Move 1 establishes territory through highlighting the topic’s relevance to actual world events or phenomena as opposed to the research world: The six RAs introduce their territory as important not in terms of an active research field, which authors refer to and review, but in terms of themes which are relevant to the discipline’s object of study. As described in section 2.1 and illustrated in Example 1, in the volume examined, the RAs concentrate on the theme of globalization at the turn of the 21st century and the contemporaneous status of society/culture. Rather than research findings, it is these current world themes which the authors use to render the territory/topic of the RA important. A similar focus on the object of study rather than research findings in establishing a territory is observed for Philosophy and CS theses in Samraj (2008) and Hood (2009) respectively.

3.2. Move 2

According to CARS, Move 1 is followed by a form of rhetorical work where authors situate their particular research within the identified territory, thereby establishing a niche (Move 2). Move 2 is realized through one of the four steps outlined in Table 1 and is most commonly linked with adverse sentence connectors such as “however” and “nevertheless”.

All six examined CS RAs are analyzed as employing Move 2 (typical illustrations of which are produced in Example 2). Five out of these position Move 2 following Move 1, Zhen presenting the only anomalous ordering whereby a Move 3 (“This essay considers...”) mediates between Move 1 (Example 1d) and Move 2 (Example 2c).

Example 2 Typical Move 2 illustrations

- a) But a series of social forms has emerged to contest, interrogate, and reverse these developments... (2-1A Counter-Claiming) (Appadurai)
- b) [...] the focus has shifted from present futures to present pasts, and this shift [...] needs to be explained historically and phenomenologically... (2-1D Continuing a Tradition) (Huysen).
- c) [This essay considers ...] Why do feminine youth [...] How is youth deployed [...]? What do young women ...? (2-1C Question Raising—Direct) (Zhen)
- d) The speed of these changes takes one’s breath away—and raises important questions about globalization... (2-1C Question Raising—Indirect) (Tsing)

The examined CS RAIs establish a niche using a variety of the Move 2 steps outlined in CARS: Example 2c and d illustrate Question-Raising (2-1C), a step whereby a niche is established by raising questions regarding the topic. In 2c, the question format is direct, clearly recognized through the usage of a wh-word and an auxiliary (e.g. “How do they think...”). In 2d, it is indirect and embedded within a statement structure (“questions... have emerged”). Move 2-1C is introduced with or without a sentence connector: 2d uses the affirmative conjunction “and” while 2c does not employ a sentence connector.

Example 2b illustrates Continuing a Tradition (2-1D), understood in Swales (1990) as a Move 2 step which indicates that the present RA extends previous explanations/findings on the topic (rather than filling in gaps) and is linked with affirmative sentence connectors and lexical markers expressing “needs/desires/interests” (p. 156). In 2b, for

instance, Huyssen refers to a shift in focus in previous understandings of memory and signals that his RA forms an extension of such a change in understanding. He does this through the usage of the affirmative sentence connector “and” and the verb phrase “needs to be explained”. Interestingly, although CARS labels step 2-1D as “Continuing a Tradition”, in the examined CS RAIs, the authors seem to extend aspects of the field’s knowledge which constitute a *break* with earlier traditions. Thus, Huyssen’s purported historical and phenomenological explanation constitutes an extension of a *shift* in focus. The 2-1D steps presented in Example 5b and c below further illustrate this point: the authors establish a niche by creating “new and rigorous understandings” (5b) and offering a “less pious attitude” (5c) than that provided by previous traditions.

Finally, Example 2a illustrates Counter-Claiming (2-1A). According to CARS, 2-1A is a step where authors establish a niche by pointing to the inadequacies of past explanations/findings and is linked with adversative sentence connectors. Appadurai’s introduction illustrates this step: After stating generalizations regarding developments in globalization (Example 1a above), in 2a, the author provides a counter-claim by stating that these developments have become a site for contestation. He signals step 2-1A through the adversative sentence connector “but” followed by verbs indicating lexical negation (“contest, interrogate and reverse”).

