

A Genre Analysis of English and Turkish Research Article Introductions

Hüseyin KAFES¹

¹Ph.D., English Language Teaching Department, Akdeniz University, Turkey,
hkafes@akdeniz.edu.tr

Article information

Submission	21/09/2017
Revision received	01/03/2018
Acceptance	29/03/2018

Keywords

Research article introductions, genre analysis, discourse community

Abstract: This corpus-based exploratory study investigates the rhetorical organization of research article (RA) introductions in the field of social sciences, using an adapted version of Swales' (1990) framework of move analysis. A corpus of 75 research article introductions in English by American academic writers and in English and Turkish by Turkish academic writers formed the data. The data were analyzed using Sheldon's adaptation of Swales' CARS model. The findings indicate that the three corpora follow the model, employing the three moves to a great extent. However, the introductions differ in the extent to which the steps are used. Both the English and Turkish article introductions by Turkish academic writers display resemblance to the established English discourse conventions. Yet, they also vary from the established discourse conventions in English in some aspects, displaying compliance with local discourse community conventions. The findings of the present study have been discussed with reference to the findings of previous studies and pedagogical implications have been discussed.

Anahtar sözcükler

Makale giriş bölümü, tür incelemesi, söylem toplumu

İngilizce ve Türkçe Akademik Makale Giriş Bölümlerinin Tür İncelemesi

Öz: Bütüncü temelli bu çalışmanın amacı anadili Türkçe ve İngilizce olan yazarlar tarafından sosyal bilimler alanında yazılan akademik makalelerin giriş bölümlerinin Swales'in (2004) CARS modelinin adapte edilmiş uyarlamasını kullanarak sözbilimsel olarak incelemektir. Araştırmanın derlemi Türkçe ve İngilizce yazılmış 75 akademik araştırma makalesinin giriş bölümlerinden oluşturmaktadır. Verilerin analizi Sheldon (2011) tarafından adapte edilen Swales's CARS modeli kullanılarak yapılmıştır. Elde edilen bulgular, yazarların CARS modelin üç aşamasını belli ölçüde kullanırken bazı alt basamakları kullanma konusunda farklılıklar gösterdiklerini ortaya koymuştur. Türk akademisyenlerce İngilizce ve Türkçe yazılan akademik makale giriş bölümlerinin yerleşik Anglo-Amerikan söylem geleneği ile benzerlikler ve bazı acılardan farklılıklar gösterdiği görülmüştür. Çalışmanın bulguları benzer alanda önceden yapılmış çalışmalara göndermeler yapılarak tartışılmış ve bu doğrultuda pedagojik öneriler sunulmuştur.

1. Introduction

The last decade or so has witnessed a growing interest in gaining insight into the nature of genre analysis, especially the generic structure of the research article (RA). The main driving force behind this increasing interest was triggered as English gained the status of *Lingua Franca* in almost every step of life and every means of communication across the globe; academic writing is no exception. The dominance of Anglophone academic writing conventions in academia has stimulated scholars to communicate and disseminate new knowledge in English in order to achieve greater visibility, publicity, recognition, and career development. This new trend has encouraged non-native English speaking researchers and scholars to publish in English to be able to address members of their respective global discourse community and win their recognition and appreciation.

Nevertheless, communicating new knowledge in the research article in a foreign language may be a complex and tough task, especially for the non-native English speaking researchers and scientists. In order to help them in this relatively daunting task, researchers have investigated the rhetorical organization of the different sections of the RA: Introduction, Methodology, Results and Discussion. Some of these studies focused on cross-disciplinary fields (Swales, 1981, 1990, 2004; Hopkins & Dudley-Evans, 1988; Thompson, 1993; Brett, 1994; Holmes, 1997; Williams, 1999; Hyland, 2000; Samraj, 2002, 2005; Yang & Allison, 2003; Öztürk, 2007), and some investigated cross-linguistic representation of the rhetorical organization of the different sections of the RA (Taylor & Chen, 1991; Mauranen, 1993; Duszak, 1994; Fredrickson & Swales, 1994; Ahmad, 1997; Hyland, 2000, 2001, 2002; Samraj, 2002; Mur Duenas, 2008, 2009; Hirano, 2009; Kafes, 2012, 2016). In this regard, Swales' (1990) seminal work has provided valuable insights into the rhetorical structure of the individual sections (IMRD) of the RA in various disciplines. Swales' ground-breaking framework and some other researchers' work (Paltridge, 1994; Hopkins & Dudley-Evans, 1988; Samraj, 2002) in move analysis have played a pivotal role in popularizing the importance of understanding how the RA is constructed. Among the different sections of the RA, "introductions have received special attention particularly following the introduction of Swales' (1990) pioneering CARS (Create a Research Space) model" (Öztürk, 2007, p. 26).

