

Genre analysis of linguistics research introductions

¹Anthony Porras and ²Sajed S. Ingilan

¹St. John Paul II College of Davao, Philippines

²University of Southeastern Philippines, Davao City Philippines

Email: sajedingilan@yahoo.com

Date received: March 31, 2017

Date accepted: April 3, 2017

Date published: December 16, 2017

ABSTRACT

The emergence of exploring genre analysis has been a trend in Applied Linguistics, not only for its interesting factor, but also because of its pedagogical implications. This study aimed to determine the overall structure, specifically the presence and conformity of moves and steps of the research introductions in the field of Linguistics. Twelve (12) available research introductions were analyzed using Create-A-Research-Space (CARS) model. The findings revealed that moves and steps across the research introductions are present. Majority of the research introductions conformed to the CARS model, but did not necessarily follow the suggested sequence. Results imply that teachers of research writing should acknowledge and introduce the CARS model as a basis for teaching the method of writing research introductions effectively.

Keywords: *Genre, Analysis, Moves, Philippines.*

INTRODUCTION

The concept of genre has recently received significant regard from linguists and researchers (Dudley-evans, 1988; Swales, 1990; Anthony, 1999), even educators (Bhatia, 1993; Pennycook, 1994; Hyland, 2000) across the globe. Genre studies are not only interesting because of its dynamicity, but also a close analysis on technical texts served with greater purpose in academes. Swales and Feak (2009) considered genre as a type of text or discourse which achieves certain goals in communication. Through genre analysis, different genres are distinguished from the other by describing their rhetorical structure, in which moves and steps are used. Moves were defined as a segment of which possessed by both of writers' purpose and content they wish to communicate (Crossley, 2007). The totality of moves or the overall purpose would then dictate its accepted linguistic convention shared by the participants of the same communicative event, qualifying it to produce its own unique genre.

Many genre-based researchers have dealt with the overall structure of introductions, discussions, and conclusions in different types of corpora such as theses (Gecikli, 2013), research articles (Kanoksilapatham, 2007), and dissertations (Arulandu, 2006). Rhetorical moves are primarily observed and identified from the different models such of Swales' (2004), Yang and Allison's (2003), and Bunton's (2005) respectively. The research paper has considerably become a famous corpus for genre analysis as there are a variety of genres present in every research paper depending on their respective domains.

Samraj's (2002) study analyzed Research Article Introductions (RAIs) of two related fields, Wildlife Behavior and Conservation Biology. In both Wildlife Behavior and Conservation Biology Introductions, Centrality Claims (Move 1) were observed to manifest promotional strategies in the texts. The Move 2 (Establishing a Niche), which aims for the gap indication, was clearly present, and Move 3 (Occupying the Niche) was generally elaborated by outlining purposes and announcing present research. Samraj posits that both domains conform to Swales' CARS model, but differ in

presenting the background of the research as Conservation Biology Introductions present real world matters, while Wildlife Behavior Introductions are more concern with the epistemic view in research.

There are also researchers who specifically focused on research introductions, which is considered to be the most difficult to start for students (Shi & Wannaruk, 2014). It has been observed that students have poor skills in presenting the output in a conventionally accepted and rhetorically effective way (Hsu, Y. & Kuo, C., 2007). Even those who possessed a background in research find it hard to finish the entire composition.

The study of Briones (2012) on move analysis examined 30 Philosophy Research Article (RA) Introductions per sentence level, taken from the selected journal publications of the University of Santo Tomas. Results revealed that research articles in the field of Philosophy carry their own distinctive features. With the utilization of Move 1, presenting the background is apparent to the majority of Philosophy RAs. Briones also observed that the obligatory Move 2 were not as prevalent in this discipline and in Move 3, most frequently used statements are purpose of the research and nature of the research. Although findings have shown similarities with Swales' CARS model, minor nuances were still observed.

