

## Schematic Sequence and Moves in MPhil Theses Introductory Chapters: A Genre Analysis

Wasima Shehzad

Akhtar Abbas

### Abstract

*Exploration of academic discourse of academic genres has been a focus of attention of many scholars (Paltridge, 2015, Basturkmen, 2014, Swales, 2012, 1990; Hyland, 2009; Shehzad, 2007, 2008, 2010, 2011; Bhatia, 2006 and Bunton, 2002) for the last twenty years in native and non-native contexts. However, the academic genres produced in Pakistan have not got the attention of scholars yet. Continuing the international tradition of analyzing genre knowledge, the current study aims at the analysis of MPhil theses' introduction chapters in the disciplines of Linguistics and Literature produced in Pakistan by applying the genre theory of Swales (1990). At macro level, genre analysis was conducted to explore the rhetorical organization of the introductory chapters qualitatively and quantitatively by adopting CARS (Create A Research Space) model proposed by Swales (2004). Contrary to other CARS based studies, M3M1, M1M3 and M3M3 were found as dominant move sequences with dominant occurrence of Move 3 (228).*

**Keywords:** *Genre analysis, move, academic writing, thesis*

### 1. Introduction

Genre study has achieved a recognizable status in the field of research related to discourse analysis in broader spectrum and has been recognized as a distinct domain of knowledge. Genres in general and academic genres in particular witness and have been proven successful in converging the attention of discourse analysts in general and genre analysts in particular across disciplines. Many genre analyses from the ecology of intercultural and intra-cultural academic settings have been produced. Some of them from different academic settings are: academic essays (Nelson, 1993; Lillis, 2001; and Hinkel, 2002), book reviews (Becher & Trowler, 2001; Hyland, 2004; Tse & Hyland, 2008) research articles (Swales, 1990; Shehzad, 2007, 2008, 2010 & 2011), referees' comments on research article submissions (2015) and theses and dissertations (Bunton, 1998, 2002; Bloor, 1996; Paltridge, 2002 & Pearson and Brew, 2002).

Unfortunately, academic and research genres produced in the English language remain unexplored in Pakistan despite the fact that English is the official language (Rahman, 2010) and taught as a second language. Higher Education Commission, Pakistan has made research mandatory for graduate degrees. Thus,

the present situation calls for a need to address the discursive practices of Pakistani research discourse including lexico-grammatical resources, schematic/rhetorical structures and contextualization of the discourse in all disciplines. Through the current study we make an effort to explore textual/rhetorical organization of the introductory chapters of MPhil theses of Linguistics and Literature produced at universities by applying CARS model of Swales (2004).

While writing the introduction of dissertation/thesis, the writer has to decide about many things such as the background information; claims and credence to stance by the readership and approach directness, therefore, the schematic/rhetorical patterns of theses' introduction section was the major focus of the current research. Various models have been suggested for writing academic introductions based on the analyses of several multidisciplinary research articles/theses such as Problem-Solution model by Zappen (1983) and CARS (Create A Research Space) model by Swales (1990, 2004). Recent practices in applied linguistics show predominance of the application of CARS model on RA introductions by many scholars (Swales & Najjar 1987; Shehzad, 2008, 2010, 2011 and Bunton 1998, 2002). Most of the studies, mentioned above, are based on CARS model proposed by Swales in 1990 and there are few studies based on the revised CARS model suggested by Swales in 2004. Moreover, the CARS model 2004 can not only be used as framework to explore academic genres but its viability as a pedagogical model is also generic. Therefore, the current study followed the revised model of 2004 to investigate schematic sequence and moves in the introductory chapters of MPhil theses.

### **1.1 Statement of the Problem**

Writing dissertations/theses in academic English is considered a challenging task by the novice researchers. In Pakistan, most of the students do not have any experience of conducting research at under-graduate level. Research and dissertation has recently been made mandatory at Master level in Linguistics and Literature. Although a course on research methodologies is part of the most curricula; and workshops on academic English are also organized by Higher Education Commission, Pakistan, they are not sufficient to fulfill the needs of the novice researchers. There are no published guidelines available in most of the universities in Pakistan for writing thesis. Hence, to understand the research discourse, it becomes imperative to study the schematic patterns of the theses produced by Pakistani researchers.

### **1.2 Research Questions**

- 1) What rhetorical patterns are preferred by researchers in MPhil theses' introduction chapters of Linguistics and Literature?

- 2) What is the frequency of each *move* and *step* in MPhil theses' introduction chapters of Linguistics and Literature?
- 3) How can other CARS based studies be compared with the findings of the current study?

## 2. Literature Review

### 2.1 Analyzing Academic and Research Genres

There are several reasons of growing interest in genre analysis of academic genres in general and research genres in particular. One of the reasons is the flourishing tradition of research and growing number of writers in both native and non-native contexts. These writers have been classified into two categories by Swales (2004) to avoid the stereotypical dichotomy of native versus non-native. These two categories are *Broadly English Proficient* scholars (Senior Scholars) and *Narrowly English Proficient* Scholars (Junior Scholars). To provide avenues of success to these junior scholars genre analysts are playing their role by exploring various academic practices in the milieu of academic world.

In this regard, research genres such as research articles, theses and dissertations got special attention of the discourse analysts in general and genre analysts in particular. Part genres including abstract, introduction, literature review, discussion and conclusion of each research genre at structural and textual levels have also been explored.

Out of all these part genres, the introduction section has got exceptional attention due to several reasons. One of the key reasons is that the authors have to make vital decisions about the quantity and the quality of the background knowledge; consider expectations of the audience; develop repertoire with audience/readers and make claims in the introductory sections/chapters. All this involves careful use of rhetoric assorted with a number of linguistic features and organization of the text.