The most common Move 2 steps used in the six articles are 2-1C (4 instances)⁸ followed by 2-1D (3 instances) and 2-1A (3 instances). Only one example of what can be classified as 2-1B (indicating a gap) is discerned in the examined CS RAIs (see section 3.4 for further discussion). This distribution of Move 2 steps seem to diverge from that observed in the corpora of Swales (1990) and Science-based studies discussed therein, which show a predominance of step 2-1B. Furthermore, they seem to indicate that the CS authors establish a niche by displaying a considerably less adversary stance towards previous knowledge: According to Swales (1990), contrary to 2-1A and 2-1B, 2-1C and 2-1D display claims which present weaker challenges to previous knowledge and are therefore associated with more affirmative sentence connectors. In the CS introductions examined, 2-1C and 2-1D are used in 7 out of 11 Move 2 cases and over half of the sentence connectors are affirmative. Rather than indicating problems or identifying gaps in previous research, the authors predominantly raise questions or continue previously raised discussions.

Another important characteristic of Move 2 in these CS RAs is that a niche is established within world events or socio-cultural phenomena rather than research activity: Similarly to Move 1, where the CS authors establish their territory by making topic generalizations about contemporary events/phenomena (1-2), in Move 2, the authors continue to position their research topic chiefly in relation to these world phenomena generalizations. In Example 2b, for instance, it is not a research finding that needs to be explained but rather current cultural shifts in conceptualizing time. Similarly, in Example 2d, rather than raising questions regarding particular research results, the author questions current understandings of globalization. Establishing a niche based on generalizations about the object of study rather than research activity further contributes to the less adversary stance taken towards previous knowledge in these RAs. Even when a Counter-Claim is used (Example 2a), its adversary stance is softened as it does not critique a researcher’s finding but rather problematizes a topic

⁸ The second and third paragraphs of Appadurai’s introduction each contains questions related to globalization. However, despite their form, these questions are not analyzed as Move 2-1C as they do not function to establish a niche but rather to expand on the preceding topic generalizations using question format.

generalization. This type of establishing a niche which emphasizes world events/phenomena rather than research literature and which reveals a tendency to subsume, rather than oppose, different voices/knowledges is similarly observed in Philosophy and CS PhD theses (Samraj 2008 and Hood 2009 respectively).

3.3. Cyclicity

Three out of the six CS RAIs are analyzed as displaying a cyclic structure, whereby an initial Move 1 - Move 2 sequence is followed by one or more of such sequences (Huysen employs three; Feld and Tsing two cycles each). In the CS RAs examined, since Move 1 is predominantly realized through topic generalizations (1-2), the most common cycles consist of 1-2 followed by one of the Move 2 steps discussed in 3.2 above, mainly 2-1C and 2-1D. To illustrate, Example 3 outlines the structure of the two cycles employed by Feld, which are each composed of an initial 1-2 topic generalization followed by a 2-1C question raising step.

Example 3 Cyclic Structure

- a) Cycle 1: To begin, the music globalization commonplaces that are [...] circulating in Western intellectual discourse... (1-2) But is there anything distinctive about how this is happening in the world of music? (2-1C)
- b) Cycle 2: One way to answer is by denaturalizing the now ubiquitous phrase *world music* ... (1-2) How did it become so [...] naturalized...? How has it participated in [...] globalization? How might a sketch genealogy of world music help...? (2-1C)

The predominantly Move 1-2 /Move 2 cyclicity displayed in these CS RAs seems to differ from that documented in Swales (1990) where authors are proposed to utilize cycles of reviewing an item of research (1-3) and indicating a gap therein (2-1B). Furthermore, whereas Swales links cyclicity to longer introductions, this is not wholly reflected in the examined RAs: Both the Feld and Huysen introductions contain only two paragraphs but maintain a cyclic structure.

3.4. Move 3

According to Swales (1990), Occupying the Niche is an obligatory move (Move 3) which is minimally constituted of a step where authors either explicitly state (3-1A) or implicitly announce (3-1B) the purpose of their research⁹. They may additionally indicate their RA principal findings (3-2) or structure (3-3).

Out of the six examined CS RAs, only two employ Move 3 steps, as illustrated in Example 4.

Example 4 Move 3 illustrations

- a) This essay is an argument for [...] this kind of globalization... (3-1B) This essay moves through three arguments... These three steps bring me to a conclusion about [...] globalization. (3-3) (Appadurai)

⁹ As opposed to 3-1A, 3-1B does not explicitly employ such terms as “purpose” or “aim”.