Fernandez (2016) also assessed the content and structure of the introductions of the undergraduate research papers of the three different programs in College of Arts and Sciences of the University of Southeastern Philippines. Establishing a research territory (Move 1) through claiming centrality (Step 1) and reviewing previous research (Step 3), establishing a niche (Move 2) through highlighting a problem (Step 1B) and presenting justification (Step 1F), and occupying the niche (Move 3) through announcing research descriptively and announcing research purposefully (Steps 1A and 1B respectively) were common to all three programs.

Although a lot of researches are present on genre analysis, only few studies are conducted locally especially for researches in the field of Linguistics. This paved the way for the researcher to explore the analysis of different moves and steps present in the research paper introductions in Linguistics, extracting its distinct and unique characteristics from other disciplines. Primarily, this study aimed to identify the moves and steps, as well as the sequences found in the Linguistics Research Introductions on studies presented during the First International Conference on Language and Linguistics held in Davao City in August, 2014.

METHOD

This is a qualitative study which employed genre analysis of conference papers presented at the First International Conference in Language and Linguistics hosted by the University of Southeastern Philippines in Davao City last August 2014. The research introductions of conference papers served as the corpora of the study which were collected from the secretary of the Linguistics Society of Mindanao (LSM). The moves, steps, sequences, and conformity of research introductions were analyzed using Swales' (1990) Create-A-Research-Space (CARS) model. Due to restricted access and availability of conference files, the corpora are only limited to twelve (12) research introductions. Since the analysis of moves and steps is considered to be subjective, the researchers conducted the process of validation made by the experts in the field of Applied Linguistics.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Moves and steps found in the linguistics research introductions

Table 1. Moves and steps found in research introductions

Moves and Steps	Steps		Moves	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Move 1 Establishing a Territory			12	37.5
Step 1 Claiming Centrality	5	10.87	-	-
Step 2 Topic Generalization	6	13.04	-	-
Step 3 Reviewing Items from Previous Research	10	21.74	-	-
Move 2 Establishing a Niche			8	25
Step 1a Counter-claiming	1	2.17	-	-
Step 1b Indicating a Gap	7	15.22	-	-
Step 1c Question Raising	-	-	-	-
Step 1d Continuing the Tradition	-	-	-	-
Move 3 Occupying the Niche			12	37.5
Step 1a Outlining Purposes	9	19.57	-	-
Step 1b Announcing Present Research	6	13.04	-	-
Step 2 Announcing Principal Findings	2	4.35	-	-
Step 3 Indicating RA Structure	-	-	-	-
Total	46	100	32	100

The Table 1 shows that the three moves from Swales' (1990) were present in the Linguistics Research Introductions. There were a total of 32 occurrences of moves identified in all of the corpora. The three moves of Swales' (1990) CARS Model were utilized in the Linguistics Research Introductions. *Move 1 Establishing a Territory* has a total of 12 occurrences or 37.5%; *Move 2 Establishing a Niche* with 8 occurrences or 25%; and *Move 3 Occupying the Niche* with 12 occurrences or 37.5%. On the other hand, there were also a total of 46 occurrences of steps identified in all of the corpora. For Move 1 Establishing a Territory, *Step 1 Claiming Centrality* had 5 occurrences or 10.87%; *Step 2 Topic Generalization* had 6 occurrences or 13.04%; and *Step 3 Reviewing Items from Previous Research* with 10 or 21.74%.

For Move 2 Establishing a Niche, Step 1a Counter-claiming had one (1) occurrence or 2.17%; and Step 1b Indicating a Gap with 7 occurrences or 15.22%. For Move 3 Occupying the Niche, Step 1a Outlining Purposes had 9 occurrences or 19.57%; Step 1b Announcing Present Research had 6 occurrences or 13.04%; and Step 2 Announcing Principal Findings had 2 occurrences or 4.35%.

