CHAPTER 2

GENRE ANALYSIS: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Introduction

In this chapter, first, the three main approaches in genre analysis are reviewed. Second, the various studies behind Swales’ genre analysis theory are reviewed. These studies include systemic linguistics, sociolinguistics, discourse analysis and ESP (English for Specific Purposes). Then, Swales’ theory, including the method of moves analysis, is explained. Finally, the literature review of genre analysis studies based on Swales’ framework are presented.

2.2 Three Approaches in Genre Analysis

The three main approaches in the study of genre analysis are based on (1) the English for Specific Purposes (ESP) theory (eg, Swales, 1990; Bhatia, 1993; Dudley-Evans, 1994), (2) the Australian educational linguistic theory (eg. Martin, 1989, 1993; Halliday and Hasan, 1985), and (3) the North American new rhetoric theory (eg.Bakhtin, 1981; Miller, 1984; Berkenkotter and Huckn, 1993). The following table summarizes these three approaches using Hyon’s description (1996).
Table 2-1 Three Approaches in Genre Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researchers</th>
<th>ESP Analysis</th>
<th>Australian Genre Theories</th>
<th>New Rhetoric Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ESP scholarship</td>
<td>Systemic-functional linguistics</td>
<td>North American scholarship interested in L1 teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Pedagogical</td>
<td>Pedagogical</td>
<td>Pedagogical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>NNSE, EAP, EPC</td>
<td>Primary; secondary, adult education for minorities, migrant workers and other non mainstream groups</td>
<td>NSE in undergraduate schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genre Theory</td>
<td>Genre as ‘Communicative events’ characterized by their “communicative purposes” and by various patterns of “structure, style, content and intended audience”(Swales,1990:56)</td>
<td>Genre as “Staged-goal-oriented social processes” (Martin,Christie and Rothery,1987)</td>
<td>“Genre as social action” with social purposes (Miller,1984)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text Analysis</td>
<td>Structural move analyses to describe global organizational patterns</td>
<td>Analysis of linguistic features within Hallidayan schemes of linguistic analysis</td>
<td>Text analysis based on ethnographic methods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EAP = English for Academic Purposes, ESP = English for Specific Purposes, EPC = English for Professional Communication.
NSE = Native Speakers of English, NNSE = Non Native Speakers of English

The three approaches all fall within the functional approach framework and have been developed mainly for pedagogical purposes. However, they differ in terms of the theory behind them and their method of text analysis.

In the ESP approach (Swales’ genre analysis approach), genre is defined as a class of communicative events based on sociolinguistic and ethnomethodological theories. This will be discussed in detail under 2.6.

In the Australian educational linguistic approach, the definition of ‘genre’ is based on the Hallidayan theory of systemic linguistics i.e., register and genre determine the patterns of language (Paltridge, 1997, p. 23). Register represents ‘context of situation’ and is controlled by field, tenor and mode (Halliday and Hasan, 1985, p. 31) while genre represents ‘context of culture’ (Halliday and Hasan, 1985, p. 108). Following Halliday, who appeared to have been more interested in register analysis than in genre analysis, Martin (1993) describes genres as ‘staged-goal oriented social
processes’, textual forms or organizational structure, used purposefully by the culture (See 2.3).

The North American new rhetoric approach which developed under the influence of developmental psychology and meta-cognitive science focuses on the social purposes of genre. Miller (1984) describes genre as a ‘social action’ and insists that the study of a genre cannot be accomplished without the ethnographic study of the community in which it is found. Berkenkotter and Huckin (1993) argue that genres are ‘dynamic rhetorical forms that develop from the ESP ones to recurrent situations and serve to stabilize experience and give it coherence and meaning’, and that ‘genres change over time in response to their users’ sociocognitive needs’. Thus in the North American new rhetoric, genre is viewed as social action and the study of a genre involves an ethnographic study of the surrounding social context.

Since the theories are dissimilar, the methods of analysis also differ. In the ESP approach, analysts look for textual patterns common in a genre by analyzing the moves. The level of analysis is not only at the level of the text but also at the lexicogrammatical level, i.e., analysts look at the use and the meaning of a particular word or phrase in a particular genre. In the Australian educational linguistic approach, the analysis is within the systemic functional approach. Unlike the ESP and the Australian educational linguistic approaches that focus on textual patterns and lexicogrammatical features, New Rhetoric analysts try to analyze a genre through the study of the society in which the genre is used. Therefore, the method of analysis is more akin to that of ethnomethodology. Yunick gives a concise description of the three approaches as follows:
With respect to drawing relations between language and its social functions, New Rhetoric focuses on the social purposes end of the spectrum, while genre analysis in ESP brings more focus to moves in discourse structure. Australian linguistics explicitly and theoretically hooks up grammar and lexicon as well as discourse structure to social function.

(Yunick, 1997)

The present research is based on Swales’ theoretical framework, which comes under the ESP approach. In the following sections, the background of the development of Swales’ theory is discussed.

2.3 Systemic Linguistics and its Influence on Swales’ Theory

The roots of systemics are in functional linguistics in which language is considered to be social, cultural and historic. The systemics theory influenced Swales’ theory of genre analysis mainly in the concept of ‘language’ and ‘generic structure’.

2.3.1 Historical Background

In the beginning of the 20th century Saussure systematically re-organized the theory of language as semiotics. Saussure’s theory influenced anthropologists, including Mallinowsky who was a pioneer in the field of sociolinguistics. Mallinowsky presented the idea that language does not stand alone by itself, but is interrelated with the social and cultural factors of the surrounding context. In his publication in 1923, Mallinowsky suggested the idea of ‘context of situation’ and claimed that the meaning of a text is correctly understood, either by the listener or the reader, only when the situation as well as the background culture is familiar to them (Halliday, 1978, p. 28, Halliday and Hasan, 1985, p. 6). Six years after Mallinowsky’s presentation of ‘context of situation’, the Whorfian Hypothesis that hypothesized the
interdependent relationships between culture, language and thought was presented. Thus, the 1920s was when linguists and anthropologists came to realize the inter-relationships between language, society and cultural background. As a result, many linguists started to explore the function of language in human communities.

Some linguists, inspired by Mallinowsky's theory of 'context of situation', were prompted to study the function of language rather than its form. Firth elaborated on the idea of 'context of situation' from the linguistic point of view and established the Firthian theory in the 1950s (Halliday and Hasan, 1985, p. 8). The major concepts of Firth's theory adopted by Halliday were the concepts of 'context of situation', 'system' and 'structure' (Halliday, 1994, p. xxvi, Kress, 1976, p. 26). Halliday's concept of 'context of situation' is discussed in detail in the following section.

2.3.2 Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics

Halliday describes genre as follows:

In order to give a complete characterization of texture, we should have to make reference also to 'generic structure, the form that a text has as a property of its genre.

(Halliday, 1978, p. 133)

Further, he explains that the concept of 'generic structure' can be located within the concept of 'register':

The concept of generic structure can be brought within the general framework of the concept of register, the semantic patterning that is characteristically associated with the 'context of situation' of a text.

(Halliday, 1978, p. 134)

'Context of situation' has been defined by Halliday as a factor that characterizes a text together with 'context of culture' (Halliday and Hasan, 1985, p. 45). 'Context of
situation’, according to Halliday, comprises three characterizing factors; field, tenor and mode (1978, p. 110). Halliday explains register as follows:

(The concept of register) refers to the fact that the language we speak or write varies according to the type of situation. This in itself is no more than stating the obvious. What the theory of register does is to attempt to uncover the general principles which govern this variation, so that we can begin to understand what situational factors determine what linguistic features. 