Different models for rhetorical division of RA introduction section have been suggested, for example, Problem-Solution model proposed by Zappen (1983) in Swales (1990) which consists of five-part rhetorical division including *goal; current capacity; problem; solution and criteria of evaluation*. Swales (1990) highlighted the problem of 'separating the move-1 and move-2' in shorter introductions and 'neglect of recycling of moves' in longer introductions in his CARS (Create A Research Space) model. As a result, the model was revised by Swales (2004) based on the discovery of the contemporary conventions of organizing the introduction section of RA.

## 2.2 Scholarly Works Conducted on Research Genres

According to Hyland (2009) most of the evaluative genre-based studies of 1980s and 1990s reflected rhetorical strategies and practice of the researchers from hard sciences including Physics, Chemistry, Biology and Engineering. Several recent comparative genre-based studies have also been produced from hard sciences (physics, Chemistry, Biology etc) and soft sciences (Humanities & Social Sciences) both, such as those produced by Atai & Samani, (2012); Ozturk, (2007); Yakhontova, (2006); Shehzad, 2007, 2008, 2011; Holmes, (1997) and Samraj, (2002). On the other hand, comparatively, less genre-based investigations of RA genre of soft sciences have been done (Khan, 2013; Briones, 2012; Krishnasamy, 2011; Azirah, 2001; Smaraj, 2008; Loi, 2010; Ozturk, 2007).

## 2.3. Genre Analysis of PhD and Masters Theses

PhD dissertation is a crucial requirement of universities as it provides the *rite of passage* to the academic world of higher education. Writing the introduction of a PhD thesis is more challenging than writing the introduction of a research article due to high expectations of rhetorical insight along with linguistic ability. Its daunting length averaged 17.4 pages ranging from 26 to 34 pages in the fields of Medicine, Social Sciences and Arts while 9 to 10 pages in Science, Engineering, and Education as pointed out by Bunton (2002) is another challenge for the writers. Both novelty and relevance (Hyland 2009) in rhetorical organization are highly expected in PhD theses' introductions which is a grave challenge for the writers. *Broadly English proficient (BEP)* scholars manage situations effectively; however, *narrowly English proficient (NEP)* researchers face many difficulties while writing theses' introductions (Paltridge and Starfield, 2007).

Having all these factors in mind, Bunton (1998, 2002) conducted genre analysis of 45 PhD theses' introductions written by Chinese scholars in English consisting of 781 pages and about 187,000 words. The main focus of the study was Move analysis at macro level; and references, and headings of sections and subsections of introductory chapters at micro level. Interestingly, all the 14 steps designed separately by Swales (1990) and DudleyEvans (1986) were identified in the corpus of 45 theses. Some more steps for example *Research Questions, Hypotheses, Definitional clarifications, Theoretical Position, Method, Chapter Structure, Materials or Subjects*, were found which did not fit into any of the suggested models of Swales (1990) and Dudley-Evans (1986). And, the most frequent cycle of Move occurrence was T-N instead of T-N-O where T is Move 1-establishing a territory, N is Move 2- establishing a niche and O is Move 3- occupying a niche (Bunton, 2002). On average 2.5 T-N cycles, 1.4 T-N-O cycles and 0.7 T-O cycles per introduction were found.

Some genre based studies have also been done on Masters theses' introductions such as Khoury (2006), Samraj (2008) and Cheung (2012). Khoury (2006) found

structural variation in Masters theses' introductions of Social Sciences and Humanities. These differences, most probably, were mainly due to the descriptive nature of the theses of Humanities and experimental nature of Social Sciences theses. Disciplinary and sub disciplinary variations were also observable, for example, researchers from Humanities focused on the background information and structure of theses, whereas, social sciences researchers used subtitles for which there is no option in CARS model. Similarly, Cheung's (2012) findings of 43 Masters theses' introductions from soft sciences also verify results of the previous studies based on disciplinary variations. However, his findings regarding the implications of CARS model showed consistency at Move level except absence of step 3 *reviewing previous items* in Move 1. This might be because of reviewing previous studies in a separate chapter of literature review. In addition to this, some new steps such as *chapter summary, limitations of the study, delimitations of the study, and implication of the study, assumptions and method of data collection and analysis* were found which were not present in the modal of Swales (1990, 2004) and Bunton (2002).

#### **2.4. Genre Analysis of MPhil / MS Theses' Introductions**

It is evident that genre analysts paid their attention to Masters and PhD theses and thus overlooked theses of MPhil /MS for genre analysis. Practices of academic genres in general and theses of Masters, MPhil /MS and PhD in particular in Pakistani universities are yet to be studied. This dearth of genre-based research in research discourse has resulted into many problems not only for undergraduate students but also for graduate and postgraduate students of the country. Universities arrange seminars, workshops and symposium on academic writing in general and English for Research Purposes in particular (Lim, 2008), yet; these are not fulfilling the needs of the novice researchers.

In Pakistan the students learn two other languages (mother tongue + national language) before they learn English which makes thesis writing in English a challenging task especially for novice researchers. Co-occurrence of psychological; behavioral and rhetorical issues with linguistic inabilities (yet to be investigated empirically in the Pakistani context) make Pakistani novice thesis writers' experience different from their past activities related to academic writing. Psychologically, novice researchers seem to be suffering from 'impostor syndrome' that may cause 'writer's block' or writing inability.

The impact of these psycho-effective issues (Paltridge and Starfield, 2007) on non-natives' writing has also been reported by Mullins and Kiley (2002). The supervisor can play a significant role to cure the problem by having regular meetings with supervisees, discussion on feedback and by creating encouraging environment as suggested by Murray (2002) and Riaz (1997).