Linguistics researchers primarily utilized Centrality Claims (Step 1) by predominantly emphasizing the topic's significance in the real world. This was one characteristic that was observed in the investigation of LRIs where 9 out of 12 studies expressed the topic in general way and elicited great importance. This finding ran parallel with the analysis of Samraj (2002) in the fields of Conservation Biology and Wildlife Behavior where it was discussed that the primary Step 1 in Move 1 seem to be made in two ways. One of the two ways is inserting assertions about the importance of the topic being discussed and this was apparent in half or six of the Wildlife Behavior Introductions. Example of excerpt was mentioned below:

Politeness plays an **important role** in human communication . . . can throw **great impact** upon the success of communication. . .

. . . it is **very important** to create an **efficient** teacher-student interaction within the classroom . . . can be a **great tool** to ease the gap between the students' perception and teacher's intention because it will lessen the division that goes along with it. . . teachers and students contributes to a comfortable classroom atmosphere, which is an **important aspect** of learning.

-Manlulu (2014), Preference of Students on the Politeness Strategies of the College of Arts and Sciences Faculty

In this excerpt, the lexical item “*important*” was being reiterated in the entire course of Step 1 and was being supported with other lexical terms such as “*great impact*”, “*very efficient*”, and “*great tool*”. The writer was trying to orient the readers by establishing the importance of research in classroom scenarios. It was further elaborated by explaining topic's various purposes that have great pedagogical implications.

On the other hand, in contrast with the excerpt presented above that asserted importance in the real world, there was only one introduction that established centrality about the importance of the topic in the research area as shown in the excerpt below.

The notion of pragmatics' unteachability **has been a challenge** for foreign and second language teaching . . . can **benefit** the **development** of pragmatic competence . . . **Many** linguists and language researchers **have posted questions** . . . Those questions **have inspired a number** of research projects, methods, and approaches **exploring** the role of instruction in the learner's pragmatic development.

. . . most curriculum designers, language teachers, instructors, and researchers **focused mainly** on the development of the learners' communicative competence in . . . **significance** of pragmatic competence development. . . linguists and language researchers **have still asserted** that pragmatics should always be integrated to communicative language teaching in order **to hasten** the **development** of pragmatic competence of language learners . . . pragmatic competence of the learners **should be developed** hand in hand with communicative competence and **should not be left behind**.

-Rayon and Sandoval (2013), Effects of Task-Based Language Teaching Method on the Pragmatic Competence of College Freshmen

An explicit rhetorical function can be observed in the excerpt shown above. The researchers were trying to show that the topic is a relatively well-established and lively area of research through lexical quantifiers such as “*many*” and “*a number of*”. They were describing the status quo of the topic's research activity and acknowledging the works conducted by previous researchers. Problematic concerns were also being asserted based on the current activities, models, and methods developed. Centrality claim in this excerpt specifies the aspect of communicative competence which is the pragmatic competence that needs to be given emphasis. The lexical items included “*should be developed*” and “*should not be left behind*”.

Linguistics Research Introductions (LRIs) utilized **Topic Generalization (Step 2)** in Establishing a Research Territory (Move 1). A total of 13.04 % was identified in the Linguistics Research Introduction wherein writers made use of this step in establishing research territory. Writers in the field of Linguistics asserted territory by giving a statement of generally known information. This

result was connected to Fernandez's (2016) findings in which she observed that the three undergraduate programs of College of Arts and Sciences at the University of Southeastern Philippines commonly gave a general statement of the topic under study. Swales (1990) claimed that Topic Generalization (Step 2) "consists with the statements concerning the current state of knowledge, practice, consensus, or description of phenomena." Sample of this manifestation was shown below.

Profanity is always considered taboo and is often prohibited in various societies. . . the direct connotation is that it **is against anything holy or against any . . . the person who utters profanity is considered** either secular, atheist, immoral, irreligious or downright evil. . . other forms of profanity deal with effluvia, which **is the cover term** for bodily secretions either in gaseous, liquid or solid forms. The **level of profanity** associated with various bodily secretions **depends** upon the society.