(Halliday, 1978, pp. 31-32)

Register is, thus, determined by these three variables, namely, ‘what is actually taking place (field)’, ‘who is taking part (tenor)’, ‘what part the language is playing (mode)’

Halliday, however, does not consider the lexicogrammatical aspects of register. He emphasizes the semantic aspect:

A register is a semantic concept. It can be defined as a configuration of meanings that are typically associated with a particular situational configuration of field, mode, and tenor. But since it is a configuration of meanings, a register must also, of course, include the expressions, the lexicogrammatical and phonological features, that typically accompany or release these meanings. And sometimes we find that a particular register also has indexical features, indices in the form of particular words, particular grammatical signals, or even sometimes phonological signals that have the function of indicating to the participants that this is the register in question, like my first example once upon a time. ‘Once upon a time’ is an indexical feature that serves to signal the fact that we are now embarking on a traditional tale. 

(Halliday and Hasan, 1985, p. 39)

To summarize, in Halliday’s theory, genre is determined by the framework of register which is characterized within ‘the context of situation’ of the text. Therefore, in written discourse, genre is the superficial form of a text through which the readers can see the contextual elements of the text.
The concept of 'genre', thus, cannot be accomplished without the concept of 'generic structure' which refers to the form of the text common to the texts that belong to the same genre. Hasan elaborated on this concept and developed the concept of 'generic structure potential' to explain how structural unity of a text is accomplished. 'Generic structure potential' is discussed in the following section.

2.3.3 Hasan's Generic Structure Potential

On the basis of Halliday's concept of 'context of situation', Hasan added another concept, 'contextual configuration' (CC). A CC is 'a specific set of values that realizes field, tenor and mode' which is essential when considering the structure of the text (Halliday and Hasan, 1985, pp. 55-56). Hasan explains the role of the CC in the structural unity of the text as follows:

In the structural unity of the text, the CC plays a central role. If text can be described as 'language doing some job in some context', then it is reasonable to describe it as the verbal expression of a social activity; the CC is an account of the significant attributes of this social activity. So it is not surprising that the features of the CC can be used for making certain kinds of predictions about text structure. These are as follows:
(1) What elements must occur;
(2) What elements can occur;
(3) Where must they occur;
(4) Where can they occur;
(5) How often can they occur.

More succinctly we would say that a CC can predict the OBLIGATORY (1) and the OPTIONAL (2) elements of a text's structure as well as their SEQUENCE (3 and 4) vis-à-vis each other and the possibility of their ITERATION (5).

(Halliday and Hasan, 1985, p. 56)

With the CC, it is possible to 'express the total range of optional and obligatory elements and their order' to state the 'structure potential' of the same genre: the generic structure potential (GSP) (Halliday and Hasan, 1985, p. 60). Thus, Hasan's
GSP is meaningful in that it specifies not only the obligatory and optional elements of a particular genre, but also the order of the occurrence of those elements.

2.3.4 Martin's Concept of 'Genre'

Martin developed a new view on the concepts of 'genre' and 'register'. The major difference between his framework and the frameworks developed by Halliday and Hasan is that in Martin's framework, the concept of 'genre' and the concept of 'register' are in two different semiotic levels that underlie the concept of 'language' (Martin, 1992, p. 501-502). According to Martin, register refers to 'the semiotic system constituted by the contextual variables, field, tenor and mode' (1992, p. 502), while genre can be defined as 'the system of staged, goal-oriented social processes through which social subjects in a given culture live their lives' (Martin, 1997, p. 13). He explains the relationship between register and genre as follows:

...genre is concerned with systems of social processes, where the principles for relating social processes to each other have to do with texture – the ways in which field, mode and tenor variables are phased together in a text. This means that the principles for relating texts to one another at the level of genre complement those at the level of register.

(Martin, 1997, p. 12)

In Martin's framework, genre contextualizes register (field, tenor, mode), and register contextualizes language (Martin, 1997, p. 7).

Swales recognized two merits in separating genre and register from one another. Firstly, by setting the goal of a text in terms of social processes at the level of genre, the elements of register (field, tenor, and mode) can be considered as being controlled by genre. Therefore, it makes it easier to explain how 'some topics are suitable for lectures than others; others will be more or less suitable for informal
conversation between unequals' (Swales, 1990, p. 40). Secondly, by separating
genre from register, it becomes easier to analyze the stages of a text. In Hasan's GSP,
text structure is strongly related to the CC of field, tenor and mode. On the other
hand, in Martin's theory, text structure is generated at the level of genre. He explains
as follows:

Genre networks would thus be formulated on the basis of similarities and
differences between the text structures which thereby define text types. As part
of the realization process, generic choices would preselect field, mode and
tenor options associated with particular elements of text structure. Text
structure is referred to as schematic structure in Martin's model, with genre
defined as a staged, goal-oriented social process realized through register.
(Martin, 1992, p. 505)

Swales adopted Martin's theory and separated the concepts of 'genre', 'register' and
'language' to carry out his genre analysis research (Swales, 1990, pp. 40-41).

2.4 Sociolinguistics and its Influence on Swales' Theory

The key concepts in sociolinguistics that influenced Swales' theory are the concepts
of 'speech community'; as defined by Saville-Troike in The Ethnography of
Communication: An Introduction (1989), and ethnomethodology. In the following
sections, these three sociolinguistic influences on Swales' theory will be discussed
after a brief review of the historical background of sociolinguistics, as well as the
relationship between genre and social reality.

2.4.1 Historical Background of Sociolinguistics

Sociolinguistics studies the use of language in a particular community. It has
influenced Swales' genre analysis theory in the way the relationship between
language and community is seen. Language from the sociolinguistic point of view is
social and functional: it is meaningful only to those who belong to the community in which it is spoken, or to those who are familiar with its use in the community. As can be seen in the Whorfian hypothesis, language and culture are so strongly related that they cannot be studied separately. Therefore, language is considered to comprise not only words and grammatical rules, but also the cultural background of the community, social rules within the community and other commonsense knowledge and practical reasoning shared by its members.

Saussure in the early 1900s also viewed language as social semiotics and this view of Saussure's greatly influenced Malinowsky and Halliday (see 2.3.1).

Although the importance of the relationship between language and culture was widely known, no successful descriptive and analytic study on the relationship was carried out until the mid 20th century when Dell Hymes published *The Ethnography of Speaking* in 1962:

Hymes launched a new synthesizing discipline which focuses on the patterning of communicative behavior as it constitutes one of the systems of culture, as it functions within the holistic context of culture, and as it relates to patterns in other component systems.

(Saville-Troike, 1989, p. 1)

The objective of this 'new synthesizing discipline' named 'ethnography of communication' was to establish an interdisciplinary study of linguistics, ethnography and anthropology to clarify the relationship between language and culture. This new discipline can be considered part of sociolinguistic studies although Saville-Troike claims that ethnography of communication and sociolinguistics differ in terms of the objective of the research. She argues that in
sociolinguistics, researchers study the variability in pronunciation and grammatical form, while in ethnography of communication, they try to explain how such variation is systematically related to the background culture (Saville-Troike, 1989, p. 11).