Secondly, (yet to be investigated) the writers in Pakistan generally appear to be obsessed with writing as an act of creativity and spontaneity engulfed with inspiration and intuition. This behavior is also observed in the lengthy and persuasive process of writing dissertations. Taking writing as a *habit* and *process* may be helpful to overcome the problem as argued by Zerubavel (1999).

Finally, disseminating knowledge through advanced writing practices seems another challenge for novice thesis writers in Pakistan. Culmination of 'rhetorical insight' into novice researchers as pointed out by Tardy (2005) can be helpful for them to present their knowledge persuasively. So, the current study aims at addressing the issue by investigating the rhetorical organization of MPhil theses with the focus on the introductory chapters of Linguistics and Literature to raise consciousness of genre acquisition along with cultivation of 'rhetorical insight' into the junior researchers.

Unfortunately, investigations to probe research genres in the Pakistani context have missed the attention of scholars at home and abroad both. The current study would be a significant addition in providing insights to academic writing teachers and learners because of its effectiveness in conceptualizing and contextualizing genres not just in the Pakistani setting but in other non-native contexts also where English is taught as a Foreign or Second language.

The value of the study is attached with future pedagogical implications for teachers in organizing writing courses based on genre approach. Genre-based approach provides a framework for lesson planners to devise their writing activities/tasks in academic writing class room to meet learners' needs and course objectives effectively based on principles proposed by (Hyland 2007:87-91). In addition, Swales' (2012) genre based greater contribution on essential tasks for thesis writers could also be helpful for the course designers, teachers and researchers at the same time. So, the genre approach will not only inculcate linguistic abilities but also raise the consciousness of rhetorical insight into the cognitive faculties of the novice researchers in Pakistani context. And usually, novice writers are from *narrowly English proficient* (Swales, 2004) category could take this study as a guide to enter the *broadly English proficient (ibid)* community of the scholars.

### 3. Research Methodology

Both qualitative and quantitative methods of analysis at macro and micro level were used for this research. For macro level qualitative analysis CARS model (2004) was used which comprises certain moves and steps as illustrated in Figure 1. Move is a rhetorical strategy through which the writer intends to achieve certain communicative purpose, for example Move 1 of CARS model is employed to establish research territory by providing current status of the

knowledge and making topic generalization. Move 2 focuses on establishing the need of the current research by indicating gap in the previous studies and Move 3 intends to occupy the gap by announcing the current study, giving research questions/hypotheses, providing definitional clarifications, summarizing methods, announcing findings, stating value and outlining thesis. These Moves and steps are characterized by some specific lexico-grammatical markers (See Paltridge and Starfield, 2007, pp.86-91). These linguistic indicators were identified to find each move and step by giving the introductory chapters (sample of the current study) close reading. The sequencing of these Moves was done and analyzed to find out rhetorical patterns in introductory chapters of MPhil theses of Linguistics and Literature. For quantitative analysis, the frequency of the occurrences of moves was also identified since it plays a significant role in determining the status of individual moves.

Keeping in mind that 'genres change, evolve and die' (Shehzad 2005), the latest samples of theses' introduction section were selected randomly from the fields of Linguistics and Literature. Twenty theses submitted to National University of Modern Languages, Islamabad during 2007 to 2013 were taken as a sample. Texts, belonging to various areas of Literature including poetry, drama, prose and novel were intended to be collected; however, owing to the non-availability of these, only theses on novels were included. On the other hand, Linguistic theses covered different areas including Sociolinguistics, Psycholinguistics, Phonetics and Phonology.

Keeping ethical considerations in view, the permission for data collection was taken formally from the Dean of Advanced Integrated Studies & Research (AISR) department and Director Library of the university.

### **3.1 Theoretical Framework**

Create A Research Space (CARS) models (1990 and 2004) (See Figure 1 of CARS model 2004 as a theoretical framework of the current study) suggested were used to discover the schematic structure of theses' introduction section of MPhil theses of Linguistics and Literature due to the following rationale:

- a) CARS models (1990, 2004) have been preferred widely by researchers to explore the rhetorical organization of research articles for more than a decade.
- b) These have been applied and experimented in multidisciplinary research articles.
- c) The models have been used to find a rhetorical organization of research articles written in languages other than English that shows its applicability across cultures (Arvey, Anett & Gyula, 2004).

- d) The models (1990) and (2004) also have been applied for other academic genres for example essays (Kusel, 1992; Alives, 2007) and book reviews (Babii, 2003; Motta-Roth, 1998).
- e) Applicability of the model (1990) has also been identified in the introductory section of the conference presentations worldwide (Ventola et al. 2002; Simpson and Swales, 2001).
- f) More importantly, the CARS model is not rigid and accepts modifications according to evolving generic practices as suggested by Bunton (1998, 2002,) and Shehzad (2005).

**Figure1. Swales' CARS model (2004) Move 1: Establishing a territory (citations required)**

Topic generalizations of increasing specificity

**Move 2: Establishing a niche (citations possible) \*\*\* via**

Step 1A: Indicating a gap or

Step 1B: Adding to what is known

Step 2: Presenting positive justification\*

**Move 3: Presenting the present work via**

Step 1: Announcing present research descriptively and/or purposively (obligatory)

Step 2: Presenting research questions or hypotheses\*

Step 3: Definitional clarifications\*

Step 4: Summarizing methods\*

Step 5: Announcing principal outcomes\*\*

Step 6: Stating the value of the present research\*\*

Step 7: Outlining the structure of the paper\*\*

\* Optional and less fixed in order

\*\* Probable in some academic disciplines

\*\*\* Possible cyclical patterning of moves particularly in longer Introductions

#### **4. Results and Discussion**

This section consists of two sub-sections which discuss sequencing and different rhetorical patterns of Moves and the frequency of each move respectively. The introductory chapters of the theses were given close reading and subsequent Moves and Steps were identified. The identification of Moves and Steps was done by identifying specific lexico-grammatical markers occurring in the sentences. These Moves were sequenced in tabular form as Table 1 and Table 2 and through this sequencing the schematic rhetorical patterns were found and analyzed qualitatively. For quantitative analysis, the frequency of occurrence of these Moves and Steps were calculated and displayed in cumulative (See Table 3) and individual tabular forms (See Table 4 and Table 5).