Ingilan and Jubilado (2014), Expressing Profanity in Filipino Muslim Languages

The writers in this excerpt supplied a rhetorical function of espousing the topic with their respective schemas (without citations). It can be observed that the writers provided extensive and informative supporting details on generalizing the phenomena in the society. For instance, "profanity", the topic of the study, was elaborated with explanations along its "*direct connotation*" and descriptions that arose from "*the person who utters*" it. It was supplemented with a concrete backdrop against which "topic themes are set." The manifestation of using present tenses (both simple and linking verbs such as *is* and *depends*) is apparent. Carter (2003) viewed that writers should be knowledgeable of using passive verbs since this led to more words that were not necessary and results to say the same thing. Hence, in order for research to be effective, use of active verbs were recommended as to what the writers utilized in their introduction.

Still in adherence to Swales' CARS Model, the most prevalent Move 1 Step found in the Linguistics Research Introductions was the Step 3 Reviewing Items from Previous Research with a totality of 21.74 %. It can be implied that discourse participants belong in the Linguistics domain were fully aware on establishing their research territories by reviewing items from previous research, knowing that this is an obligatory step in Move 1. The observation was highly inclined with the study of Gecikli (2013) where 20 PhD Theses were analyzed. Gecikli's corpora included 10 Turkish and 10 English Introduction Sections. The findings in Gecikli's study revealed that 100% of both Turkish and English PhD Thesis Introductions frequently used Step 3 Reviewing Items from Previous Research in manifesting the research territory's establishment. One possible reason why Gecikli's study had similar findings with the present study was that, both studies had "cognate" domains since the corpora from Gecikli's study belonged to the field of English Language Teaching (ELT).

In addition, Briones (2012) posited that such "discourse feature (pertaining to Step 3) in the research corpora was expected because background information based on the research article writer's schema, no matter how extensive, will still be insufficient in the absence of supplementary review of previous research." Below was the sample of excerpt from LRIs that utilized Step 3.

There are many ways in order to develop literacy and one of these ways is through learning writing. In the formal education system, learning writing is apparently dependent on writing instruction. The main job of improving students' writing proficiency is therefore given to teachers (Polio, 2003).

Risonar (2014), Teacher Cognition in Assessing Writing

In the excerpt, the rhetorical function of this literature review was to support the centrality claim of the topic “literacy” in the preceding sentences. These lines served as a back up to give additional information to make the Step 1 (Centrality Claim) portray its purpose in giving the importance of the study. The writer also made use of non-integral citation (citing the author in parenthesis only) which showed deliberation in the use of citation. This became a strategic function not only as a support to centrality claims or topic generalizations, but also to entice reader’s attention for further reading. One way to prove this was that the researcher observed the increasing specificity happening where the topic was directed to writing.

Far from other writers’ creativity in establishing a territory which is the most frequently employed statements; it was also observed that one researcher utilized Move 1 in the use of quotation. This was labeled Step 2 in this study since primary rhetoric function is to provide background information of “*balarila*” (grammar). The writer was asserting the principal scenario of the Filipino language with its description in the Philippine context. It was noteworthy to mention this creative manner of presenting Move 1 which was not previously identified, although labeled as Step 2 in Swales’ CARS model. Briones (2012) interpreted this objective as an implication that writer in this field of study “exercise flexibility in ensuring that their articles will appeal to the readers from the start up to the end.” Example was presented below:

Ang aking Balarila ay hindi gawang Diyos kung
Kaya magbabago at magbabago sa pagdating
Ng takdang panahon

-Lope K. Santos

(Excerpt taken from Bateria, 2014)

Among the Steps observed in Move 2, only one corpus utilized this move that served as contradicting statements from previous claims of the researcher or Step 1A.

Ngunit mangyaring marami ang **tumutol** dito at hindi nagkagusto sa ilang mga kadahilanan kaya ito ay **pansamantalang ipinahintong** ituro sa paaralan.