- b) This essay considers the rice bowl of youth phenomenon... (3-1B) I am particularly concerned with... Why do feminine youth...? These are the questions that structure the essay. (2-1C and 3-3) (Zhen)

Appadurai occupies the niche by announcing his current research (3-1B) and providing an outline of the RA structure (3-3). Zhen also employs step 3-1B but interestingly then conflates both Move 2 and Move 3 steps: The author raises a number of questions which function to both establish a niche (Move 2-1C; Example 2c) and outline the RA structure (3-3), as stated in the author's final sentence. Neither of these two introductions contains an outline of the RA findings (3-2).

In the remaining four RAs (Feld, Binde, Huysen and Tsing), the authors do not employ a Move 3: no reference to the RA purpose or an indication of its subsequent structure is made. This suggests that, in these RAs, not only is occupying the niche a rhetorically optional move, but also that, in the absence of Move 3, the aims of the RA may be less predictable from the introduction. Despite the lack of a Move 3, however, it is argued here that occupying the niche (i.e. the minimal indication of the RA purpose and optional outline of the RA findings/structure) can be deduced from Move 2 steps occurring in different cycles of the introduction. Alternatively put, each Move 2 step in a cycle carries significant rhetorical weight: not only does it establish a niche, but based on it, the overall purpose of the RA may be deduced.

To illustrate with Feld (Example 3), despite the absence of a Move 3, the purpose of the RA can be deduced based on the Move 2 steps occurring in each cycle of the introduction: As discussed in 3.3, each of Feld's cycles contains a Move 2-1C step, the first raising questions regarding the distinctive nature of world music and the second posing a series of questions (related to its naturalization, participation in globalization and genealogy). An examination of the title and content of the headings constituting the RA body clearly suggests that these address the 2-1C questions raised: the first heading "World Music" deals with the first of the 2-1C cycle questions, while the remaining headings address the various questions raised in the second (although they do not necessarily display a one-to-one correspondence with each of these questions). Despite the lack of a Move 3, the purpose of the RA (how the niche will be occupied) can nevertheless be deduced: The RA aims to address the questions raised in the various Move 2 cycles of the introduction. Alternatively put, Feld's Move 2 steps not only establish a niche but also implicitly signal how the niche will be occupied.

The proposed rhetorical weight of Move 2 steps in the absence of Move 3 has implications for the analysis of introduction-final sentences in Binde, Huysen and Tsing. Example 5 reproduces these sentences (indicated in italics).

Example 5 Absent Move 3 introduction-final sentences

- a) All over the world, the citizens of today are claiming rights over the citizens of tomorrow... (1-2). *Without proper attention, future generations are in danger of becoming the prisoners of unmanageable changes...* (2-1B) (Binde)
- b) Time and space as fundamentally contingent categories [...] are always bound up with each other in complex ways... (1-2). *Indeed, questions of discrepant temporalities [...] have emerged as key to new and rigorous understandings of the long-term processes of globalization...* (2-1D) (Huysen)

- c) Yet the whiggish acrobatics necessary to show how those very economies [...] were simultaneously lurking crises hardly seem to tell the whole story. (2-1A). *A less pious attitude toward the market may be necessary to consider the specificities of those political economies...* (2-1D) (Tsing)

While each of these introduction-final sentences may be viewed as mere statements expanding on the previous step (the preceding 1-2 in Binde and Huyssen; and 2-1A in Tsing), they are argued to carry more rhetorical weight and are analyzed as final Move 2 steps, which in turn implicitly indicate the RA purpose. In Binde, for example, the author ends the introduction by making a topic generalization about tomorrow's citizens (1-2), adding that future generations are "in danger". The latter sentence is analyzed not as an expansion of the preceding topic generalization but as a Move 2-1B: Firstly, it begins with the phrase "Without proper attention" a type of lexical negation documented as a strategy in indicating a 2-1B step (Swales 1990, 155). Also, in line with observations made in 3.2, namely that CS introductions generally establish a niche less adversatively by positioning the niche within the world events/phenomena raised in Move 1, the sentence can be interpreted as identifying gap-- a gap in recognizing the human rights of future generations. With the absence of a Move 3, this 2-1B step implicitly indicates the RA purpose: The paper's aim is to fill the indicated gap by providing "proper attention" to this topic (although precisely how this will be done is not specified). This analysis is supported by an examination of the section headings occurring in the RA body and their content: Headings such as "Responsibility is Now Turned toward the Future" clearly show that attention is being provided to the topic of future generations, i.e. that the stated gap is being filled.