T10 M1 M1 M3 M1 M2 M2 M1 M2 M3 M2 M3 M3 M1 M3 M3 M3 M3 M3 M3  
M3 M3 M3 M3

**Total M1= 56, M2= 29, M3=94**

*T= Thesis, M= Move*

Most models for writing introductions of theses and research articles suggested by genre analysts such as Dudley-Evans (1986); Swales (1990 & 2004); Bunton (2002) and Shehzad, (2005) favour organization of rhetorical moves from general to specific. However, the findings of our research about sequencing of moves are contrary to the results of other CARS-based studies such as Cooper (1985); Crookes (1986a); Hopkins and Dudley Evans (1988) conducted on introductions of both research articles and theses. As illustrated in Tables 1 and 2 the three dominant move patterns (M stands for Move henceforth) M3M1, M1M3 and M3M3 are against the proposed sequence of all the CARS-based models. Furthermore, cyclicity (dominant recurring patterns) of these moves is also contrary to the cyclicity of several CARS-based studies, for example, cyclicity of M1 and M2 was observed by many genre analysts such as Cooper (1985); Crookes (1986a); Hopkins and Dudley Evans (1988). Contrary to this, our results show cyclicity of M1 and M3 and vice versa in all the theses' introductions of Linguistics and Literature except T8 of Linguistics. In T8, sequence of M1 and M2 occurs 7 times preceded by M3 which is the only sequence similar to the above mentioned CARS-based studies. The reason for the occurrence of cyclic patterns of M3M1, M1M3 and M3M3 might be the longer nature of introductions and broad loosely connected areas of research. The writers might establish the territory first and occupy later for one area of the research followed by establishing the territory and occupying other area of the same research.

Some of the writers here are so predominantly occupied with describing their own research plans that 10% of theses introductions were entirely different from rest of the theses' introductions as they had only one Move, i.e Move 3. However, within this move the writers avoided mentioning the research questions/hypotheses explicitly which is considered an important step of Move 3 in Social Sciences theses' introductions. Though, a section heading of *Question Statement* was present but it did not serve as research question or hypothesis statement. Similarly, the thesis introduction in Literature focusing completely on M3 missed few steps of the move. The authors neither wrote significance or value of the study nor provided methodology of the research. T13 (Table 2) was also found different from other theses' introductions as the writer without establishing territory established the niche (M2) followed by occupation of the niche (M3). Occurrence of M1 in T15 (Table 2) at the end of introduction reveals a vivid deviation of rhetorical practice from the established norms in the local context.

The occurrence of gap indication statements i.e Move 2 (29 in Linguistics & 20 in Literature) appeared higher in theses' introductions of Linguistics, but, this difference is due to the highest number of Move 2 in one thesis (T8) only. This statistical finding shows that the rest of the 19 theses' writers possess nearly similar schematic behavior and attitude towards writing introductions.

The major purpose of indicating gap (M2) is creating a research space for your work which serves justifications for your contribution and gives identity to your work in the vast field of research. In addition to this, gap indication move provides other researchers the insight of exploring new areas of research. On the whole, Move2 functions as minicritique (Swales, 2012) which establishes the niche for the research and becomes source of motivation for the researchers.

Table 2: *Move Sequence of Theses' Introductions of Literature*  
MOVE SEQUENCE

<b>T11</b>	M3 M1 M3 M1 M1 M3 M1 M1 M2 M2 M1 M3 M1 M3 M1 M1 M3 M3 M3 M3 M1 M3 M3 M3 M3 M3 M3
<b>T12</b>	M1 M3 M2 M1 M3 M3 M3
<b>T13</b>	M3 M3 M3 M3 M2 M3 M2 M3 M3 M3
<b>T14</b>	M3 M3 M3 M3 M3 M3
<b>T15</b>	M3 M3 M3 M3 M3 M3 M3 M3 M3 M3 M3 M3 M3 M2 M1 M3 M3 M3
<b>T16</b>	M1 M3 M1 M3 M1 M3 M1 M1 M2 M1 M3 M1 M3 M1 M3 M3 M1 M3 {M2} M1 M3 M3
<b>7</b>	M1 M3 M1 M3 M1 M3 M1 M3 M1 M3 M1 M3 M1 M3 M1 M3 M1 M3 M1 M3 M1 M3 M1 M2 M2 M3 M1 {M2} M2 M1 M3 M2 M1 M3 M1 M3 M3 M3 M2 M3
<b>T18</b>	M3 M1 M3 M1 M1 M3 M1 M3 M3 M3 M1 M3 M1 M3 M1 M3 M1 M3 M3 M2 M3 M1 M3 M1 M3 M3 M3 M1 M3 M3 M1 M3 M3 M1 M3 M1 M3 M1 M3 M3 M3
<b>T19</b>	M3 M1 M3 M1 M3 M3 M1 M1 M3 M3 M1 M3 M1 M3 M3 M3 M1 M1 M3 M1 M2 M1 M3 M3 M3 M3 M3 M2 M2 M2 M3 M2 M3 M3 M3 M3 M3
<b>T20</b>	M3 M1 M3 M1 M3 M1 M3 M3 M3 M3 M1 M3
<b>Total</b>	<b>M1=67, M2=20, M3=134</b> <b>T= Thesis, M=Move</b>

#### 4.2 Occurrences of Moves

The cumulative occurrence of each move and its steps in the theses' introductions of Linguistics and Literature are displayed in Table 3 which shows that the authors of Literature theses employ more cycles of Move 1 and Move 3 in writing introductions than the authors in the discipline of Linguistics. The difference of Move 3 is higher (40) than difference of Move 1 (10) in both the

disciplines as can be seen in Table 3. This difference indicates that writers of theses' introductions of Literature present their own research descriptively (nature of research based on methodology) or purposefully (goal/aim/focus) more frequently than the writers of theses' introductions of Linguistics. The higher cumulative occurrence of M 3 (228) than Move 1(123) also reveals the writers' cognitive structure of being specific most of the time. In other words, the writers come to the point straightaway without giving background of the research area.