Bateria (2014), Ang Intelihibilidad at Akseptabilidad ng Walong Dagdag na Letra sa Pagsulat at Pagbaybay sa Wikang Filipino

The writer in the excerpt made use the word “*Ngunit*” (However/But), a negation that indicated contradiction against the notion of previous researchers in establishing the different rules in standardization of having a national language. The presence of negative verbs such as “*tumutol*” (contradicted) and “*pansamantalang ipinahintong ituro*” (temporarily ceased/stopped to be taught) were worth notable in mentioning counter claims. The writer was more concerned with the conflicting truths averred by previous known information that new rules upon language may be adhered in different scenarios.

With the assumption of the researcher that the field of Linguistics can be counted as a large discourse community, it was expected that indication of gap will be apparent in the corpora. The Move 2 of Swales’ CARS model was an obligatory move. However, only 15.22 % of Linguistics Research Introductions employed this step in establishing the niche. The corpora revealed that Move 2 Step 1B was not as prevalent in this field, knowing that Linguistics Society of Mindanao (LSM) and the Language Department of University of Southeastern Philippines where majority of the corpora were gathered were continuously conducting seminars, conferences, and other colloquiums, the researcher

viewed this to be relatively low for an active research community. It can be postulated that researchers in this particular field did not need to compete with other researchers similar to the results of Samraj (2002) where Master theses introductions revealed the non-prevalence of specific research gaps. Some of the samples that revealed this step are presented below:

However, in the University of Southeastern Philippines, the researcher **has not come across** any study on politeness **yet**.

Manlulu (2014), Preference of Students on the Politeness Strategies of the College of Arts and Sciences Faculty

In the excerpt, the indication of research gap was manifested with the utilization of negative lexical items “*However*,” “*not*”, and “*yet*.” The writer provided the information to the readers that niche must be established since he “*has not come across any study*” about the topic. This implied that there was a need for studies since there are no researches conducted locally.

In preparing for the present study, majority of the writers in Linguistics most commonly stated the objectives of their research. This was typically located at the end of the Linguistics Research Introductions. From the researcher’s point of view, it was recommendable to point the goal of the study at the end part of the introduction, not only for the conventional purpose as what the discourse community dictated, but also this process suggested smoothly knitted ideas. Example for which was presented below:

It is for such reason that the **researcher** found it necessary **to design** a communicative competence test for English 1 (Study and Thinking Skills) following the framework of Canale and Swain (1980) and subject it to item response analysis (Rasch, 1980).

Roble (2014), A Model for Communicative Competence Test: Basis for Syllabus Enhancement

The writers in the sampled excerpt mentioned or put forward the aims of the current research. The use of infinitives like “*to find out*”, “*to determine*”, and “*to design*” was observable for presenting objectives since these were considered to be linguistic signals in producing purposive statements. It was also noteworthy to mention the use of the word *researcher*. The use of pronoun ‘I’ is strictly prohibited in the Philippine context despite the observation of Swales (1990) in which first person pronouns are frequently found. This was similar to Jogthong’s (2001) claim that Thai authors avoid to use pronoun ‘I’ since this was quite not acceptable for writing academic papers in Thailand.

A total of 13.04 % of Linguistics Research Introductions utilized this Step 1B Presenting the Objectives of Study. The sample that manifested this phenomenon was shown below.

The linguistic varieties **these** languages are those spoken in Davao Region in the Philippines. Kagan speakers, who are also called Davawenyo Muslims, and the Bahasa Sug speakers, called Tausugs, are believers of Islam. **This research delves** into the influence of Islam in the use of profanity among speakers of Kagan and Bahasa Sug from the sentential level to the conceptual structures associated with the expressions of profanity through lexicological analysis (Coleman and Kay, 2000).

Ingilian (2014), Expressing Profanity in Filipino Muslim Languages

The excerpt provided background information to the readers about the parameters which were only exclusive on the languages “*spoken in Davao Region*” from “*Kagan and “Bahasa Sug speakers*” of the study. It was further elaborated on delving with the “*influence of the use of profanity*” among the said speakers. A rhetorical function, which was descriptively utilized by the writer, prompted for the presentation of the research. This gave reinforcement to the readers on to what extent the scope of the research was focused which increased specificity. A similar finding was consistent to the study of Habibi (2008) where 16 Research Article Introductions (80%) in the field of Sociolinguistics employed this step. The use of inanimate agent such as “*This research delves*” and the use of demonstrative pronouns (*This* and *these*) were observed that pertains to the current research.