Swales' CARS model postulates that the RA Introduction consists of three moves: "establishing a territory," "establishing a niche" and "occupying the niche." Each of these moves is realized by some obligatory and optional steps (Swales, 1990, p. 80). Following Swales' CARS model, a couple of studies have been conducted, suggesting some modifications and adaptations. Some researchers have applied his model in different fields in different languages too (Arvay & Tanko, 2004; Hirano, 2009; Kafes, 2012, 2016). In addition to using this model to analyze the RA abstracts and introductions, some took it as a model to analyze MA thesis and PhD dissertation introductions (Jogthong, 2001; Gecikli, 2013). Despite the myriad of cross-disciplinary and/or cross-linguistic studies on RA introductions, there is no comparative study on RA introductions in English and Turkish. Triggered by the aspiration to address this issue, this corpus-based study aims to analyze American and Turkish academic writers' deployment of the moves and steps of English and Turkish RA introductions, using an adapted version of CARS model. Specifically, this study investigates the use of the rhetorical organization of research article (RA) introductions in the field of social sciences.

2. Method

2.1. Corpus selection

This study employs a quantitative approach, comprising frequency counts and text analysis of three corpora of published research article introductions. Initially, a corpus of 150 research article introductions was formed. Fifty English RA introductions by American Academic Writers (EL1) and 50 English RA introductions by Turkish academic writers (EL2) in the field of English applied linguistics were chosen. Fifty Turkish RA introductions (TL1) by Turkish academic writers in the field of social sciences were compiled, for there was not an adequate number of Turkish RA introductions from the same academic field. Then, multiple-authored articles and the second or third articles by the same author were discarded from the corpus, fixing the number at 25, for 25 was the maximum number available. Twenty-five article introductions from every corpora were chosen, employing a convenience sampling method. Single-authored RA introductions and only one article by the same author were chosen to broaden the representativeness of the corpus.

Table 1
Corpus composition

	EL1 corpus		EL2 corpus		TL1 corpus	
JOURNALS	English for Specific Purposes	1	Akdeniz University J.	1	Akdeniz University J.	2
	Journal of Pragmatics	2	Ankara University J.	1	Çukurova University J	3
	English for Academic Purposes	3	Balıkesir University J.	1	Gazi University J.	3
	J. of Second Language Writing	5	Gazi University J.	1	Ankara University J.	3
	Tesol Quarterly	6	Çukurova University J.	2	Balıkesir University J.	3
	Written Communication	8	Science and Education	2	Hacettepe Uni.	3
					Education Faculty J.	
			Novitas-Royal	7	Education and Science	6
			Hacettepe Uni.	10		
			Education Faculty J.			

As seen in Table 1, the EL1 corpus comes from six journals. Issues of these journals *published* between 2000 and 2014 were scanned, and only single-authored empirical research articles were chosen for practical reasons, such as online availability and impact factor. American writers' surnames, location of their institutions, and the information given in their CVs were taken into consideration.

The EL2 corpus was compiled from eight journals, produced mostly by universities in Turkey between 2000 and 2014. In the choice of Turkey-based journals, the journals that are indexed by Turkish Academic Network and Information Center (ULAKBIM) were chosen. All of the authors of these articles are from the English Language teaching academia and are experts in their fields.

The TL1 corpus consists of articles published in seven Turkey-based journals between 2000 and 2014. As is the case with the selection of EL2 corpus, the journals that are indexed by Turkish Academic Network and Information Center (ULAKBIM) were chosen. Both the EL2 and TL1 corpora were chosen from articles published in the same journals in order to ensure comparability. Both corpora consist of journal articles produced under similar contextual conditions, such as field of study, text type, genre, mode, and participants as proposed by Moreno (2008). The EL1 corpus shares the same features with the EL2, with only one exception; while EL1 addresses international audience, the EL2 addresses mainly Turkish audience, and TL1 addresses only Turkish audience. All the same, it is my contention

that the three corpora of RA introductions are comparable when the main contextual factors mentioned are considered.

2.2. Analysis of the data using Swales' CARS model

As the purpose of this exploratory study was to investigate the rhetorical structure of RA introductions, the analysis was restricted to the organization of moves and steps. For the analysis of the rhetorical organization of the RA introductions, the study employed Sheldon's (2011) adaptation of Swales' (2004) CARS model (Figure 1). According to this model, the introduction consists of three moves: Move 1, "Establishing a territory"; Move 2, "Establishing the niche"; Move 3, "Presenting the present study"; each move being subdivided into steps. As can be seen in the figure below, Move 1 and Move 3 have been adapted while Move 2 has remained intact.