Since the study of genre analysis within Swales’ framework is the study of the use of language in a particular discourse community, it is not surprising that some sociolinguistic influences, especially that of ethnography of communication can be found in the theory. Sociolinguistic influences can be seen in the definition of the first two of the three key concepts in Swales’ theory: ‘discourse community’, ‘genre’ and ‘task’. Ethnomethodological influences can be seen in the method and objective of Swales’ genre analysis study.

2.4.2 ‘Speech Community’ in Sociolinguistics and Swales’ ‘Discourse Community’

From the outset of the study of sociolinguistics, one of the key subjects of the study has been the community in which members speak the same language. Sociolinguists called such a community ‘speech community’. Researchers tended to agree that this concept refers to a community in which the people not only use the same language and share the grammatical rules but also the cultural and historical background of the language. However, they failed to come up with a common definition that satisfies every researcher. Hudson summarizes several definitions of ‘speech community’ by major sociolinguists:

(1) A speech community is a group of people who interact by means of speech. (Bloomfield, 1933, p. 42)
(2) The speech community: any human aggregate characterized by regular and frequent interaction by means of a shared body of verbal signs and set off from similar aggregates by significant differences in language use.

(Gumperz, 1968)

(3) The speech community is not defined by any marked agreement in the use of language elements, so much as by participation in a set of shared norms; these norms may be observed in overt types of evaluative behavior, and by the uniformity of abstract patterns of variation which are invariant in respect to particular levels of usage (Labov, 1972, p. 120)

(Hudson, 1980, p. 25)

Dell Hymes suggested a definition of ‘speech community’ that came to be widely accepted:

A speech community is defined, then, tautologically but radically, as a community sharing knowledge of rules for the conduct and interpretation of speech. Such sharing comprises knowledge of at least one form of speech, and knowledge also of its patterns of use. Both conditions are necessary.

(Hymes, 1974, p. 51).

At the same time, Hymes defined a ‘speech community’ as the ‘social matrix’ through which children learn the system of grammar and the system of use regarding persons, places and purposes and other modes of communication (Hymes, 1974, p. 75).

Swales’ concept of ‘discourse community’ differs from that of Hymes’. Swales defines ‘discourse community’ as a community in which a particular type of written text is shared, by contrasting it with Hymes’ description of ‘speech community’. First, he paraphrases Hymes’ definition of ‘speech community’ as a community that has ‘shared linguistic forms, shared regulative rules and shared cultural concepts’ (Swales, 1990, p. 24). Then, he mentions that there are three major differences between Hymes’ concept of ‘speech community’ and his concept of ‘discourse community’. First, in a discourse community, the language medium is mainly
written text and not speech. This means that members of the community do not have to be geographically located close to each other. Second, in a discourse community, social consideration is not necessary and the use of language is essentially functional, whereas in a speech community language is used primarily for the social objective. Thirdly, in a speech community, membership is passed down from generation to generation, but in a discourse community, people become members of it on their own will (Swales, 1990, p. 24).

In summary, while both sociolinguistics and Swales’ genre analysis focus on the use of language in the human social community, the concept of community in the two fields is different. In a sociolinguistic ‘speech community’ people become members not of their own will, and the use of language is social and not goal oriented. On the other hand, in Swales’ ‘discourse community’, people become members of it for their own benefit and the use of language is purely functional.

2.4.3 Concept of ‘Genre’

The concept of ‘genre’ in Swales’ framework is linked to Hyme’s and Saville-Troike’s views. In both views, three-fold units, i.e., ‘communicative situation’, ‘communicative event’ and ‘communicative act’ are used for the analysis of an utterance, or discourse. The definition of these units is as follows:

The communicative situation is the context in which communication occurs. … A single situation maintains a consistent general configuration of activities, the same overall ecology within which communication takes place, although there may be great diversity in the kinds of interaction which occur there.

The communicative event is the basic unit for descriptive purposes. A single event is defined by a unified set of components throughout, beginning with the same general purpose of communication, the same general topic, and involving the same participants, generally using the same language variety, maintaining
the same tone or key and the same rules for interaction, in the same setting. An event terminates whenever there is a change in the major participants, their role-relationships, or the focus of attention. ...

The communicative act is generally conterminous with a single interactional function, such as a referential statement, a request, or a command, and may be either verbal or non-verbal. (Saville-Troike, 1989, pp. 26-28)

The example of wedding can be used to illustrate these units. A Christian wedding ceremony (a communicative situation) is likely to include the following 'communicative events': welcome prayer, summary of the law, reading of scriptures, sermon, declaration of intention, exchange of rings, prayer, declaration of marriage, and blessing. In one of these communicative events i.e., the declaration of intention, a sequence of 'communicative acts', like confirmation of the intention with the bridegroom, confirmation of the intention with the bride, declaration by the bridegroom, and declaration by the bride, will take place. Thus, the communicative event is embedded in the communicative situation and the communicative act is embedded in the communicative event.

However, Hymes’ and Saville-Troike’s views, differ when it comes to the concept of 'genre'.

(a) Hymes’ View

Hymes considered the concept of ‘genre’ as one of the components of ‘context of utterance’; in other words, as a factor in a communicative situation. He defined ‘context’ as a complex system consisting of cognitive, sociocultural, discourse, psycho-biological, political and material factors that ‘covers anything which could
influence the production or interpretation of an utterance’ (Figueroa, 1994, p. 60). He claimed that context consists of eight components: setting and scene, participants, ends (the point where the speaker thinks his/her goal of the communication has been attained), act sequence (message form and message content), key (the modality of the speech act), instrumentalities (how the message is transmitted), norms of interaction and interpretation, and finally, genre (Hymes, 1974, pp. 53-66).

Hymes defines genre as follows:

Genres often coincide with speech events, but must be treated as analytically independent of them. They may occur in (or as) different events. The sermon as a genre is typically identified with a certain place in a church service, but its properties may be invoked, for serious or humorous effect, in other situations. (Hymes, 1974, p. 61)

In Hymes’ view, genre is a factor of the speech situation and is something that must be treated separately from the speech event. This view of Hymes towards genre can be problematic when analyzing discourse. In his view, for example, when a prayer in a wedding ceremony is given the context of, for example, a comedy play for a humorous effect, it should still be recognized as a prayer in a wedding ceremony.

(b) Saville-Troike’s view

Saville-Troike, on the other hand, takes a different view of genre. Saville-Troike uses the same three-fold units of analysis stated by Hymes. However, she takes the view that genre refers to a type of communicative event. She clearly states that genre is one of the components of a communicative event that comprises the scene, or extra-personal context of the event (Saville-Troike, 1989, p. 138). She provides conversation, lecture, oratory, gossip, joking, story telling, and preaching as examples of types of communicative event (Saville-Troike, 1989, p. 30-31). In her
framework, when properties of a prayer are invoked in a joke, it can no longer be seen as a prayer, but must be categorized as a joke.

(c) Swales’ View

Saville Troike’s concept of ‘genre’ was adopted by Swales. Following Saville-Troike, Swales makes it clear that in the course of genre analysis, analysts do not have to blindly follow pre-existing categorization labels:

Rather, the procedure should be to develop sets of a posteriori categories, ones based on empirical investigation and observation, within which eliciting the community’s category-labels plays a central role. (Swales, 1990, pp. 39-40)

In summary, in Swales’ theory, genre is considered a type of communicative event in relationship to the situation.