Announcing principal findings was the less frequent step employed based on the summary of the steps in Move 3 with 4.35 % were employed in the Linguistics Research Introductions. Only few researchers had used this step and this was also one of the rare strategies encountered by the researcher in occupying the niche. The finding was in line with the study of McMahan (2013) where only 6 occurrences were found in revealing outcomes in Spanish Teachers’ Introductions. Excerpt that manifest this step was presented below:

The study has **revealed** how elections affect the use and meaning of signs in editorial cartoons to depict the certain event. Also, socio-cultural and political contexts within the society **are discussed and raised** during this national event. There is indeed awareness that editorial cartoons mirror socio-cultural and political contexts which the study did so through the use of semiotic concepts. Furthermore, the study **increased** the use of semiotic concepts as a means of **revealing** the meaning of signs present in the editorial cartoons.

Atok (2014), A Semiotic Analysis of Editorial Cartoons

In this excerpt, the writer indicated how “*elections affect the use and meaning of signs in editorial cartoons*” as the preliminary results of the study in a surface level. Primary reason for this was that, it will be further elaborated in the previous sections of the study. Hence, indicating the results in full-blown description will not make any sense. However, the writer added the principal finding “*that there is indeed awareness*” based on the “*editorial cartoons which mirrors political and socio-cultural contexts.*” It can also be observed that the lexical items used were in past form and suggest an informative function such as “*revealed*”, “*are discussed and raised*”, and “*increased*”.

Sequences of moves found in the linguistics research introductions

Table 2. Sequences of moves found in the linguistics research introductions

Corpus	Sequence
1	M1(S2)(S3)(S2) → M3(S1A)(S1B)
2	M1(S1)(S3) → M2(S1B) → M1(S3) → M2(S1B) → M1(S3) → M2(S1B) → M1(S3) → M2(S1B) → M3(S1A)
3	M2(S1B) → M1(S3) → M2(S1B) → M1(S3) → M3(S1A)
4	M1(S2)(S1)(S3) → M2(S1B) → M1(S3) → M3(S1A)
5	M1(S2)(S3) → M2(S1B) → M1(S2) → M3(S1A)
6	M1(S1) → M2(S1A) → M1(S3) → M2(S1A) → M3(S1A)
7	M1(S1)(S2) → M3(S1A)
8	M1(S2)(S3)(S2)(S3) → M3(S1B) → M1(S3) → M3(S1A)(S1B)
9	M1(S3) → M2(S1B) → M1(S3) → M3(S1A)(S1B)
10	M1(S2)(S3)(S2)(S3)(S1)(S3) → M2(S1B) → M3(S2)(S1A)
11	M1(S3) → M2(S1B) → M3(S1B)
12	M1(S3) → M3(S2)(S1B)(S1A)(S1B)

The table showed the move sequences found from the different corpus of the study. It can be observed that nuances among the structure of moves are present. Different writers have different ways of presenting the study based on how they sequenced the moves. However, there were still introductions which possessed the same sequence in terms of the overall structure with other introductions despite the minimal amount of corpus gathered.

The most prevalent sequence found in the research corpora were the M1-M3 sequence and M1-M2-M1-M3 sequences which were also present in 3 out of 12 or 25% of Linguistics Research Introductions found in Corpus 1, 7 and 12, and Corpus 4, 5, and 9 respectively. This finding was similar to Hirano's (2009) analysis where Brazilian Portuguese writers preferred this move sequence with 4 occurrences out of 10 Research Article Introductions utilized the M1-M3 organizational structure.