Move 1: Establishing a territory

Step 1. Topic generalization of increasing specificity

- (i) Reporting conclusion of previous studies
- (ii) Narrowing the field
- (iii) Writer's evaluation of existing research
- (iv) Time-frame of relevance
- (v) Research objective/process previous studies
- (vi) Terminology/ definitions
- (vii) Generalizing
- (viii) Furthering or advancing knowledge

Move 2: Establishing a niche

- Step 1A Counter-claiming or
- Step 1B Indicating a gap or
- Step 1C Question-raising or
- Step 1D Continuing a tradition

Move 3: Occupying the niche

- Step 1. (oblig.) Announcing present work descriptively and/or purposively
- Step 2. (opt.) Presenting research questions or hypotheses
- Step 3. (opt.) Definitional clarifications
- Step 4. (opt.) Summarizing methods
- Step 5. (PISF) Announcing principal outcomes
- Step 6. (PISF) Stating the value of the present research
- Step 7. (PISF) Outlining the structure of the paper

Fig. 1. Sheldon's (243-246) adaptation of Swales' CARS model (2004)

As all the articles in the corpus were already organized into clearly labeled sections, identifying the introductions was a straightforward and easy process. Each sentence in the introduction was assigned a move and step. In many cases, the sentence as the unit of coding was unproblematic, yet in few cases, when a sentence included two moves, the sentence was assigned to the move or step that looked more salient. The introductions were coded by four raters independent of one another; the researcher, an American university lecturer holding a PhD in Applied Linguistics, and a Turkish linguist. The raters were all familiar with the process. There was full agreement in the coding of Turkish article introductions between the researcher and the Turkish linguist. However, the comparison of the coding between the researcher and the American rater yielded 88% agreement according to inter-rater reliability formula of Miles and Huberman (1994). Although 88% interrater agreement was within the acceptable range, the remaining cases of disagreement were solved, consulting a fourth rater, another American expert. The three raters analyzed those discrepancies in English RA introductions and reached full agreement.

3. Results and discussion

3.1. Comparison of the employment of moves and steps

To address the issues mentioned above, quantitative and textual analyses were conducted. First, a general overview of the use of moves and steps is presented, then prominent patterns identified by the qualitative analyses are provided.

The analysis of the three corpora of RA introductions on moves and steps of the moves reveals both similarities and differences between EL2 and TL1 and between EL1 and EL2. As can be seen in Table 2, Move1 and Move 3 are mandatory, as they are present in all of the introductions. When it comes to Move 2, it appears that the EL1 has conventionalized it, for it seems to be a standard rhetorical feature of the introductions. Overall, EL2 and TL1 resemble that of English article introductions. Yet, some degree of variation was found at a micro level: EL2 and TL1 introductions include Move 2 and its sub-steps less than EL1 introductions. Move 2, according to Swales (2004), is an obligatory component in RAs written in English, and when compared with the other two moves, it is a more face-threatening act since its main rhetorical purpose is to indicate gaps in previous research and/or criticize or refute previous knowledge claims, allowing writers to pave the way to underline a need for their contribution. EL2 and TL1 corpora's comparatively less employment of Move 2 could be related to a number of reasons ranging from the emerging status of the research area (Hirano, 2009) to displaying solidarity with the local discourse community (Taylor & Chen, 1991) to the size of their discourse community (Jogthong, 2001), which is much smaller compared to the EL1 discourse community. In small discourse communities, "collective thinking tends to prevail over individual thinking" (Vassileva, 1998, p. 181). In such communities, competition is not as harsh as it is the case in individualistic societies.

Table 2

Frequency of occurrences and distribution of the three moves in each group

Moves	EL1 f (%)	EL2 f (%)	TL1 f (%)
Move 1	25 (100)	25 (100)	25 (100)
Move 2	25 (100)	19 (76)	18 (72)
Move 23	25 (100)	25 (100)	25 (100)

Given the fact that Turkish researchers tend to omit Move 2, both in their Turkish and English article introductions, we can argue that the cultural background of these writers might have a role in their conscious and/or unconscious choice of rhetorical purposes, and that these writers may have transferred their L1 patterns into the L2.

3.2. Move 1: Establishing the territory by EL1, EL2, and TL1

In congruence with Swales' (1990, 2004) postulate, all the research article introductions analyzed in this study begin by emphasizing the importance of the general topic within which the research being reported is situated; that is, Move 1, establishing the territory. According to Sheldon's (2011) adapted version of Swales' CARS model, eight steps may be employed to accomplish this move.