2.4.4 Ethnomethodology

Ethnomethodology is a process-oriented analytical method of know-how in a culture. Saville-Troike describes this method as follows:

Ethnomethodology is concerned primarily with discovering the underlying processes which speakers of a language utilize to produce and interpret communicative experiences, including the unstated assumptions which are shared cultural knowledge and understandings. (Saville-Troike, 1989, p. 130)

In ethnomethodology, a text is studied not only at the surface level, but also at a lower level where the cultural factors of the community in which the text was generated determine its meaning. An example of religious discourse can be used to illustrate this point. ‘Remembering His suffering and passion, we receive this bread and this cup, which tell of His atoning death for the sins of the whole world’ would
be a puzzling or even meaningless text at the surface level especially for non-Christian people. However, for Christians, this text at a lower level would immediately remind them of the Holy Communion service in which the believers take the bread and wine that symbolize the body and blood of Jesus. They would know the meaning of the phrases in the text, for example, that ‘His suffering and passion’ point to the death of Jesus on the cross. Moreover, Christians would know that the text is only a part of what they call ‘the words of institution’ that they chant before they receive the bread and wine.

Another example that can be used to illustrate the above point is the organization of an experimental research article. When reading an experimental article in a particular field, the readers who are familiar with the field are able to predict the contents of the article without looking at the subheadings in each section because they are familiar with the lower level of the text. They know that the introduction, method, results and discussion would come in an established order. They can anticipate the kind of information they would get and can identify the textual characteristics or the lexico-grammatical features that would illuminate the expected information. The role of ethnomethodologists is to try to account for the ongoing social and cultural process of a text. This methodology has influenced genre analysis in that analysts observe genre-specific features in the surface structure of a text and try to explain the cultural factors that underlie the surface structure.

2.4.5 Genre and Social Reality

So far, three aspects of sociological influences on Swales’ theory of genre analysis have been discussed.
Bhatia, one of the advocates of Swales’ theory, has identified yet another sociological element. He claims that by analyzing genre, analysts can ‘understand how a particular genre defines, organizes and finally communicates social reality’ (Bhatia 1993, p. 18). He adds that the text itself does not have a complete set of meaning on its own but must be regarded as ‘an ongoing process of negotiation’ in social and cultural settings. Bhatia thus emphasizes the importance of the sociolinguistic point of view when analyzing a genre. At the same time, the study of genre analysis can clarify not only the linguistic form of a text of a particular discourse community but also the sociological features of the community.

Miller also accepts the view that genre analysis should be studied both linguistically and sociolinguistically:

Genre study is valuable not because it might permit the creation of some kind of taxonomy, but because it emphasizes some social and historical aspects of rhetoric that other perspectives do not.

(Miller, 1984).

She emphasizes that through the study of genre analysis, it is possible to see the social, historical, and cultural aspects of the discourse community.

People who belong to any particular community share a language. Therefore, the study of language must involve a sociological and sociolinguistic study of the community in which the language is used. The same can be said with the study of genre. Since genre is ‘a set of communicative events’ (Swales, 1990, p. 58) in a particular discourse community, the sociological and sociolinguistic elements of the community are essential to the description and explanation of a genre. A successful
study of a genre must explain not only the linguistic, formulaic characteristics of the text, but also the social and cultural constraints that lie in the background.

2.5 Discourse Analysis and its Influence on Swales’ Theory

Among the related studies, perhaps the study of discourse analysis is the closest to Swales’ genre analysis in the sense that the two studies analyze text with the view that a text consists of semantic units. However, there is a difference between the two in the way the researcher carries out the analysis. A successful conversation or text is achieved only when the executer and the receiver come to a consensus about meaning. Otherwise, it will result in misunderstanding between them. In discourse analysis, the researcher carries out the process-oriented analysis of a text from both speaker/writer and hearer/listener points of view. In other words, the researcher merely describes the interaction between the executer and the receiver of the message. On the other hand, in Swales’ genre analysis, the researcher not only describes the interaction but also tries to explain it. The explanation is not limited to lexico-grammatical features specific to the genre but is extended to the cultural factors of the discourse community that affect the construction of the text.

In the following sections, major theories in discourse analysis are reviewed.

2.5.1 Historical Background

In 1952, one of the first papers on discourse analysis was presented by Harris (Rieser, 1978, p. 6, van Dijk, 1985, p. 4). Harris analyzed text using morphologically equivalent units. Coulthard (1977) explains Harris’ analysis as follows:
As an example he (Harris) creates a text containing the following four sentences,

The trees turn here about the middle of autumn.
The trees turn here about the end of October.
The first frost comes after the middle of autumn.
We start heating after the end of October.

The aim of the analysis is to isolate units of text which are distributionally equivalent though not necessarily similar in meaning; that is equivalences which have validity for that text alone. From the first two sentences above one establishes the equivalence of 'the middle of autumn' and 'the end of October', not because they are similar in meaning but because they share an identical environment, 'the trees turn here'. The next step is to carry over the equivalences derived from the first two sentences into the next two and this allows us to equate 'the first frost comes' with 'we start heating' and of course both with 'the trees turn here' which provided the original context. Thus, in terms of equivalence classes, all four sentences have identical structure, class X followed by class Y.

(Coulthard, 1977, p. 4)

In this purely syntactic analysis using morphologically equivalent units in a text, Harris claims that the cohesion of a text is realized by recurrence of parallelism of syntactic patterns (de Beaugrande and Dressler, 1981, p. 21).

Following this paper, in the 1970s, under the influence of the Chomskian theory of generative transformational grammar, researchers tried to analyze texts using sentence grammar. However, soon, some of these researchers found difficulty in analyzing texts syntactically at the surface level. As a result, researchers such as Van Dijk and Kintch developed generative semantics in which the text is analyzed both syntactically and semantically. Another trend of discourse analysis based on the functional analysis approach developed from systemics. One of the earliest studies in this trend was conversation analysis by Sinclair and Coulthard which developed into written discourse analysis by researchers like Hoey and Winter. In the following two sections, generative semantics and conversation analysis are discussed.
2.5.2 van Dijk's Generative Semantics

In 1972, van Dijk stated his theory of 'micro-structure' and 'macro-structure', which was a theory and, at the same time, a methodology of generative semantics. 'macro-structure' of a text refers to a summary of the text while 'micro-structure' of a text refers to the relationship between the propositions:

At the micro-level the semantics assigns sequences of propositions to the sequence of sentences of the discourse. Several propositions may be expressed by one sentence, depending on certain semantic, pragmatic, stylistic (and cognitive and social) factors not to be discussed here, or must be expressed by a sequence of sentences.

(van Dijk and Kintsch, 1978, pp. 67-68)

On the other hand, he describes macro-structure as follows:

The global meaning of a discourse is represented by semantic macro-structures. These will also be represented as propositions. Hence we need semantic mappings, which we call macro-rules, in order to relate micro-structures with macro-structures. Characteristic of macro-structures is that they are entailed by the sequence of propositions (micro-structure) of the discourse. Characteristic of macro-structure is that they are entailed by the sequence of propositions (macro-structure) of the discourse. Their function is to reduce and organize information. That is, they delete and combine sequences of propositions, under certain specified conditions. Due to their recursive nature, macro-rules generate not one macro-structure, but several macro-structures at increasingly more global levels of semantic representation, where the macro-structure is the top-most macro-structure. A general constraint on macro-rules is that no proposition may be deleted which is a presupposition for a subsequent (macro-) proposition in the discourse.