Similarly, in Example 5b, while Huyssen's introduction-final sentence¹⁰ may appear as a continuation of the previous topic generalization (the contingency of time and space in relation to memory), it is analyzed here as a 2-1D step: "Indeed" exemplifies one of the affirmative sentence connectors which are typically used in the examined CS introductions to indicate shifts to Move 2 and "questions... have emerged as key to new understandings" suggest that this is a Continuing a Tradition step (2-1D) where the author positions his research niche as one extending the field's knowledge (through providing new understandings). With a lack of an explicit Move 3, this introduction final 2-1D step simultaneously indicates the RA purpose: An examination of Huyssen's subsequent subject headings (e.g. "Memory as Spectacle and Commodity") and their content demonstrates the addition of perspectives on the topic of memory, which constitute new understandings and thereby fulfill the implicit purpose indicated in 2-1D.

Finally, a comparable analysis applies to Example 4c: Following Tsing's Counter-Claim (2-1A, as evidenced by the sentence connector "Yet" and the negation in the verb phrase "hardly seem"), the introduction-final sentence is analyzed as constituting a separate 2-1D step, which not only establishes a niche through extending previously held knowledge (by offering the necessary "less pious attitude" towards the market), but also implies the RA purpose: The RA aims to occupy the niche by offering precisely such a less pious attitude.

¹⁰ While Huyssen's introduction is not clearly differentiated from the RA body (it does not contain an explicit Move 3 and is not followed by a section heading), the examined sentence signals the introduction end: The ensuing eleven paragraphs address the first of the author's Move 2 cycles, namely investigating memory "historically and phenomenologically" (Example 2b), and therefore constitute the beginning of the RA body.

3.5 Reference to the Literature

The examined CS introductions seem to make relatively sparse reference to the literature: Only three of the six RAIs explicitly refer to secondary sources (Huysen refers to four, Zhen and Tsing to two each¹¹) for a total of eight references across six introductions. Furthermore, both of Tsing's references occur as part of an additional footnote text (as opposed to the introduction per se): the author inserts a footnote providing supplementary information, which is itself referenced (Example 6c). The sparse usage of references seems in alignment with similar results obtained in Samraj's (2008) Philosophy MT introductions and Hood's (2009) CS PhD introductions.

Out of these citations, five are made non-integrally, where the author's name is not mentioned within the citing sentence but using a superscript number and footnote which provide full bibliographic detail (Example 6a). Huysen employs the only integral citation where the author's name is mentioned within the citing sentence (6b).

Example 6 Observed citational patterns

a) Typical non-integral citation

[...] The robust image of [...] female eaters of the rice bowl of youth symbolizes [...] the "democracy of consumption"...² (Zhen)

² The term is borrowed from [fully cited reference (REF for short)].

b) Integral citation

But, as the work of geographers such as David Harvey has shown ...⁴ (2-1A) (Huysen)

⁴ [REF].

c) References as part of supplementary footnote text (non-integral citation)

A less pious attitude toward the market may be necessary to consider the specificities of those political economies...¹ (Tsing)

¹ [...] Between the late 1980s and 1997, economic growth averaged [...] [REF].
[...] See, for example, [REF].

The six references across the CS RAIs occur predominantly in Move 1 but also appear as part of Move 2. In both cases, the reference to the item of literature functions to support the particular rhetorical step the author is making. In Example 6a above, for instance, Zhen supports her characterization of rice bowl imagery (1-2) by referring to a term borrowed from the literature, while in 6b, Huysen's use of reference functions to support his 2-1A Counter-Claim. In other words, references to items of research in these RAIs do not exclusively occur as a 1-3 step as proposed in Swales (1990), but similarly to Samraj (2002) and Swales' revised model (2004), appear in different move structures depending on their rhetorical function.