The writers of Linguistics and Literature theses followed the similar pattern of occurrence of Move 2 with the exception of one thesis (T8) where Move 2 occurred eight times. As depicted in Table 3 step 1A of this move i.e *indication of gap* is significantly higher than Step1B *adding to what is known*. This is also higher than Step 2 *presenting positive justifications*. The gap was indicated explicitly or implicitly either under the section heading of *statement of the problem* or under other section headings such as *significance of the study* and *aims/objectives*. This shows the writers' reliance on S1A only for the niche establishment without *presenting positive justifications* (S1B) in this rhetorical action of employing Move 2.

Table 3: Move and Step of Thesis Introductions

	Move1	Move 2			Move 3							Total	
	Total Move1	S1A	S1B	S2	Total	S1	S2	S3	S4	S7	Total Move3		
						S5	S6	Move2					
T1-10	56	24	2	3	29	55	9	4	10	2	9	6	94
T11-20	67	14	2	4	20	90	11	9	10	2	6	6	134
total	123	38	4	7	49	145	20	13	20	4	15	12	228

There could be several reasons for preferring Step 1A over Step1B and Step 2 to establish the niche. One may be the schematized cognitive structure of the writers for emphasizing the gap indication in the local context. The other reason could be explained in global context as argued by Swales (2004) that on English language proficiency continuum touchstone these writers belong to the category of narrowly English proficient (NEP) writers who have equal chances of becoming broadly English proficient (BEP) ones with exposure to regular research oriented communicative events. Therefore, the scholars from NEP category are not equipped with many rhetorical techniques/ strategies to create a research space effectively for their own research. This lack of skills is clear in T9, T14 and T20 which do not show employment of Move 2 at all.

Move 2 is the key move of CARS model since it justifies relevance of the study in the large territory of interest. And owing to Move 2, according to Bhatia (1993) the writers perform communicative purpose to create,

“a link between what has gone before in the relevant field of research and the recent work that is being reported...making it relevant by placing it appropriately in the context of...previous research in a particular field of study”. (p. 82)

Table 4 and Table 5 show occurrence of each move and step in theses' introductions of Linguistics and Literature respectively. Table 4 indicates similar cognitive attitude of the writers of theses of Linguistics in case of applying Move 1 and step 1 of Move 3. M1 and M3S1 (announcing present research) occurs 56 and 55 times respectively which show writers' focus of establishing research territory and occupying it instantly by announcing the research purposively or descriptively. The consistency in the recurrent patterns of M1M3 and/or M3M1 also supports the quantitative results.

Table 5 regarding theses of Literature indicates different attitude of the writers towards M1 and M3S1. The writers' focused more on announcing their research purposively or descriptively than providing background information to claim centrality of the works. The findings support the argument that the writers announced the research (M3S1) 90 times and gave background information of the research field (M1) 67 times only (See Table 5). These results reveal another rhetorical strategy of the *NEP* scholars of Linguistics and Literature i.e, the high use of M3S1 as the rhetorical movement for organizing theses' introductions is the clear indication of being specific without supporting the necessary generalities of the studies.

Table 4: Occurrence of Moves in Theses' Introductions of Linguistics

	Move1	Move2			Move3							Total Moves
		S1A	S1B	S2	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	
T1		2	2	NIL	6	1	NIL	1	NIL	NIL	1	17
	4	4			9							
T2		1	NIL	1	5	1	NIL	1	1	1		15
	3	2			10							
T3		1	NIL	NIL	9	1	NIL	2	NIL	NIL	NIL	16
	3	1			12							
T4		1	NIL	NIL	2	1	1	1	NIL	2	NIL	10
	2	1			7							
T5		4	NIL	NIL	5	1	NIL	1	NIL	1	1	20
	7	4			9							
T6		2	NIL	NIL	9	1	1	1	NIL	NIL	NIL	28
	14	2			12							
T7		3	NIL	NIL	8	1	NIL	1	NIL	NIL	NIL	22
	9	3			10							
T8		7	NIL	1	2	1	NIL	NIL	NIL	1	1	22
	9	8			5							
T9		NIL	NIL	NIL	4	NIL	NIL	1	NIL	1	1	7
		NIL	NIL		7							
T10		3	NIL	1	5	1	2	1	1	3	1	23
	5	4			14							
<b>Total</b>	56	24	2	3	56	9	4	10	2	9	6	

$$M1= 56, M2= 29, M3=94$$

Presenting *research questions/ hypotheses* i.e. M3S2 occurs in CARS model (2004) as an optional step; however, similar to Bunton's (2002) findings of social sciences theses' introductions, all of the introductory chapters of the theses of Linguistics and Literature in the present study except T9 have the explicit section headings of *research questions or hypotheses*. Almost 100% occurrence of M3S2 shows the compulsory status of this step which is contrary to the Swales' suggestion. However, considering disciplinary variations, Bunton (2002) found very low occurrence (8 out of 45) of explicit *research questions or hypotheses* in the introductory section of theses of Empirical Sciences. Shehzad (2005) also observed the similar practice in Computer Science research article introductions and suggested this to be an optional step in her proposed model for writing introduction in Computer Sciences. There was only one introduction in our study that gave the section heading of *Question statement* but even this was not followed by explicit *research questions or hypotheses*. We did not stop here and explored further to find out if *hypotheses or research questions* occurred in some other chapter of the thesis or were mentioned implicitly somewhere in the thesis. To confirm this, the contents of other chapters were read and no explicit section

heading of *research questions/hypotheses* was found. Nevertheless, further research needs to be carried out to find the implicit existence of *research question/hypothesis* in the thesis.