By and large, Move 1 is present in all of the articles across the three corpora as it allows writers to create "appeals to the discourse community whereby members are asked to accept that the research to be reported is part of a lively, significant or well-established research area" (Swales, 1990, p.144), and it "builds a framework of knowledge with research evidence from topic generality to specificity, making it possible to position the new study as filling a

gap” (Sheldon, 2011, p. 244). In other words, by establishing a territory, writers can prepare the ground for their own research, while at the same time presenting themselves as credible members of their discourse community. As seen in Table 3, the EL1 corpus made use of a greater number of rhetorical resources. Although the three groups used all the eight sub-steps of Step 1 to identify and distinguish their research territory, they employed some subcategories more consistently. For example, the sub-step (i) “Reporting conclusions of previous studies” has occupied an important place in all the introductions, allowing writers to prepare a sound ground to situate their studies in. For instance, the following excerpt by an EL2 writer shows how the writer strategically uses previous research as a preface to present his own study:

(Example 1)

...and male examinees were less likely than female examinees to choose handwriting as the composition medium for their essays (Wolfe & Manola, 2005). However, Hawisher and Fortune (1989) did not find significant differences in writing improvement based on gender. As the review of literature suggests... (EL2 14).

The sub-step (ii) “narrowing the field” is another common rhetorical strategy, which the EL2 and TL1 groups employed with close occurrences, 19 and 21 respectively, while the EL1 group secured 29 occurrences, for example:

(Example 2)

...In one of the few studies of student discourse, Herrington (1988) identified and evaluated the lines of reasoning, perceptions of audience and purpose, and ethos construction... (EL1 25)

The excerpt above has underlined a small research area. By narrowing the focus of his/her research area from the broad “Conventional Values of Literary Analysis in an Undergraduate Literature Course” to “Assessing students’ perceptions of the purposes of their writing,” the writer uses this piece as background knowledge to have a smooth flow to his/her own study. As is the case with the sub-step (ii) “Narrowing the field,” EL1 employed all the other remaining sub-steps more frequently than the other two groups.

Table 3

Summary of occurrences of Move 1, Step 1, Structure of Move 1

	EL1 f (%)	EL2 f (%)	TL1 f (%)
Total no. of instances of three moves	148 (100)	116 (100)	113 (100)
Total no. of instances of Move 1	75 (50.67)	61 (52.58)	60 (53.09)
Step 1. Topic generalization of increasing specificity	75	61	60
(i) Reporting conclusion of previous studies	75	61	60
(ii) Narrowing the field	29	19	21
(iii) Writer’s evaluation of existing research	21	12	14
(iv) Time-frame of relevance	24	14	12
(v) Research objective/process previous studies	14	8	9
(vi) Terminology/definitions	12	6	10
vii) Generalizing	13	8	11
(viii) Furthering or advancing knowledge	5	2	2

3.3. Move 2: Establishing the niche by EL1, EL2, and TL1

Move 2, establishing the niche, according to Martin-Martin (2003), has attracted a significant amount of attention, especially on articles written in languages other than English because of a “notable absence of this move in article introductions.” As is known, Move 2 is characterized by writers validating their own research by raising questions, underlying the gaps, making counter claims and/or stressing limitations in the extant literature. As such, this move is risky and face-threatening. Analysis indicates that all the articles in the EL1 corpus include this move, whereas 19% of EL2 and 18% of TL1 contain it (Table 1). The most salient difference between the EL1 and EL2 and TL1 lies in the persistent absence of Move 2 in EL2 and TL1; that is, in articles, both English and Turkish, by Turkish academic writers. The frequency of occurrence of this move in EL1 indicates that it is an obligatory move, and that EL1 do not abstain from criticizing previous research. Both EL2 and TL1 groups, on the other hand, were inclined to avoid underscoring the shortcomings of previous research and therefore omit Move 2. The lesser employment of Move 2 in EL2 and TL1 introductions seems to suggest that Turkish writers do not place as much emphasis on establishing the niche. This commonality once more reminds us that cultural background may influence writers’ rhetorical choices.

This finding is supported by the limited presence of Move 2 in comparative studies in Chinese (Taylor & Chen, 1991; Loi, 2010), Swedish (Fredrickson & Swales, 1994), Malaysian (Ahmad, 1997), Spanish (Burgess, 1997), Thai (Jogthong, 2001), Korean (Shim, 2005), English (Öztürk, 2007), and Brazilian Portuguese (Hirano, 2009). A few explanations, ranging from educational background-related issues to socio-cultural-related ones, and from issues related to the emerging status of research areas to the influence of Anglo-American writing norms, have been offered to account for the low presence of this move. Ahmad (1997) attributes it to the influence of a local discourse community-induced elements, while Lee (2001) to the influence of English writing norms on the writing norms of other cultures, and Al-Qahtani (2006) to the educational background of writers.