Furthermore, even when a reference does occur as part of Move 1, it does not adhere to the proposed function of 1-3, if this is understood similarly to Swales (1990) as a step which establishes a territory by referring to the status of the research world and where

¹¹ In Zhen, this number excludes two references to primary data (a film and cartoon).

attribution to researchers are made, their previous findings outlined, and a stance taken towards these. Rather, as mentioned above, in the examined introductions, a reference is used mostly to support a topic generalization, where the authors generally align themselves with, rather than against, the cited literature. This reiterates the less adversary character of these RAIs, discussed in section 3.2. and observed for Philosophy (Samraj 2008) and CS PhD introductions (Hood 2009).

Conversely to Example 6 above, which illustrates references to the literature that are explicitly cited, Appadurai and Huyssen's introductions (Example 1a above and 7 below respectively) include topic generalization statements which contain no cited references but which clearly summarize a body of research. These statements are reminiscent of the references to research items documented in Jacoby's (1987) Literature RAs (section 1.1.2).

Example 7 Summary of research (Huyssen)

But the contemporary focus on memory and temporality also stands in stark contrast to so much other recent innovative work on categories of space, maps, geographies, [...]

While these statements form topic generalizations, they differ from the Move 1 topic generalizations discussed in 3.1 as they refer to the research world rather than world events/phenomena. They are also distinct from other references to the literature as they contain no explicit attribution to particular authors.

Given that reference to items of literature in the CS RAs occurs in either Move 1 or Move 2; functions to support these Move steps rather than to independently review/evaluate research items as part of establishing a territory in the research world; and can take the form of a summary of a body of research (i.e. a topic generalization) without including a reference, the current analysis is more aligned with the CARS models proposed in Samraj (2002) and Swales (2004) and suggests classifying a particular statement according to its rhetorical function (i.e. Move 1 or 2) with a specification for whether 1) it refers to the "research world" or to "world events/phenomena"; and 2) whether a reference is cited or not (using, for example, a [+ or - ref] feature).

This analysis, for instance, treats Huyssen's explicit reference to the literature in 6b above as a Move 2-1D, which refers to "world events/phenomena" and is specified for [+ref], while his summary in Example 7 is classified as 1-2 topic generalization which refers to "the research world" but includes no overt reference [-ref]. It thus avoids classifying statements which essentially function as topic generalizations differently, depending on whether they make a reference to the literature or not; and accounts for topic generalizations about the status of the research world which do not necessarily contain an overt reference to the literature but rather summarize it. It also avoids the problem of classifying a statement as a review of literature when no explicit linguistic cues such as a citation can be discerned.

3.6 Summary

To recapitulate, while the CS RAs examined establish a territory (Move 1) as proposed in CARS, they do so primarily by making topic generalizations regarding the problematic nature of world events/ cultural phenomena under consideration (1-2). Establishing the importance of the RA territory is therefore rarely based on the status of research activity in the field. The CS Introductions examined additionally establish a niche (Move 2) through the various steps outlined in CARS although they predominantly

use Question-Raising, Continuing a Tradition and Counter-Claiming, steps which are associated with a less adversative stance and weaker challenge to previous knowledge¹². The occurrence and realization of Establishing a Niche steps in the CS RAs examined thus seem to diverge from the Indicating a Gap (2-1B) step common in Science corpora. Furthermore, Move 1 and Move 2 can appear in cycles which are constituted mostly of 1-2 and Move 2 step sequences as opposed to the 1-3/2-1B cycles proposed in Swales (1990).

While some of the examined CS RAs employ Move 3, through indicating the general purpose and outline of the RA, the majority omit this move altogether. Contrary to the CARS model, Occupying the Niche thus seems to constitute a rhetorically optional move in these introductions. When a Move 3 is lacking, the overall RA purpose may nevertheless be predicted based on the Move 2 steps occurring in different cycles of the introduction. In this context, Move 2 steps seem to carry particularly heavy rhetorical weight: they not only establish a niche but may also indicate implicitly how the niche will be occupied. This in turn seems to affect the rhetorical work performed by introduction-final sentences: while these may appear as mere statements developing preceding steps, they are argued to be more rhetorically significant and analyzed as Move 2 steps from which the purpose of the RA can be deduced.

Finally, the examined CS RAs seem to make sparse reference to the literature. Reference to research occurs as part of Move 1 or 2 and mainly functions to support the claims made in these moves. A topic generalization may cite a reference to support a statement related to world events/phenomena and, conversely, may refer to a body of research without citing any references. These different means of referring to the literature are better accounted for in Swales' (2004) model where reference to research is not specified as an exclusive Move 1-3 step but rather as a feature which may optionally accompany various Move 1 or 2 steps.

4. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In its exploratory investigation of the discursual structure of six CS RAs, the current study reveals that the examined introductions are generally analyzable according to the CARS model, especially in their employment of moves establishing a territory and a niche. Tentatively, however, noteworthy variation seems to be displayed in relation to:

- the occurrence and realization of steps used within moves (cf. Move 1 and 2);
- the obligatory status of CARS moves (cf. lack of Move 3); and
- the frequency and means of referring to the literature (cf. section 3.5).

The above findings are based on a small number of RAs (which controlled for level of expertise, period of publication and topic) and need to be validated across larger and more diverse corpora before any generalization across CS RAs are made. Nevertheless, they raise interesting questions as to why the observed move/step structures *do* occur. A potential explanation is that the detected employment of rhetorical moves/steps may be illustrative of the espoused principles, practices or languages of legitimation (Maton 2000a, 2000b) of CS as constructed in the writing of its experts. As discussed in section

¹² Note, however, the usage of 2-1D (Continuing a Tradition) which extends knowledge by highlighting breaks with previous traditions (section 3.2 above).

1.2 above, Maton analyzes the CS languages of legitimation as concerned with key themes such as the questioning of disciplinarity and positivistic notions of objective truths. The features of CS RAIs outlined above may be interpreted as embodying the practices of such legitimizing discourses. For example, while establishing the importance of the niche through the use of topic generalizations, rather than reference to research activity, has similarly been documented in other Humanities RAIs (e.g. Samraj (2008) for Philosophy; Neff-Van Artselaer (2011) for English Literature), its usage in CS may also be linked to the internal conceptualization of the field as breaking down distinctions such as those between “formal educational knowledge [as represented by the claims of the research world] and everyday experience“ (Maton 2000a, 155) as represented by the lived socio-cultural events referred to in topic generalizations.

Furthermore, while the observation that these topic generalizations generally refer to the problematic nature of the object of study (rather than to its centrality or importance) has been similarly noted in Hood (2009, 194) for AL and CS PhD thesis introductions and can function to “compel the reader to view the object [of study] as worthy of attention”, it may also reveal the self-conceptualization of CS as forming “critical ‘breaks’ [and] rupture” with previous intellectual traditions (Maton 2000a, 153). In other words, focusing on the problematic nature of the object of study may be interpreted as the embodiment of CS’s self-characterization as “decentering its [own] intellectual tradition” (Maton 2000a, 153) and opposing the traditional discourses of continual progress (particularly dominant in the Sciences). This point is further reinforced by the noted usage of Step 2-1D which, rather than *Continuing* a Tradition, seems to contribute to the field’s knowledge by indicating breaks with that tradition (section 3.2 above). Similarly, the lack of a Move 3 may be explained as illustrative of CS purposeful opposition to positivist modes of discourse: Leaving the research niche unoccupied (with no explicitly stated purposes, asserted conclusive findings, and outlined research structure) could be seen as resisting positivist notions of clearly delineated objects of study and procedures of enquiry, detached objective knowledge, and absolute truth claims.

The noted sparse reference to items of literature in the examined CS RAIs may also be due to different factors: On the one hand, limited citation could reflect the status of the examined authors as world renowned scholars publishing in a highly reputed journal. In other words, less rhetorical effort may be required by these authors in competing for a research space and demonstrating their knowledge of the field’s research world since they are well-known inhabitants of that world. On the other hand, it may also relate to Hood’s (2009) observation that in CS PhD introductions, the writer signals a connection to a particular reference/theory, not through explicit citation, but through the use of key terms/phrases employed by theorists or even through mimicry of their style of writing. While investigating stylistic imitation was beyond the scope of the present study, such an examination may shed further light on this issue. Equally, however, the noted sparse referencing may be interpreted as a form of practicing CS opposition to notions of a “cumulatively developing canon” (Maton 2000a, 153) as represented by the works of major theoreticians or researchers, and a purposeful de-privileging of a supposed detached researcher voice¹³.

¹³ Further research would be needed, however, to examine the frequency and attribution methods of references throughout a CS RA as authors may carry out this type of rhetorical work beyond the scope of introductions.