Step 3 of Move 3 (definitional clarifications) occurred in 30% of theses' introductions of Linguistics and in 50% theses' introductions of Literature as depicted in Table 4 and Table 5. This shows that the need to define terms is higher in Literature than in Linguistics. Contrary to Bunton (2002), who observed this step marked with a separate section heading of *defining terms/definitional clarifications*, in the present study it was mostly embedded in the text.

Table 5: Occurrence of Moves in Theses' Introductions of Literature

	Move1	Move2		Move3							Total Moves	
		S1A	S1B	S2	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6		S7
T11		1	1	NIL	10	1	2	1	NIL	NIL	1	
	10	2			15							27
T12		1	NIL	NIL	2	2	NIL	NIL	NIL	NIL	NIL	
	2	1			4							7
T13		1	NIL	1	5	1	NIL	NIL	NIL	2	NIL	
	NIL	2			8							10
T14		NIL	NIL	NIL	5	1	NIL	NIL	NIL	NIL	NIL	
	NIL	NIL			6							6
T15		1	NIL	NIL	10	1	NIL	1	NIL	3	1	
	1	1			16							18
T16		2	NIL	NIL	7	1	NIL	1	NIL	NIL	1	
	10	2			10							22
T17		5	NIL	1	15	1	1	1	NIL	NIL	NIL	
	15	6			18							39
T18		1	NIL	NIL	20	1	2	2	NIL	NIL	1	
	15	1			26							42
T19		2	1	2	13	1	3	4	1	NIL	1	
	10	5			23							38
T20		NIL	NIL	NIL	3	1	1	NIL	1	1	1	
	4	NIL			8							12
<b>Total Steps</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	

Steps

$M1=67, M2=20, M3=134$

Almost all of the writers of Linguistics (90%) summarized the methods (M3 S4) that they had used for conducting of their research with the exception of one which is negligible. However, 40% introductions of Literature had no mention of the methods. Thus, avoidance of summarizing methods in the introductory section was higher in the theses of Literature than in Linguistics. This may be because the scholars in Literature do not follow clear cut explicitly defined

methods and arrive at more of opinion based qualitative interpretations through arguments.

The trend of announcing principal findings (M3S5) is very low in both Linguistics and Literature theses' introductions as illustrated in Table 4 and Table 5. This is similar to Bunton's (2002) findings who reported the presence of step 5 in 10 out of 45 theses introductions only. Findings of the present study and Bunton's (2002) results are quite opposite to some early findings such as of Swales and Najjar (1987) who informed that physicists gave findings half the time but the researchers from the discipline of education avoided them completely. According to Swales (2012), Announcing principal findings three times, one in abstract, then in introductions and finally in result and discussion chapter, seems unnecessary. However, occurrence of this rhetorical step in abstracts and introductions in addition to the chapters of results and discussion carries the intentions of *selling* and *self-projection* (Shehzad, 2010) which is one of the implicit goals of writers.

Mentioning the contribution of your research (M3S6) in introduction section again is a debatable subject because *value/significance* of research is normally given in the discussion section in detail. Table 4 and table 5 show that the step of giving *significance of research* in introductions is mostly avoided by the theses writers of both Linguistics and Literature. 55% theses' introductions do not *state the value of research* at all. Here, we need to consider that current research practices in most disciplines, around the globe, focus on instant promotion of the work (Shehzad, 2010). Therefore, *stating value* step, in our view, must be incorporated in the introductory chapter of the theses.

Finally, the question of outlining structure (M3S7) at the end of the introductory chapter has been answered in different ways. For example, Swales (2012), due to huge length of thesis, considers completing introduction with an outline of the structure obligatory. In the present corpus 40% of the writers did not bother about providing any guidelines for the readers by giving an outline of the thesis which shows difference in schematic patterns among the writers clearly.

## 5. Conclusion

Firstly, regarding the rhetorical organization of text, most models for writing introduction section/chapter of theses and research articles proposed by genre analysts (Dudely-Evans, 1986; Swales, 1990 & 2004; Bunton, 2002; Shehzad, 2005) suggested rhetorical organization from general to specific flow of information. The findings of the current study about sequencing of moves (rhetorical organization) showed specific to general flow of ideas and ended with specific move as illustrated in Table 1 and Table 2. Furthermore, the dominant move patterns were M3M1, M1M3 and M3M3 that are again contrary to the findings of



other CARS based studies (Cooper 1985; Crookes 1986a; Hopkins and Dudley-Evans 1988) that showed dominant cyclical move patterns of M1M2. The reason for the occurrence of cyclic patterns of M3M1, M1M3 and M3M3 in the current study might be the length of introductory chapters. Overall 228 times Move 3 and 123 times Move 1 were employed by the writers of both Linguistics and Literature theses. The question may be raised whether the identified sequence of rhetorical organization achieve communicative purpose or not. It may be argued that linear writing is easily comprehensible than nonlinear one. This non-linearity appears to pose the piece of writing 'reader responsible' which demands readers' effort to dig out meanings of the text.