(van Dijk and Kintsch, 1978, p. 68)

Later, van Dijk elaborated on his theory of 'macro-structure' and proposed the concept of 'superstructure' which is a schematic structure common to a class of macro-structures. He defines superstructure as follows:

Superstructures are schemata for conventional text forms; knowledge of these forms facilitates generating, remembering, and reproducing macrostructures.
Not all text types have such conventional forms, but when one exists it seems to play a considerable role in processing.  
(van Dijk and Kintsch, 1983, p. 54)

He uses the example of a story to explain narrative schema. Usually, a story begins with the exposition or the introduction of the actors and the situation followed by the complication which changes the initial situation with a dramatic event and is finally concluded by the resolution which settles down the event and stabilizes the situation. This string of three frames is the narrative schema. Within this schema, or superstructure, the macro-structure or summary is formed.

However, van Dijk’s concepts of ‘micro-structure’, ‘macro-structure’, and ‘superstructure’ proved to be rather formal and descriptive and thus were not suitable for analyzing the ongoing underlying process of a text that needs to involve the context. Description of the ongoing process of a text was attempted by the Birmingham School which is discussed in the following section.

2.5.3 Conversation Analysis and the Birmingham Model

Conversation analysis developed from Halliday’s systemic functional linguistics in the 1970s. Sinclair, Coulthard, Hoey and their peers, under the influence of the analysis of communicative events by sociolinguists like Firth, Gumpertz and Hymes, analyzed everyday conversation in the context in which it appeared. They argued against Chomsky’s generative transformational grammar which analyzes only a grammatically correct model sentence, and claimed that it was not suitable for analyzing the functional meaning of the language that appears in actual conversation, for example in the following conversation:

Father: Is that your coat on the floor again?
Son: Yes. (Goes on reading)  

(Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975, p. 5)

If the father's question were analyzed within the framework of generative transformational grammar, the functional meaning of 'Pick the coat up' would be left out. Sinclair and Coulthard explained that:

......, the level of the language function in which we are centrally interested is neither the universal functions of language, nor the detailed function of surface formal ordering within the sentence. It is rather the level of the function of a particular utterance, in a particular social situation and at a particular place in a sequence, as a specific contribution to a developing discourse.  

(Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975, p. 13)

Sinclair and Coulthard are of opinion that the unit of communication is not a word or a sentence, but the 'act' that the sentence is to perform (Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975, p. 14).

In 1975, Coulthard and other members of the English Language Research group at the University of Birmingham launched a research project called 'The English Used by Teachers and Pupils'. Upon analyzing the classroom talk between a teacher and the pupils, they first clarified the different levels of analysis that could take place (see Table 2-2).
Table 2-2 Levels and Ranks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Linguistic Organization</th>
<th>DISCOURSE</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>LESSON</td>
<td>sentence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>period</td>
<td>TRANSACTION</td>
<td>clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>topic</td>
<td>EXCHANGE</td>
<td>word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move</td>
<td></td>
<td>morpheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975, p. 24)

In the above table, the non-linguistic organization level lends an institutional point of view to the analysis. The discourse level represents the functional linguistic point of view and the grammar level refers to the formal linguistic point of view. Ranks at different levels, for example, the sentence rank at the level of grammar, were found to correspond superficially to the move rank of the discourse level. The ranks represent the units of analysis at the level: the lower rank unit is embedded in the higher rank unit. Sinclair and Coulthard analyzed the classroom conversation at the discourse level, using the four ranks indicated below:

```
Act
  ↓
Move
  ↓
Exchange
  ↓
Transaction
```

(Source: Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975, pp. 19-24)

The benefit of using the rank scale is its flexibility. Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) explain the flexibility of the model as follows:
We decided to use a rank scale for our descriptive model because of its flexibility. The major advantage of describing new data with a rank scale is that no rank has any more importance than any other and thus if, as we did, one discovers new patterning it is a fairly simple process to create a new rank to handle it.

(Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975, p. 20)

Table 2-3 below briefly describes the system of analysis developed in the above method, now called the ‘Birmingham Model’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Major Categories</th>
<th>Other Identification Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Act</td>
<td>Corresponds closely to grammatical clause,</td>
<td>elicitaton</td>
<td>Situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>but clause is formal whereas act is functional.</td>
<td>directive</td>
<td>Tactics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>informative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move</td>
<td>Consists of one or more acts.</td>
<td>Framing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Focusing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opening</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Answering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Follow-up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange</td>
<td>Consists of several moves. The structure of an</td>
<td>Boundary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>exchange is labeled in terms of Initiation (I),</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response (R), Feedback (F).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transaction</td>
<td>Begins with preliminary exchange (boundary)</td>
<td>Inform</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>followed by medial exchanges and concluded by final</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>exchange (boundary).</td>
<td>Elicit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975, pp. 27-60)

The categories of each unit are specific to the type of conversation that is being analyzed. The categories given in the above model are of a classroom conversation between the teacher and the pupils. ‘Situation’ under ‘other identification measures’ refers to the context and situation of the utterance while ‘tactics’ refers to the syntagmatic patterns of discourse, or the order of the utterance. It is the ‘tactics’ that would describe the ongoing process of the conversation (Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975; Coulthard, 1977). The Birmingham model was epochal in that it invented the
measure to describe the underlying process of spoken text. However, this model is
only useful in the analysis of conversational texts and is not suitable for written text.
In the following section, the analysis of written text by Winter and Hoey is discussed.

2.5.4 Winter’s Clause Relations and Hoey’s Textual Patterns

The focus of this section will be on clause relations and macro-patterns found in
English texts.

According to Winter, the clause is the largest semantic unit in the sentence (Winter,
1986, p. 90; 1994, p. 48). His definition of ‘clause relations’ is as follows:

A Clause Relation is the shared cognitive process whereby we interpret the
meaning of a Clause or group of clauses in the light of their adjoining clauses
or group of clauses. Where the clauses are independent, we speak of ‘sentence
relations’.

(Winter, 1994, p. 49)

There are three kinds of the basic clause relations: ‘matching’, ‘logical-sequence’
and ‘multiple clause relation’ (Winter, 1986, p. 91; 1994, pp. 50-55 and elsewhere).
‘Matching’ relation is characterized by ‘high degree of systematic repetition between
its clauses’ and by the ‘semantics of compatibility or incompatibility’ (Winter, 1994,
p. 50). ‘Logical-sequence’ relation expresses simple chronological sequences or
deductive or causal sequences. ‘Multiple clause relation’ refers to the relation that is
a composite or multiple of ‘matching’ and ‘logical’ sequence. In Winter’s theory,
clause relations are realized by subordinators, conjuncts, lexical signaling and
repetition. Paraphrase and questions are useful measures for clarifying the
relationship.
Hoey (1983, p. 19, 1994, pp. 26-34) applied this method of defining the sequential relations between the clauses to define the textual patterns of longer passages or discourse as a whole. He assumed that there are patterns in discourse organization that are known to both writers/speakers and readers/listeners. These discourse patterns are signaled by clues, including clause relations observed within the discourse. He claimed that the most popular discourse pattern in English text is that of Situation-Problem-Response-Result-Evaluation, widely known as the Problem-Solution Pattern.

The study of discourse thus paved the way for analyzing the semantic structure of discourse shared both by the writer/speaker and the reader/listener.