Additionally, as pointed out in 3.5 above, when they do refer to items of literature, the examined CS RAIs avoid adversative steps (such as counter-claiming and identifying gaps in previous research) and, as in Hood's CS PhD introductions (2009), position writer stance mostly in alignment with, rather than challenging, the cited literature. While Swales (1990) links such writer stance with emerging fields of study and their more cooperative approach to the occupation of research space, similar observations of writer stance have been made in Philosophy (e.g. Samraj 2008), suggesting additional similarities across Humanities disciplines. However, inclusive writer stance may also reflect the languages of legitimation of CS which emphasize "giving voice to" the knowledge and experiences of silenced or dominated groups (Maton 2000a, b). While the voice of researchers can hardly be considered as that of the dominated, the key notion of "giving voice" in CS may have resulted in a more empathetic stance to all voices cited, including those of (the relatively infrequently referenced) researchers.

To summarize, the combination of setting the context of the CS RAIs in terms of lived world events rather than research literature; establishing a niche using less adversative steps and aligning research voices with the author's; the frequent lack of explicit occupation of the niche; and the sparse reference to the literature may not only suggests a mode of creating a research space which shows similarities to other Humanities disciplines, but may also be seen as reproducing the languages of legitimation which stress the field's constant "blurring, crossing and transgressing [of] established borders or boundaries" (Maton 2000a, 153).

Following from this, however, the ecological metaphor of establishing a territory, establishing a niche, and occupying the niche constitutes a territorial and boundary setting discourse which may stand in stark contrast to, if not violates, CS's "espoused opposition to notions of disciplinarity, a relatively uncircumscribed object of study [...], open procedures of enquiry and teaching, and a commitment to problematizing categories, boundaries and hierarchies between and within forms of knowledge and objects of study" (Maton 2000a, 155). This raises the question of whether it is still acceptable to analyze the rhetorical work carried out in CS RAIs as conforming to the CARS model (albeit with some variation), given that CS may be reacting against precisely such territorial notions of creating research spaces. Conversely, if further research validates the rhetorical patterns observed in the examined CS RAIs across larger corpora, it would raise the equally thorny question of whether, despite its languages of legitimation, CS is shifting towards stricter disciplinary rhetorical conventions and more contested research spaces.

From the perspective of language pedagogy, the current findings may have noteworthy implications on ES/AP teaching practice in the Humanities and CS specifically. They highlight that, while CARS may have been adopted widely in the teaching of the RAI genre, different disciplines (particularly in the Humanities) may not entirely conform to the rhetorical structures proposed in the model. More specifically, in teaching reading of CS RAIs, for example, students may be alerted to the possible lack of a Move 3 in the text and that, to extrapolate the purpose and structure of the paper, they may need to refer to Move 2 and introduction-final sentences. Similarly, students may be alerted to the different means of realizing Move 2 in CS RAIs, which may differ significantly from the realizations of the move's counterpart in Science-based RAIs where a gap in research, often indicated with a clear adversative sentence-connector, is commonly used as a strategy in establishing a niche. It may also be noted that some of the rhetorical strategies observed in CS RAIs may show similarities with other related CS

genres such as the PhD thesis (Hood 2009) and other Humanities disciplines such as Philosophy (e.g. Samraj 2008). Finally, in developing the discursive competence of students in CS, teachers may need to take into account not only the above documented rhetorical structures but also CS' self-conceptualizations and the means by which its languages of legitimation are practiced in writing. The notion of languages of legitimation may thus provide a broader framework for potentially explaining the rhetorical decisions made by disciplinary experts.

Clearly, further research is needed to investigate trans-disciplinary and emerging Humanities areas such as CS through not only compiling larger corpora (which would document the rhetorical structures of CS introductions across a wider range of RAs); but also enriching linguistic textual analyzes and validating the links with legitimation discourses by consulting with the disciplinary authors themselves. Such research may be used to further inform teaching practice and elucidate the intimate links that occur (at particular historical moments) between genre and disciplinarity in the social construction of written knowledge.