Schematized structure of rhetorical organization of introductory chapters of the current study from specific to general information and then ending with specific information, according to contrastive rhetoricians' view, are based on culturally different norms of rhetoric. It seems to indicate a conventionalized norm of rhetorical consciousness of the institution or the rhetorical cognitive consciousness of the writers. However, this view presents 'the deficit view of students' and 'over generalize' and 'oversimplify' the characteristics of writing belonging to non-native cultures. With the tremendous increase of non-native researchers and supervisors, we agree with Swales (2004, 2012) who suggested a solution to the problem vexed with linguistic issues and rhetorical concerns in native and non-native settings. Discouraging the dichotomy between native and nonnative speakers of English, Swales (ibid) proposed English language proficiency continuum as a yardstick to classify the writers. The two broad categories of the scholars or writers, no matter whether they are native or non-native speakers of English, are broadly English proficient (BEP) writers and narrowly English proficient (NEP) ones.

## 6. Pedagogical Relevance

In sum, genres are socio-cognitive processes of grouping texts into some taxonomy to respond to particular situations to achieve a certain communicative purpose. Genre as 'communicative event' with 'shared purposes' focuses on rhetoric at macro level and other linguistic features at micro level to achieve 'communicative goal'. Hoey (1983) compared the rhetorical moves of the writers with dancing patterns of the dancers to practice genre in expectations of the community. Thus, genre is not rigid but it has its own identity and integrity along with its characteristics of dynamism. From different employed patterns at macro and micro level one can recognize the genre identity. For example, different lexico-grammatical features and rhetorical organization of research articles make it different from lab reports or some other genres.

Much attention has been paid to 'Genre' by many researchers as a research tool (Charles, Pecorari, & Hunston, 2009). However, in the light of the findings of the present study we recommend that, adoption of genre as a teaching approach could also be effective in teaching English for specific purposes in the academic

milieu of Pakistan. Genre as an approach to achieve communicative goal which is contextualized with certain set of conventions, according to many scholars (Hyland, 2007; Wennerstrom, 2006; Hasan and Williams 1996; Martin 1989), has been proved to be successful in teaching English in native and non-native contexts for specific purposes. A successful application of genrebased pedagogy has taken place in Australia (Hasan and Williams 1996; Martin, 1989). Similarly, genre approach has been practiced effectively in the USA especially for composition at college level as reported by Wennerstrom (2006).

Students are exposed in this approach to different genres from daily life and academic setting. Students, thus, understand and acquire lexico-grammatical structures and rhetorical patterns employed in those genres. Adopting this approach in Pakistani context of academic writing, on the whole, would result into genre awareness and competence which would develop competence of lexical, grammatical and rhetorical patterns of English language of the novice writers. Swales (2012) and Hyland (2008) designed several genre based tasks for teaching academic writing at graduate; postgraduate and undergraduate levels to acquire different academic genres and partgenres including research article, thesis and dissertation. Following the same approach, introducing genre based pedagogies grounded in the rhetorical context of Pakistan would definitely be instrumental for neophytes in the academic discourse communities.

## Reference

- Arvey, A. & Gyula (2004). A contrastive analysis of English and Hungarian theoretical research article introductions. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 42, 71-100.
- Atai, R. M., & Samani, S.A. (2012). *Exploring genre variations in research article introductions within a single subdiscipline: EOP versus EAP*. Iran: Tarbiat Moallem University.
- Avilés, H. (2007). *A genre analysis of students' essay introductions* (Unpublished Masters' Thesis). Hidalgo: Universidad Autónoma del Estado de Hidalgo. Retrieved on September 14, 2013 at 16:30 from <http://www.fonael.org> - [fonael@fonael.org](mailto:fonael@fonael.org) on September, 14, 2013.
- Azirah, H. (2001). So what's new? The discussions in medical research articles. *Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics*, 4(1), 127-152.
- Babii, E. (2003). *Towards an analysis of book reviews as an academic written genre* (Unpublished Masters' Thesis). Iran: Shiraz University.
- Basturkmen, H. (2014). Replication research in comparative genre analysis in English for Academic Purposes. *Language Teaching*, 47(3), 377-386.
- Becher, T. & Trowler, P. (2001). *Academic tribes and territories: Intellectual inquiry and the cultures of disciplines*. Milton Keynes: SRHE and Open University Press.
- Bhatia, V. (1993). *Analyzing genre: Language use in professional settings*. London: Longman.

- Bhatia, V. (2006). *World of written discourse*. London: Continuum.
- Bloor, M. (1996). *Academic writing in computer science: A comparison of genres*. New York: Continuum.
- Briones, Y.R.R. (2012). Move analysis of philosophy research article introductions. *Philippine ESL Journal*, 9, 56-75.
- Bunton, D. (1998). *Linguistic and textual problems in PhD and MPhil*. (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). Hong Kong: Hong Kong University.
- Bunton, D. (2002). Generic moves in PhD thesis introductions. In J. Flowerdew (Ed.), *Academic discourse* (pp. 57-75). London: Longman.
- Charles, M., Pecorari, D. & Hunston, S. (2009). *Academic writing: At the interface of corpus and discourse*. New York: Continuum.
- Cheung, L.Y. (2012). Understanding the writing of thesis introductions: An exploratory study. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 46, 744-749.
- Cooper, C. (1985). *Aspects of article introduction in IEEE publications*. United Kingdom: University of Aston.
- Crookes, G. (1986). Towards a validated analysis of scientific text structure. *Applied Linguistics*, 7, 57-70.
- Dudley-Eavan, T. (1986). Genre analysis: An investigation of the introduction and discussion sections of M.Sc dissertations. In M. Coulthard (Ed.). *Talking about text* (pp. 128-145). Birmingham: English Language Research, University of Birmingham.
- Hasan, R. & Williams, G. (1996). *Literacy in society*. London: Longman.
- Hinkel, E. (2002). *Second language writers' text*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum.
- Hoey, M. (1983). *On the surface of discourse*. Birmingham University, UK: ELR Monograph.
- 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 (1), 321-337.
- Hopkins, A. & Dudley-Evans, T. (1988). A genre-based investigation of discussion sections of articles and dissertations. *English for Specific Purposes*, 7, 113-122.
- Hyland, K. (2004). Disciplinary interactions: Metadiscourse in L2 postgraduate writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13, 133-151.
- Hyland, K. (2007). *Genre and second language writing*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Hyland, K. (2008). *As can be seen: Lexical bundles and disciplinary variation English for Specific Purposes*. London: Routledge.
- Hyland, K. (2009). *Academic discourse*. Continuum: London.
- Khan, I. (2013). Genre analysis of literature review section of MPhil dissertations. (Unpublished M.Phil Thesis). Islamabad: Air University.
- Khoury, J. L. (2006). *Genre analysis of master's thesis introductions: Variations across the humanities and social sciences*. Lebanon: American University of Beirut.
- Krishnasamy, R. (2011). *A genre analysis of rhetorical structure and linguistics features in psychology research articles*. Malaysia: University of Malaya.