2.5.5 Discourse Analysis and Genre Analysis

Discourse analysis is a study of semantics through which the patterns of the ongoing process of logical development is sought and described. The objective of the study is very close to that of genre analysis. However, genre analysts take a more pedagogical point of view and try not only to describe the logical development pattern of the text but also to explain it. For the writer or reader to succeed in reading or writing a text in a particular genre, he/she must be familiar with lexico-grammatical and textual norms of the genre. Bhatia writes that:

In the case of many other academic or professional genres a successful achievement of the specific communicative purpose that the genre in question serves, depends on the use of specific conventionalized knowledge of linguistic and discoursal resources, depending upon the subject-specific, socio-cultural and psycholinguistic factors typically associated with the setting with which the genre is associated.

(Bhatia 1993)
In the next section, English for Specific Purposes, which is the pedagogical study of particular usages of English in a particular discourse community is discussed in detail in reference to Swales' theory.

2.6 English for Specific Purposes and Swales' Theory

English for Specific Purposes (ESP) is one of the neighboring studies of genre analysis.

2.6.1 Historical Background of ESP and Major Works in the Field

After World War II, people of different native languages started to use English. English soon became a common language in the academic and business worlds. However, the teaching of English was limited to the general use of the language and was not sufficient to satisfy the needs of those who needed to use it for specific purposes like in business contexts, or in the academic field. To meet such needs, a new field, English for Specific Purposes (ESP) developed in the 1960s.

One of the first papers in ESP was presented by Barber on the syntax and vocabulary observed in scientific texts (Barber, 1962). In 1964, Halliday et al. presented a study on register analysis for pedagogical purposes. In this early stage, ESP studies were mainly on grammatical and lexical features of scientific English based on statistical analysis of the use of vocabulary, or a particular type of verb tense (Hutchinson and Waters, 1987, pp. 9-10; Swales, 1990, p. 2). These studies were purely descriptive and the objective was to teach the learners the language forms specifically found in the field.
The second stage was during the 1970s where ESP analysts started analyzing texts both syntactically and semantically. In 1971, Swales presented *Writing Scientific English*, a textbook for non-native speakers. The first half of this book was on grammatical features observed in scientific English; however, the second half was more functional with the exercises reflecting the 'cognitive approach' and not the pattern-practices popular in those days. A major feature of this book was that Swales presented the information structure of the paragraphs in science (Swales, 1985, p. 37).

American academicians also contributed to the field. Lackstrome, Selinker and Trimple (1972) claimed that rhetorical considerations determine grammatical choices; in other words, they tried not only to describe but also to explain the syntactic features of technical English:

The purpose of this article is to show that correct grammatical choices in a written medium cannot be taught apart from considerations of rhetoric and subject matter. To support this claim we will examine several areas. We will show (1) that the choice of tenses in the written medium is dependent not on 'time lines', as most textbook presentations suppose, but on rhetorical and subject-matter considerations, (2) that specific grammatical choices involving definite and indefinite articles depend on rhetorical and subject-matter principles, and (3) that choices involving adverbs, aspect, agent phrases, and nominalization often demand contextual directives. In a sample paragraph of scientific writing, we will explore some additional aspects of the interpenetration of grammar and rhetoric.

(Swales, 1985. p. 62)

More specifically, they analyzed and explained the register for the core idea and the supporting ideas within a paragraph. This article was the beginning of the rhetorical functional approach in ESP. Until then, register analysis was limited to sentence grammar, but with the pioneering works of Swales (1971), Lackstrome, Selinker and
Trimble (1972), the semantic relationship between the sentences within a discourse became the focus of the analysis.

The practice of needs analysis was another landmark of this era. The teachers and researchers in ESP noticed the importance of identifying the target situation for the successful results of the ESP classes. Munby proposed a needs analysis model, the Communicative Needs Processor, for a purpose-specific course based on functional, sociolinguistic theories. He describes the principle of the Communicative Needs Processor as follows:

A sociocultural orientation focuses on the social function of language and displays a learner-centered approach. Before deciding what to teach the learner one wants to know his requirements in terms of, for example, communicative mode and activities, and the relationships between him and his interlocutors. In other words, the specification of communication requirements or needs is prior to the selection of speech functions or communicative acts to be taught. By drawing up a profile of communication needs one can more validly specify the particular skills and linguistic forms to be taught.

(Munby, 1978, p. 24)

However, although the Communicative Needs Processor was innovative, it only illustrated the list of linguistic features resulting in the inhuman mechanical teaching of the language of the target discourse community (Swales, 1985, p. 189; Hutchinson and Waters, 1987, p. 54). While admitting the importance of needs analysis, Hutchinson and Waters proposed a new way to assess the needs of the learners. They proposed gathering information on ‘target needs’, ‘what the learner needs to do in the target situation’, and on ‘learning needs’ which is ‘what the learner needs to do in order to learn’ (Hutchinson and Waters, 1987, p. 54). Their approach was more effective in that it was ‘learner-centred’.
In the 1980s, the theme of the ESP studies became narrower and deeper and more explanatory than descriptive as exemplified by Tarone, Dwyer, Gillette and Icke’s work on the use of the passive in astrophysics journal papers (1981). They set out to explain the use of the passive in two articles from astrophysics by not only comparing the frequency of the occurrences of the active and passive voices, but also analyzing the rhetorical function of the active and passive verb forms according to the discourse structure of the text. Another innovative feature of their work was that they consulted a ‘specialist informant’ on the use of the language in astrophysics data.

Linguists also explored the characteristics of the discourse structure of a particular kind of text in a particular field. Swales, for example, studied the norms in the logical development of the article introductions in the fields of science and technology (Swales, 1981). He analyzed the moves of the text and proposed a model indicating the flow of the moves. This model will be discussed in detail later under 2.7. Wood (1982) studied articles in the field of chemistry and claimed that the articles were written according to established rhetorical structure. He suggested that the teachers incorporate the teaching of the authentic rhetorical structure. Swales describes the development of ESP of the 1980s as follows:

Work in ESP was, by the middle eighties, not merely interested in characterizing linguistic effects; it was also concerned to seek out the determinants of those effects. It thus, of its nature, deals with the ‘communicative character’ of discourse.

(Swales, 1990, p. 4)

To summarize, with the development of related fields like socio-linguistics, systemics and discourse analysis, more researchers in the field of ESP became interested in the relationship between the rhetorical functions of grammatical features
and the discourse structure of a particular kind of text in a particular field. Researchers began not only describing the linguistic features but also ventured into explaining them.

2.6.2 ESP and Swales’ Genre Analysis

Genre analysis can be considered one of the ESP studies focusing on the discourse structure of a particular kind of text in a particular discourse community. A crucial difference between discourse analysis and genre analysis is that while discourse analysis is a linguistic study, genre analysis is a pedagogical study. Genre analysts try to analyze and explain the rhetorical functions of linguistic features and the discourse structure of a particular kind of text written in a particular discourse community for the benefit of learners.

2.7 Genre Analysis in Applied Linguistics: Swales’ Theory

Genre Analysis developed as a part of ESP. During the 1960s, Swales, in the course of teaching academic English, felt the need to analyze how an authentic text is interpreted by the community for which the text was written. Certainly, there had been lexico-grammatical analysis of texts in a particular academic field (Barber, 1962, Halliday, McIntosh and Strevens, 1964). However, these analyses were superficial and did not explain why a particular discourse structure was adopted in such texts. Swales tried to analyze the contextual situation and the rhetorical function of the text from the pedagogical standpoint resulting in his theory of genre analysis (Bloor, 1998).
Swales explained that his theory of genre analysis is built upon three concepts, that is, ‘discourse community’, ‘genre’ and ‘language-learning task’ (Swales, 1990, p. 9).