REFERENCES

- Anthony, Laurence. "Writing Research Article Introductions in Software Engineering: How Accurate is a Standard Model?" *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication* 42 (1999): 38–46.
- Bhatia, Vijay K. *Analysing Genre: Language Use in Professional Settings*. London: Longman, 1993.
- Biber, Douglas, Ulla Connor, and Thomas A Upton. *Discourse on the Move: Using Corpus Analysis to Describe Discourse Structure*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2007.
- Bruce, Ian. "Results Sections in Sociology and Organic Chemistry Articles: A Genre Analysis." *English for Specific Purposes* 28 (2009): 105–124.
- Crookes, Graham. "Towards a Validated Analysis of Scientific Text Structure." *Applied Linguistics* 7 (1986): 57–70.
- Hood, Susan. "Arguing in and across Disciplinary Boundaries: Legitimizing Strategies in Applied Linguistics and Cultural Studies." In *Advances in Language and Education*, edited by Anne McCabe, Mick O'Donnell, and Rachel Whittaker, 185-200. London: Continuum, 2009.
- Hopkins, Andy and Tony Dudley-Evans. "A Genre-based Investigation of the Discussion Sections in Articles and Dissertations." *English for Specific Purposes* 7 (1988): 113–122.
- Hyland, Ken. "Activity and Evaluation: Reporting Practices in Academic Writing." In *Academic Discourse*, edited by John Flowerdew, 115-130. Harlow: Longman, 2002.
- Hyland, Ken. *Disciplinary Discourses: Social Interactions in Academic Writing*. USA: University of Michigan, 2004.
- Jacoby, Sally. "References to other Researchers in Literary Research Articles." *Empirical Language Research Journal* 1 (1987): 33–78.
- Johnson, Richard, Deborah Chambers, Parvati Raghuram and Estella Tincknell. *The Practice of Cultural Studies*. London/Thousand Oaks/New Delhi: Sage, 2004.
- Kanoksilapatham, Budsaba. "Rhetorical Moves in Biochemistry Research Articles." In *Discourse on the Move: Using Corpus Analysis to Describe Discourse Structure*,

- edited by Douglas Biber, Ulla Connor, and Thomas A. Upton, 73–120. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2007.
- Maton, Karl. “Languages of Legitimation: The Structuring Significance for Intellectual Fields of Strategic Knowledge Claims.” *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 21 (2000a): 147–167.
- Maton, Karl. “Recovering Pedagogic Discourse: A Bernsteinian Approach to the Sociology of Educational Knowledge”. *Linguistics and Education* 11 (2000b): 79–98.
- McCarthy, Michael and Anne O’Keeffe, eds., *The Routledge Handbook of Corpus Linguistics*. Florence/ KY/USA: Routledge, 2010.
- Meyer, Charles F. *English Corpus Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Neff-Van Artselaer, Joanne. “Avenue towards Mastery: Teaching (Applied) Linguistics and Literary Studies as ESP”. Paper presented at The 38th International Systemic Functional Congress, Lisbon, Portugal, July 25–29, 2011.
- Nwogu, Kevin N. “The Medical Research Paper: Structure and Functions.” *English for Specific Purposes* 16 (1997): 119–138.
- Pho, Phuong D. “Linguistic Realizations of Rhetorical Structure: A Corpus-based Study of Research Article Abstracts and Introductions in Applied Linguistics and Educational Technology.” *Language and Computers* 71 (2010): 135–152.
- Samraj, Betty. “Introductions in Research Articles: Variations across Disciplines.” *English for Specific Purposes* 21 (2002): 1–17.
- Samraj, Betty. “A Discourse Analysis of Master’s Theses across Disciplines with a Focus on Introductions.” *English for Academic Purposes* 7 (2008): 55–67.
- Swales, John. *Aspects of Article Introductions*. Birmingham, UK: Aston University, 1981.
- Swales, John. *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Swales, John. *Research Genres: Exploration and Applications*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Thomas, Sarah and Thomas P Hawes. “Reporting Verbs in Medical Journal Articles.” *English for Specific Purposes* 13 (1994): 129–148.
- Thompson, Geoff and Ye Yiyun. “Evaluation in the Reporting Verbs Used in Academic Papers.” *Applied Linguistics* 12 (1991): 365–382.
- Thomson Reuters Journal Citation Reports 2012. Retrieved October, 15, 2013, <http://thomsonreuters.com/journal-citation-reports/>
- Yang, Ruying and Desmond Allison. “Research Articles in Applied Linguistics: Moving from Results to Conclusions.” *English for Specific Purposes* 22 (2003): 365–385.