- Kusel, P. (1992). Rhetorical approaches to the study and composition of academic essays. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20, 457-469.
- Kwan, B. (2006). The schematic structure of literature reviews in doctoral theses of applied linguistics. *English for Specific Purposes*, 25, 30-55.
- Lillis, T. (2001). *Student writing: Access, regulation and desire*. Routledge: London.
- Lim, M. J. (2008). Indicating significance of current research: Pedagogical implications of a genre analysis for dissertation writing. *The Open Applied Linguistics Journal*, 1, 46-55.
- Loi, K. C. (2010). Research article introductions in Chinese and English: A comparative genre-based study. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 9 (4), 297-279.
- Martin, J. (1989). *Factual writing: Exploring and challenging social reality*. Geelong Victoria: Deakin University Press.
- Motta-Roth, D. (1998). Discourse analysis and academic book reviews: A study of text and disciplinary cultures. In I. Fortanet, S. Posteguillo, J. C. Palmer, & J. F. Coll, (Ed.), *Genre studies in English for Academic Purposes* (pp. 29-58). Castelló, Spain: Universitat Jaume I.
- Mullins, G., & Kiley, M. (2002). It's a PhD not a Nobel Prize: How experienced examiners assess research theses. *Studies in Higher Education*, 27, 369-386.
- Murray, R. (2002). *How to write a thesis*. Birmingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Nelson, J. (1993). *The library revisited: explaining students' research processes*. New York: Continuum.
- Ozturk, I. (2007). The textual organisation of research article introduction in applied linguistics: Variability within a single discipline. *English for Specific Purposes*, 26 (1), 25-38.
- Paltridge, B. (2015). Referees' comments on submissions to peer-reviewed journals: When is a suggestion not a suggestion? *Studies in Higher Education*, 40 (1), 106-122.
- Paltridge, B., & Starfield, S. (2007). *Thesis and dissertation writing in a second language*. New York: Routledge.
- Pearson, M., & Brew, A. (2002). Research training and supervision development. *Studies in Higher Education*, 27(2), 135-50.
- Rahman, T. (2010). *Language policy, identity, and religion*. Islamabad: Quaid-e-Azam University.
- Riazi, A. (1997). Acquiring disciplinary literacy: A social cognitive analysis of text production and learning among Iranian graduate students of Education. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 6, 105-137.
- Samraj, B. (2002). Introductions in research articles: Variations across disciplines. *English for Specific Purposes*, 21(1), 1-17.
- Samraj, B. (2008). A discourse analysis of master's theses across disciplines with a focus on introductions. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 7 (1), 55-67.
- Shapin, S. (1984). Pump and circumstance: Robert Boyle's literary technology. *Social Studies of Science*, 14, 481-520.
- Shehzad, W. (2005). *Corpus-based genre analysis of computer science research article introductions* (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). NUML: Islamabad.

- Shehzad, W. (2007). How to end an introduction in computer science research article? A corpus-based approach. In E. Fitzpatrick (Ed.). *Corpus linguistics beyond the word: Research from phrase to discourse*. (pp. 243-255. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Shehzad, W. (2008). Move two: Establishing a niche. *IBERICA*. 15, 25-50.
- Shehzad, W. (2010). Announcment of prinicipal findings and value addition in computer science research articles. *IBERICA*. 19, 97-118.
- Shehzad, W. (2011). Outlining purposes, stating the nature of the present research, and listing research questions or hypotheses in academic papers. *Journal of Technical Writing & Communication*. 41 (2), 139-160.
- Simpson, R. & Swales, J. (2001). *Corpus linguistics in North America*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Swales J. & Najjar, H. (1987). The writing of research article introductions. *Written Communication*, 4, 175-191.
- Swales, J. (1990). *Genre analysis: English for Academic and Research Settings*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press
- Swales, J. (2004). *Research Genre: Explorations and Applications*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Swales.J. (2012). *Academic Writing for Graduate Students*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tardy, C. M. (2005). It's like a story: Rhetorical knowledge development in advancedacademic literacy. *Journal of English for Specific Purposes*, 4, 325-338.
- Tse, P. & Hyland, K. (2008). Robot Kung Fu: Gender and the performance of a professional identity. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40 (2), 300-322.
- Ventola, E., Shalom, C. & Thompson, S. (2002). *The Language of conferencing*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Wennerstrom, A. (2006). Discourse analysis in second language class room. *Genres of Writing*, 2, 200-244.
- Yakhontova, T. (2006). Cultural and disciplinary variation in academic discourse: The issue of influencing factors. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 5(2), 153-167.
- Zappen, J. (1983). *A rhetoric for research in sciences and technologies*. New York: Sage.
- Zerubavel, E. (1999). *The clockwise muse: A practical guide to writing theses, disserations and books*. MA: Harvard University Press.