The inter-relationship between these three key concepts is described as follows:

Discourse communities are sociorhetorical networks that form in order to work towards sets of common goals. One of the characteristics that established members of these discourse communities possess is familiarity with the particular genres that are used in the communicative furtherance of those sets of goals. In consequence, genres are the properties of discourse communities; that is to say, genres belong to discourse communities, not to individuals, other kinds of grouping or to wider speech communities. Genres themselves are classes of communicative events which typically possess features of stability, name recognition and so on. Genre-type communicative events (and perhaps others) consist of texts themselves (spoken, written, or a combination) plus encoding and decoding procedures as moderated by genre-related aspects of text-role and text-environment. These processing procedures can be viewed as tasks. The acquisition of genre skills depends on previous knowledge of the world, giving rise to content schemata, knowledge of prior texts, giving rise to formal schemata, and experience with appropriate tasks. Thus, the teaching of genre skills essentially involves the development of acquisition-promoting text-task activities.

(Swales, 1990, pp. 9-10)

He further states that it is the ‘communicative purpose’ that binds these three key concepts in his theory (Swales, 1990, p. 10). Each of the three concepts is discussed in detail below.

(a) Discourse Community

Genre analysis analyzes the lexico-grammatical features and rhetorical features of a particular type of text adopted in a particular discourse community from the social-semiotic point of view. In Swales’ theory, a discourse community is essentially a social community. He defines his concept of ‘discourse community’ as follows:

1. A discourse community has a broadly agreed set of common public goals.
2. A discourse community has mechanisms of intercommunication among its members.
3. A discourse community uses its participatory mechanisms primarily to provide information and feedback.
4. A discourse community utilizes and hence possesses one or more genres in the communicative furtherance of its aims.
5. In addition to owning genres, a discourse community has acquired some specific lexis.
6. A discourse community has a threshold level of members with a suitable degree of relevant content and discoursal expertise.

(Swales, 1990, pp. 24-27):

Swales' 'discourse community' is different from 'speech community' in sociolinguistics mainly in that the objective of Swales' 'discourse community' is not in the socializing of its members like in a 'speech community', but in its members' sharing of the same interest, either social or academic (see 2.4.2 for details).

**b) Genre**

Swales defines 'genre' as follows:

... a class of communicative events, the members of which share some set of communicative purposes. These purposes are recognized by the expert members of the parent discourse community, and thereby constitute the rationale for the genre. This rationale shapes the schematic structure of the discourse and influences and constrains choice as content and style. Communicative purpose is both a privileged criterion and one that operates to keep the scope of a genre as here conceived narrowly focused on comparable rhetorical action. In addition to purpose, exemplars of a genre exhibit various patterns of similarity in terms of structure, style, content and intended audience. If all high probability expectations are realized, the exemplar will be viewed as prototypical by the parent discourse community. The genre names others constitute valuable ethnographic communication but typically need further validation.

(Swales, 1990, pp. 45-58)

His concept of 'genre' is more conscientious about the parent discourse community and its members than Halliday's concept of 'genre'. Halliday defines his concept of 'generic structure' as 'the form that a text has as a property of its genre' (1978, pp. 133-134). Thus, Halliday's concept of 'genre' resides within the concept of 'register' and therefore, his concept of 'generic structure' is formulaic. Swales'
concept of ‘genre’ is somewhat closer to Martin’s concept of ‘genre’ in which ‘genre’ and ‘register’ are in different semiotic levels that lie under the concept of ‘language’ (Martin, 1992, p. 501-502) (see 2.3.4). In addition, Swales’ concept of ‘genre’ is cultural and is considered a type of communicative event (see 2.4.3 for details).

As examples of ‘genre’, Swales names research papers, letters of personal reference, poems, recipes, news broadcasts (Swales, 1990, p. 62). The texts that belong to one genre share a set of communicative purposes. Other properties, such as form, structure and audience expectations are identified with the prototypical rhetorical structure of the genre (Swales, 1990, p. 52).

In addition, Swales emphasizes the importance of understanding the rationale behind the discourse structure of a particular genre (1990, pp. 53-54) describing the inter-relationship between communicative purposes, rationale and conventions as ‘recognition of purposes provides the rationale, while the rationale gives rise to constraining conventions’ (Swales, 1990, p. 53)

For example, the discourse structure of a ‘good news’ letter differs from that of a ‘bad news’ letter, based on the different assumptions made by the writer. A ‘good news’ letter is written on the assumption that the information in the letter is welcome, whereas a ‘bad news’ letter is written on the assumption that the information in the letter would upset the receiver. Assumptions place constraints on the formal features of the text like the discourse structure and also the lexical, grammatical choices.
Swales also claims that nomenclatures used in a discourse community are insightful (Swales, 1990, pp. 54-57). The examples that he gives are those with premodifying nominal of purpose (e.g. introductory lecture, qualifying exam, survey article, review session, writing workshop), a purposive head-noun (e.g. grant application, reprint request, course description) and those that are self-descriptive of the occasion (e.g. final examination, plenary lecture, festschrift, faculty meeting or graduation address). He justifies reference to nomenclatures as follows:

One consequence is that these active members give genre names to classes of communicative events that they recognize as providing recurring rhetorical action. These names may be increasingly adopted first by overlapping or close discourse communities and then by farther and broader communities. Particular attention therefore needs to be given to the genre nomenclatures created by those who are most familiar with and most professionally involved in those genres.

(Swales, 1990, p. 55)

However, he warns that such nomenclatures of genre names must be treated with some caution as there are some genre names with no genres attached to them or there are ‘genres’ without a name.

(c) Task

Since the study of genre analysis was developed to meet the needs of ESP, it is obviously related to pedagogical objectives and language learning tasks. Borrowing from Candlin, Swales defines a ‘language learning task’ as:

... One of a set of differentiated, sequenceable goal-directed activities drawing upon a range of cognitive and communicative procedures relatable to the acquisition of pre-genre and genre skills appropriate to a foreseen or emerging sociorhetorical situation.

(Swales 1990, p. 76).

In order to be successful in providing appropriate language tasks to students, one needs to correctly evaluate what Swales calls the ‘four-fold investigative strategy’:
(1) assessment of the discourse community the students belong to or have belonged to; (2) evaluations and validations of instructional materials or textbooks and instructional advice on the text of the genre: sometimes, the sample text in a textbook does not represent the real example of the genre; (3) discourse analysis of the genre; and (4) evaluation of the methodology to be taken for the achievement of the students' goal of learning a particular language (Swales 1990, pp. 68-73). Since the results of genre analysis is intended for pedagogical use, elaborating on effective learning tasks is one of the key tasks in the theory of genre analysis.

The three key concepts elaborated above and bound by shared communicative purposes form the subjects of the genre analysis study in Swales' theory. In the following section, the process of analysis, i.e., moves analysis established by Swales is introduced.

2.8 Analyzing Genre: Swales' Moves Analysis

Swales developed moves analysis which, since Swales' pioneering 1981 publication on research article introductions, has become a popular method of analyzing genre in applied linguistics. Swales' moves analysis comprises two kinds of studies: studies on moves and studies on lexico-grammatical features of moves. In the following sections, these two studies are explained.