Another move sequence found was the original structure of the Swales' CARS Model, which is the M1-M2-M3. 2 out of 12 or 16.67% LRIs employed this sequence. This opposed to the results in the study of Salom et al. (2008) where the M1-M2-M3 move structure was found in half of the Spanish PhD theses analyzed, showing the cognitively natural structure of moving from general to specific when presenting information.

Other move structure such as M1-M2-M1-M2-M3 (8.33%), M1-M3-M1-M3 (8.33%), M1-M2-M1-M2-M1-M2-M1-M2-M3 (8.33%), and M2-M1-M2-M1-M3 (8.33%) were also found in the research corpora.

Although majority of the Linguistics Research Introductions' move sequence is cyclical, there are still sequences which are linear in nature. Linear sequence is described as a sequence with no recurring moves such as M1-M3 and M1-M2-M3. On the other hand, cyclic sequence is referred to as a sequence with repetitive moves. Examples were M1-M2-M1-M3, M1-M3-M1-M3-M1-M2-M1-M2-M1-M2-M1-M2-M3, and M2-M1-M2-M3. This phenomenon exists because, as mentioned, different writers possessed different perspectives based on the manner of presenting his or her thoughts. The organization of writer's communicative purpose or move may vary or depend on his or her schemata.

Conformity of linguistics research introductions

The researchers based the concept of conformity in terms of the moves and the overall structure since moves were considered to be the communicative purposes and the overall structure or totality of moves would dictate the distinct genre of the corpora.

In the aspect of moves, Research Introductions in Linguistics appeared for the most part to utilize the Moves of Swales' CARS Model with a greater emphasis in Move 1 and Move 3 which was exhibited by 100 % of the Linguistics Research Introductions. The most notable difference was the absence of Move 2 in some of the corpora under study where only 58% of the corpora employed the said move. A total of 66.67 % or 8 out of 12 Linguistics Research Introductions conformed to Swales' CARS Model through their moves while a total of 33.33% or 4 out of 12 Linguistics Research Introductions did not. It was noteworthy to mention that writers possessed different schemas. There was a variety of perspectives on how a researcher can express his or her aims since the framework provided by Swales (1990) was meant to describe, not to prescribe, though there were moves that were obligatory since this was an essential segment for an inductive structure of an introduction.

In connection to this, one factor could be the differences among the corpora or a lack of unity in terms of genre. There were studies from a different type of genre such as dissertations, Master theses, Baccalaureate theses, etc that might possess different writing conventions. Another relative factor that can be the cause of these nuances was their academic background as other universities or colleges may have different mechanics or technicalities introduced. In relation for these assumptions, significant results for the overall structure revealed that only 16.67% of the Linguistics Research Introductions strictly followed and conformed to the suggested pattern of M1-M2-M3 based on the said model, while 83.33% Linguistics Research Introductions opted to organize their own structure.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Based on the gathered findings, the moves and steps from Swales' (1990) CARS Model were present in the Linguistics Research Introductions. The pervasive sequence found among the Linguistics Research Introductions was cyclic. A relatively high percentage of Linguistics Research Introductions conformed to the Swales' CARS model, but did not necessarily follow the suggested sequence.

Based on the foregoing findings and conclusions, teachers of research writing should acknowledge and introduce Moves and Steps from Swales' CARS Model as a basis for teaching the method of writing research introductions effectively. Students are advised to apply the knowledge gained to build appropriate schemata which aid in the development of their writing skills. They should also appreciate the value of conducting research. Researchers are encouraged to employ the rhetorical structure of the Swales' CARS Model. They should also be aware with the writing conventions in their respective fields. For future researchers, the researcher proposes to conduct further studies in Genre Analysis, but explore other sub-genres of research, delve with other domains, and increase the number of corpora.

REFERENCES

- Arulandu, M. (2006). A Genre Analysis of Master's and Doctoral Dissertations in the Sciences and Social Sciences. A Published Master Thesis, Universiti Putra Malaysia.
- Bazerman, C. (1988). Shaping Written Knowledge: The Genre and Activity of the Experimental Article in Science. Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Bhatia, V. J. (1997). Genre-mixing in Academic Introductions. English for Specific Purposes.