In elaborating on the low presence of Move 2 in research articles by Chinese academic writers, Taylor and Chen (1991) postulate that it could be related to the socio-cultural aspects of Chinese society; that is, given the importance of face saving in Chinese culture, “Chinese writers find it difficult and inappropriate to take a strong critical stance in their writing” for fear of hurting feelings of solidarity with the local discourse community. Rather than attributing the low presence of Move 2 to socio-cultural issues, Fredrickson and Swales (1994) ascribe it to the size of a discourse community, stating that Swedish scholars do not need to compete for research space because of the small size of their discourse community. On the other hand, Hirano (2009) notes that the cause could be related to the “emerging status of research areas in developing countries, in contrast to established fields.”

Another common feature of EL2 and TL1 is these two groups employed the sub-steps of Move 2 in very close percentages, as can be seen in Table 4, with an exception that TL1 used the sub-step indicating a gap more than EL2. We can say that this lesser employment of this sub-step could be due to the even smaller size of this discourse community, while not denying the probability that something other than cultural background could be the cause.

Table 4
Summary of occurrences of Move 2, Structure of Move 2

	EL1 f (%)	EL2 f (%)	TL1 f (%)
Total no. of instances of three moves	148 (100)	116 (100)	113 (100)
Total no. of instances of Move 2	30 (20.27)	12 (10.34)	21 (18.58)
Step 1A Counter claiming or	5	---	---
Step 1 B Indicating a gap or	28	12	19
Step 1 C Question-raising or	6	2	3
Step 1 D Continuing a tradition	15	6	7

As can be seen in Table 4, neither the EL2 nor the TL1 made counter claims to establish the niche. They also raised questions sparingly, probably because these sub-steps are riskier compared to the other two. Among these three sub-steps, the sub-step indicating a gap was employed the most. Through this move, writers highlighted the gaps in previous research, thus paving the way for their own study as can be seen in the following excerpt.

(Example 3)

...Eğitim alanında var olan daha az sayıdaki araştırma ise üniversite düzeyinde yapılmıştır (Bayraktar, 2012; Kert ve Tekdal, 2012; İncik ve Yelken, 2011...(TL1 4)

The few studies in the field of education were conducted at university level (Bayraktar, 2012; Kert ve Tekdal, 2012; İncik ve Yelken, 2011)...'

Compared to this sub-step, the sub-step "Raising a question" was employed a lot less. Through this move, writers raised questions about the issue in hand, thus prepared a solid ground to present their studies as seen in the following excerpt.

(Example 4)

...The central question of the present study, then, returns to the importance of using register-specific material in reading skill instruction for academically oriented ESL students: How might development of lexico-grammatical decoding skills in non-academic texts facilitate or interfere with development of those needed for decoding academic texts? Answering this question requires two steps :...(EL1 20)

All the three groups employed the sub-step "Continuing a tradition" as seen in the following excerpt.

(Example 5)

...All these problems raised in the studies conducted at lower grade levels might be true for upper grade levels and needs to be examined... (EL2 20)

3.4. Move 3: Presenting the present work by EL1, EL2, and TL1

As the name implies, this move allows writers to present their works for which they create a need in Move 2 by raising questions, underlying the gaps in previous studies, making counter claims and/or stressing limitations in the extant literature. In other words, now is the time to fill the gap previously addressed by using the sub-steps of Move 3 as seen below.

Table 5

Summary of occurrences of Move 3 and embedded steps in introduction section

Structure of Move 3

	EL1 f (%)	EL2 f (%)	TL1 f (%)
Total no. of instances of three moves	148 (100)	116 (100)	113 (100)
Total no. of instances of Move 3	44 (29.72)	55 (47.41)	33 (29.20)
Step 1. (oblig.) Announcing present work descriptively and/or purposively	22	30	23
Step 2. (opt.) Presenting research questions or hypotheses	16	13	7
Step 3. (opt.) Definitional clarifications	---	---	---
Step 4. (opt.) Summarizing methods	---	---	---
Step 5. Announcing principal outcomes	---	---	---
Step 6. Stating the value of the p. r.	4	---	---
Step 7. Outlining the structure of the paper	3	---	---

Overall, there does not seem to be a lot of differences between the groups in terms of occurrences of the sub-steps. As can be seen in Table 5, the first two sub-steps “Announcing present work descriptively and/or purposefully” and “Presenting research questions or hypothesis” are the most widely-employed sub-steps of Move 3. Almost all of the article introductions announced present work descriptively and/or purposefully. Some article introductions from the EL2 corpus employed this sub-step more than once. Another subtle difference between the groups lies in the way this sub-step is expressed. The EL1 corpus used what Swales (2011) describes as ‘ontological moves’ 68% of the time, using ‘descriptive language,’ as labeled by Bittencourt dos Santos (1996), to announce their work. They also employed ‘teleological moves’ (Swales, 2011) 13% of the time, as seen in the below excerpt.