- Briones, R. (2012). Move Analysis of Philosophy Research Article Introductions Published in the University of Santo Tomas. *Philippine ESL Journal*.
- Bunton, D. (2005). The Structure of PhD Conclusion Chapters. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*.
- Carter, R. (2003). Talking and Creating International Language, Creativity, and Context. *English Language and Literature Journal*.
- Crossley, N. (2007). Research in Embodiment by Way of Body Techniques. University of Manchester.
- Dudley-evans, T. (1997). Genre Models for the Teaching of Academic Writing to Second Language Speakers: Advantages and Disadvantages. In T. Miller (Ed.), *Functional Approaches to Written Text: Classroom Applications* (pp. 150-159). Washington, DC: USA.
- Fernandez, I. (2016). Discourse Analysis of Research Introductions and its Pedagogical Implications to ESL Writing Classroom. *The Philippine ESL Journal, Volume 17* (1718-2298). Retrieved from <https://www.elejournals.com/1441/2016/pealj/philippine-esl-journal-volume-17-july-2016/>.
- Gecikli, M. (2013). A Genre-analysis Study on the Rhetorical Organization of English and Turkish PhD Theses in the Field of English Language
- Habibi, P. (2008). Genre Analysis of Research Article Introductions across ESP, Psycholinguistics, and Sociolinguistics. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*.
- Hashima, N. (2014). Rhetorical Structures in Academic Research Writers by Non-native Writers. *International Journal of Higher Education*.
- Hirano, E. (2009). Research Article Introductions in English for Specific Purposes: A Comparison between Brazilian Portuguese and English. *English for Specific Purposes*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.09.298>.
- Huttner, J. (2010). The Potential of Purpose-built Corpora in the Analysis of Students' Academic Writing in English. *Journal of Research Writing*.
- Hsu, Y. & Kuo, C. (2007). Writing RA Introduction: Difficulties and Strategies. Hsinchu, Taiwan.
- Jogthong, C. (2001). Research Article Introductions in Thai: Genre Analysis of Academic. Doctoral Dissertation, West Virginia University
- Kanoksilapatham, B. (2007). Writing Scientific Research Articles in Thai and English: Similarities and Differences. *Silpakorn University International Journal*..
- Martin, J. R. (2001). *Language, Register, and Genre*. London : Routledge, Macquarie University.
- Mcmahon, C. M. (2013). Applied Genre Analysis: The Case of Introductions in Spanish Teacher Trainees' Curriculum Design Documents. *Development of Applied Linguistics Journal*.
- Miller, C. R. (1984). Genre as a Social Action. *Quarterly Journal Speech*.
- Nwogu, K. N. (1997). The Medical Research Paper: Structure and Functions. *English for Specific Purposes*.

- Salom, L. et al. (2008). The Move Structure of the Introductory Sections of Spanish PhD Theses. Universidad Politecnica de Valencia.
- Samraj, B. (2002). A Discourse Analysis of Master's Theses across Disciplines with a Focus on Introductions. English for Specific Purposes.
- Samraj, B. (2002). Introductions in Research Articles: Variations Across Disciplines. The American University: Elsevier Science Ltd.
- Swales, J. & Feak, C. (2009). Academic Writing for Graduate Students. University of Michigan Press.
- Swales J. (2004). Research Genres: Explorations and Applications. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Swales J. (1990). Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Swales J. & Feak, C. (1994). Academic Writing for Graduate Students: Essential Tasks and Skills. Ann Arbor, Michigan: The University of Michigan Press.
- Shi, H. & Wannaruk, A. (2014). Rhetorical Structure of Research Articles in Agricultural Sciences. *English Language Teaching Journal*. Published by Canadian Center of Science and Education.
- Yang, R. & Allison, D. (2003). Research Articles in Applied Linguistics: Moving from Results to Conclusions. English for Specific Purposes.