(Example 6)

...The present study seeks to illuminate how two preservice L2 writing teachers’ concept of parallelism and how to teach it develops through a team microteaching project in a TESL methodology course... (EL1 24)

The EL2 corpus, on the other hand, preferred to realize the same rhetorical purpose, with a 33% ‘ontological move’ usage and 50% ‘teleological moves’ usage as seen below, using nominal phrases.

(Example 7)

...The main aim of this study is to reveal whether or not English Language teacher trainees at Gazi University Faculty of Education English Language Teaching Department have any difference in their perceived self–efficacy regarding the type of education they get... (EL2 20)

This much discrepancy does not exist in TL1 corpus, for they employed this sub-step, with a 26% ‘teleological moves’ usage and a 39% ‘ontological move’ usage. The two sub-steps, “Stating the value of the present research” and “Outlining the structure of the paper,” are the least employed sub-steps. The sub-steps 3, 4 and 5 were not used at all.

3.5. Cycle patterning in the Introduction section

Analysis of the rhetorical moves and steps of the Introduction has provided us with a deeper insight into how writers from different cultural backgrounds establish a territory, establish a niche, and finally present their works. The analysis has shown that rhetorical moves can exist in (repeated) cycles of moves, as has already been demonstrated (Crookes, 1986; Hopkins & Dudley-Evans; 1988, Kanoksilapatham, 2005; Sheldon, 2011).

Table 6

Move patterns of the three groups

	EL1 f (%)	EL2 f (%)	TL1 f (%)
No. of RAs	25 (100)	25 (100)	25 (100)
1-2-3	16 (64)	9 (36)	11 (44)
1-3-1-2-3	9 (36)	12 (48)	10 (40)
1-2	---	4 (16)	5 (20)
1-3	---	13 (52)	6 (24)

As can be seen in Table 6, 50% of EL1 and TL1 introductions include the moves in a linear order, while only 25 % of EL2 contains the moves in this order. The main departure from Swales' model lies in the cyclical pattern between move 1 and move 2. The one recurring move which violates the linear order is the appearance of Move 3 sub-step 2, presenting research questions or hypotheses, and the reappearance of this move and sub-step in its designated place towards the end of the introductions. This feature is most pronounced in EL2 introductions, for this cyclical pattern exists in almost half of them. Another observation is that almost 20% of EL2 and TL1 introductions include only two moves. In other words, EL2 and TL1 corpora omit Move 2 "Establishing a niche" in 20 and 28 % respectively of their introductions. This omission may be due to risky and more face-threatening feature of this move compared to the other two moves. This finding supports Posteguillo's (1999), Kanoksilapatham's (2005), and Öztürk's (2007), findings. Öztürk (2007), for example, found 30% of the RA introductions in his study differed from the CARS model, as they did not contain Move 2. Yet, this finding contradicts Sheldon's (2011) findings, in that indicating a research gap recurred in English and Spanish article introductions. Overall, interestingly, EL1 and TL1 seem to share more commonalities than, say, EL1 and EL2 or EL2 and TL1. This interesting observation indicates the impact of global discourse community conventions on local discourse conventions. It would not be unrealistic to expect EL2 to look more similar to EL1 as EL2 writers are more likely to follow Anglo-American academic writing conventions and be influenced by them. It is also plausible that the global rise of English might have affected TL1 writers (Pennycook, 1994; Tardy, 2004; Moreno, 2010).

4. Conclusion

This exploratory research sought to investigate the rhetorical organization of English RA introductions by American (EL1) and Turkish academic writers (EL2) and Turkish RA introductions by Turkish academic writers (TL1). This study shows that the three sets of introductions support the general framework suggested by Swales and Sheldon's (2011) adaptation of Swales' (1990, 2004) CARS model. All the introductions employed the three moves (i.e., Move 1, Move 2, and Move 3) to a certain extent. Overall, EL2 and TL1, the corpora by Turkish academic writers displayed resemblance to the established discourse conventions in English. However, they seemed to vary from the established discourse conventions in English in three aspects: they employed Move 2 a lot less, abstaining

especially from indicating gaps in previous research; by employing just two moves (almost 20% of them) and by following a cyclical order (almost half of them), rather than a linear one.

Yet, this does not mean that the two corpora by Turkish academic writers, Turkish and English, are completely uniform. They do show differences especially at a micro level, transgressing the assumption that socio-cultural factors alone can account for the differences in the rhetorical organization of article introductions across different languages. It seems that the causes are far more complicated. Although there are signs that socio-cultural factors seem to influence the rhetorical choices of writers, we have no evidence to make such a strong assertion. In other words, we cannot claim that the features of the rhetorical organization of the two corpora by Turkish academic writers can be attributed solely to the shared cultural background and conventions. To recap, Turkish academic writers, both in their English and Turkish research articles, adhered to their global discourse community conventions, underlining at the same time their sensitivity to their local discourse community conventions.

Given that this study investigated a small corpus of English and Turkish article introductions by American and Turkish academic writers, the results reported here can only reflect the rhetorical organization of the RA introductions in this particular corpus. Therefore, studies with a larger corpus of RA introductions by Turkish and American writers from the same field are needed to verify the findings of this study. Further research might help unearth the causes of the differences observed in English and Turkish RA introductions by Turkish academic writers. Further research might also account for the differences observed in English RA introductions by American and Turkish academic writers to ascertain whether these differences are related to socio-cultural factors such as different intellectual styles and cultural patterns, individual differences, educational background and/or the influence (or lack) of academic writing instruction.

Still, the findings of this study can be useful for teaching English academic writing to novice writers and Turkish EFL students. One implication that can be drawn from this study is that if we can raise novice writers' consciousness about the established English academic writing conventions, and how different socio-cultural factors influence writers' rhetorical choices, we can help them make informed decisions of the preferred rhetorical strategies. In view of the fact that neither BA nor MA students, not even PhD candidates in Turkey are offered enough opportunity to study rhetorical structure of the RA introduction, these young academics' needs should be given due consideration. Their awareness of rhetorical structure and function(s) of the different moves of RA introduction could be raised. Such awareness-raising could be complemented through pedagogical tasks. In such consciousness-raising tasks, they could well be encouraged to explore and reflect on their own writing and the writing practices of others, so that they can make informed choices.

Acknowledgements

This is part of a larger project on academic writing funded by The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TUBITAK).

References

- Ahmad, U. K. (1997). *Scientific research articles in Malay: A situated discourse analysis*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Al-Qahtani, A. A. (2006). *A contrastive rhetoric study of Arabic and English research article introductions*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Oklahoma State University, Oklahoma.

- Arvay, A., & Tanko, G. (2004). A contrastive analysis of English and Hungarian theoretical research article introductions. *IRAL*, 42, 71–100.
- Bittencourt dos Santos, M. (1996). The textual organization of research paper abstracts in applied linguistics. *Text*, 16(4), 481–499.
- Brett, P. (1994). A genre analysis of the result section of sociology articles. *English for Specific Purposes*, 13(1), 47–59.
- Burgess, S. (1997). *Discourse variation across cultures: a genre analysis study of writing on linguistics*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The University of Reading, Reading.
- de Rezende, P. A., & Hemais, B. (2004). Análise comparativa de artigos científicos da área de saúde. *The ESpecialist*, 25(2) 131–152.
- Crookes, G. (1986). Towards a validated analysis of scientific text structure. *Applied Linguistics*, 7, 57–70.
- Duszak, A. (1994). Academic discourse and intellectual styles. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 21, 291–313.
- Fredrickson, K., & Swales, J. M. (1994). Competition and discourse community: Introductions from Nysvenka studier. In B. Gunnarson, B. Nordberg, & P. Linell (Eds.), *Text and talk in professional context* (103–136). Uppsala: ASLA
- Gecikli, M. (2013). A genre-analysis study on the rhetorical organization of English and Turkish PhD theses in the field of English language teaching. *International Journal of Business, Humanities and Technology*, 3(6), 50–58.
- Hirano, E. (2009). Research article introductions in English for specific purposes: A comparison between Brazilian Portuguese and English. *English for Specific purposes*, 28(4), 240–250.
- Holmes, R. (1997). Genre analysis and the social sciences: An investigation of the structure of research article discussion sections in three disciplines. *English for Specific Purposes*, 16, 321–337.
- Hopkins, A., & Dudley-Evans, A. (1988). A genre-based investigation of the discussion sections in articles and dissertations. *English for Specific Purposes*, 7, 113–122.
- Hyland, K. (2000). *Disciplinary discourse: Social interactions in academic writing*. London: Longman.
- Hyland, K. (2001). Humble servants of the discipline? Self-mention in research articles. *English for Specific Purposes*, 29(3), 207–226.
- Hyland, K. (2002). Authority and invisibility: Authorial identity in academic writing. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34, 1091–1112.
- Jogthong, C. (2001). *Research article introductions in Thai: Genre analysis of academic writing*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of West Virginia, Morgantown.
- Kafes, H. (2012). Cultural traces on the rhetorical organization of research article abstracts. *International Journal on New Trends in Education and Their Implications*, 3(3), 207–220.
- Kafes, H. (2016). Cultural or discursual proclivity: Rhetorical structure of English and Turkish research article abstract. *Anthropologist*, 21(2), 240–254.
- Kanoksilapatham, B. (2005). Rhetorical structure of biochemistry research articles. *English Specific Purposes*, 24, 269–292.
- Loi, C. K. (2010). Research article introductions in Chinese and English: a comparative genre-based study. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 9(4), 267–279.
- Martin-Martin, P. (2003). A genre analysis of English and Spanish research paper abstracts in experimental social sciences. *English for Specific Purposes*, 22, 25–43.
- Mauranen, A. (1993). Contrastive ESP rhetoric: Metatext in Finnish-English economics texts. *English for Specific Purposes*, 12, 3–22.

- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: an expanded sourcebook* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.
- Moreno, A. I. (2008). The importance of comparable corpora in cross-cultural studies. In U. Connor, E. Nagelhout, & W. V. Rozycki (Eds.), *Contrastive rhetoric reaching to intercultural rhetoric* (pp. 25-41). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Moreno, A. I. (2010). Researching into English for research publication purposes from an applied intercultural perspective. In M. Ruiz-Garrido, J. Palmer, & I. Fortanet-Gómez (Eds.), *English for professional and academic purposes* (pp. 59-73). Amsterdam: Editions Rodopi B. V.
- Mur Duenas, P. (2008). Analyzing engagement markers cross-culturally: the case of English and Spanish business management research articles. In S. Burgess, & P. Martin-Martin (Eds.), *English as an additional language in research publication and communication* (pp. 197-214). Berlin: Peter Lang.
- Mur Duenas, P. (2009). Logical markers in L1 (Spanish and English) and L2 (English) business research articles. *English Text Construction*, 2(2), 246-264.
- Öztürk, I. (2007). The textual organization of research article introductions in applied linguistics: Variability within a single discipline. *English for Specific Purposes*, 26(1), 25-38.
- Paltridge, B. (1994). Genre analysis and the identification of textual boundaries. *Applied Linguistics*, 15, 288-299.
- Pennycook, A. (1994). *The cultural politics of English as an international language*. London: Longman.
- Posteguillo, S. (1999). The schematic structure of computer science research articles. *English for Specific Purposes*, 18(2), 139-158.
- Samraj, B. (2002). Introductions in research articles: variation across disciplines. *English for Specific Purposes*, 21(1), 1-17.
- Samraj, B. (2005). An exploration of a genre set: Research article abstracts and introductions in two disciplines. *English for Specific Purposes*, 24, 141-156.
- Sheldon, E. (2011). Rhetorical differences in RA introductions written by English L1 and L2 and Castilian Spanish L1 writers. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 10, 238-251.
- Shim, E. (2005). *Explicit writing instruction in higher educational contexts: genre analysis of research article introductions from the English Teaching and TESOL Quarterly Journals*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Minnesota, Minnesota.
- Swales, J. M. (1981). *Aspects of article introductions*. Birmingham, UK: The Language Studies Unit, University of Aston.
- Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Swales, J. M. (2004). *Research genres: Exploration and applications*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Swales, J. M. (2011). *Aspects of article introductions*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Tardy, C. (2004). The role of English in scientific communication: lingua franca or Tyrannosaurus rex? *English for Academic Purposes*, 3, 247-269.
- Taylor, G., & Chen, T. (1991). Linguistic, cultural, and sub-cultural issues in contrastive discourse analysis: Anglo-American and Chinese scientific texts. *Applied Linguistics*, 12(3), 319-336.
- Thompson, D. (1993). Arguing for experimental facts in science. *Written Communication*, 10, (1), 106-128.

- Vassileva, I. (1998). "Who am I/who are we in academic writing? A contrastive analysis of authorial presence in English, German, French, Russian and Bulgarian". *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 8, 163-189.
- Williams, I. (1999). Results sections of medical research articles. *English for Specific Purposes*, 18(4), 347–366.
- Yang, R., & Allison, D. (2003). Research articles in applied linguistics: Moving from results to conclusions. *English for Specific Purposes*, 22, 365–387.