2.8.1 Moves Analysis

The first objective of moves analysis is to define and explain the role of each move as a component of the schematic structure of one particular section in a genre. In
short, a move consists of one or more sentences that are united under one topic within a paragraph and plays a specific role as a component of the schematic structure of the section, such as the introduction section, the method section, or the discussion section of a research article. Then based on this analysis, the analyst looks for the generalized model of the structure of the section.

In his analysis of the introduction section of 48 research articles from the science fields, Swales suggested the rhetorical structure model shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Move One: Establishing The Field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: Showing Centrality of the Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Stating Current Knowledge of the Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Ascribing Key Characteristics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Move Two: Summarizing Previous Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Move Three: Preparing for Present Research by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: Indicating a Gap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Question Raising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Extending a Finding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Move Four: Introducing Present Research by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: Giving the Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Describing Present Research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Swales, 1981, p. 22a)

When analysts like Bley-Vroman and Selinker (1984) and Crooks (1986) pointed out the difficulties caused by separating Move 1 and Move 2, Swales presented the threefold model known as the Create a Research Space (CARS) model shown below:
Move One: Establishing a territory
Step 1  Claiming centrality
and/or
Step 2  Making topic generalization(s)
and/or
Step 3  Reviewing items of previous research

Move Two: 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 Three: Occupying the niche
Step 1A  Outlining purposes
or
Step 1B  Announcing present research
Step 2    Announcing principal findings
Step 3    Indicating RA structure

(Swales, 1990, p. 141)

Through the study of moves, the researcher defines the move structure and the role of each move in the text.

2.8.2 Lexico-Grammatical Signals

In order to identify each move, Swales defined the lexico-grammatical features of each move. For example, he suggested that typical examples of the expressions found in Move 1 Step 1: Centrality Claims are:

- Recently, there has been a spate of interest in how to ...
- In recent years, applied researchers have become increasingly interested in ...
- The possibility ... has generated interest in ...
- Recently, there has been wide interest in ...
- The time development ... is a classic problem in fluid mechanics.
- The explication of the relationship between ... is a classic problem of ...
- The well-known ... phenomena ... have been favorite topics for analysis both in ...
- Knowledge of ... has a great importance for ...
- The study of ... has become an important aspect of ...
- The theory that ... has led to the hope that ...
The effect of ... has been studied extensively in recent years. Many investigators have recently turned to ...
The relationship between ... has been studied by many authors. A central issue in ... is the validity of ...

(Swales, 1990, p. 144)

For Move 1 Step 3, he first categorized the citations as integral or non-integral, and then each of these categories as reporting and non-reporting. He concluded that the use of the past tense is observed in an integral, reporting type of citation, the present perfect tense is observed in a non-integral, reporting type of citation, and the present (or modal) tense in a non-integral, non-reporting type of citation.

Thus, Swales not only developed a model of rhetorical organization of the research article introduction, but also suggested the lexico-grammatical signals of each move and step. Inspired by Swales' moves analysis, other analysts began working on the moves analysis of research articles. The major moves analysis studies based on Swales' theory are reviewed in the following section.

2.9 Major Studies based on Swales' Moves Analysis

Studies based on Swales' theoretical framework typically focus on rhetorical organization. Many researchers have studied the rhetorical structure of the various sections found in research articles. Others like Bhatia have worked on the moves analysis of other genres, like legal documents. The following table lists the major genre analysis works on rhetorical structure that have been carried out using Swales' framework.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Swales</td>
<td>Aspects of Article Introductions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Crookes</td>
<td>Towards a Validated Analysis of Scientific Text Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Dudley-Evans</td>
<td>Genre Analysis: An Investigation of the Introduction and Discussion Sections of MSc Dissertations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Hopkins</td>
<td>A Genre-Based Investigation of the Discussion Sections in Articles and Dissertations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Swales</td>
<td>Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Bhatia</td>
<td>A Genre-Based Approach to ESP Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Bhatia</td>
<td>Analysing Genre: Language Use in Professional Settings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Brett</td>
<td>A Genre Analysis of the Results Section of Sociology Articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Holmes</td>
<td>Genre Analysis, and the Social Sciences: An Investigation of the Structure of Research Article Discussion Sections in Three Disciplines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Onewu</td>
<td>The Medical Research Paper: Structure and Functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>Results Sections of Medical Research Articles: Analysis of Rhetorical Categories for Pedagogical Purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Posteguillo</td>
<td>The Schematic Structure of Computer Science Research Articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Feak</td>
<td>A Preliminary Analysis of Law Review Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reinhardt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sinheimer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Previous studies focusing on the various sections of the research article and the research article as a whole are discussed in detail below.

**Introduction Section**

Crookes (1984) and Dudley-Evans (1986) studied the introduction section of scientific research manuscripts and more recently, Feak et al. (2000) studied the introductory section of legal research papers.

Crookes (1984) analyzed the introduction section of 96 scientific articles. In order to avoid researcher subjectivity, he trained 2 MA (ESL) students to analyze the text and to test Swales’ four-move model. As a result he found that the boundary markers of Swales’ model were not clear. He also questioned the rationale for this first model of Swales’ rigidly limiting the moves to four moves. As was mentioned in 2.7.2,
Swales later revised the model and presented a three-move model, the CARS model (1990).

In his study of seven MSc dissertations on plant biology, Dudley-Evans (1986) found that the introduction section in his data had similar moves to those suggested in Swales' CARS model presented in 1981. However, there was a difference in the number of moves: Dudley-Evans' model consisted of 6 moves due to the greater length of the dissertation introduction. A major finding from his study was the cyclical patterns at a level below the model both in the introduction and the discussion sections of the articles.

Feak et al. (2000) carried out a detailed moves analysis of the introductory section of legal research papers and discovered the similarities and differences between the moves found in their corpus and the CARS model.

(b) Result Section
The major works on the result section include the studies of Brett (1994) and Williams (1999).

Brett (1994) was one of the first researchers to focus on articles in the field of sociology unlike earlier researchers who focused on articles in the field of natural science and technology. He introduced 'provisional, pedagogically usable description of the communicative categories or 'moves' (Brett, 1994). He identified 16 communicative categories of moves that could be classified into 'meta-textual' (pointer to the figures and tables), 'presentation' (statement of the findings) and
'comment' (substantiation of the findings). He claimed that the three-part pattern consisting of each of these three categories occurs cyclically in the result section.

Williams (1999) studied the result section of medical research articles and proposed a modified version of Brett's rhetorical categories. He claimed that Brett's model can be a basic model of rhetorical categories, but indicated that there is disciplinary variation in this section.

(c) Discussion Section

The discussion section was studied by Dudley-Evans (1986), Hopkins and Dudley-Evans (1988) and Holmes (1997).

Dudley-Evans (1986) studied the discussion section of MSc dissertations on plant biology while Hopkins and Dudley-Evans (1988) studied the discussion section of MSc dissertations on biology and articles on irrigation and drainage. In both articles, the cyclicity of the elements in the section was observed. Dudley-Evans and Hopkins found 11 elements that occurred in cyclic patterns in their data.

Holmes (1997), on the other hand, studied the social science discussion sections. He found that the rhetorical organization of the discussion section of social science articles was similar to that found in the natural science discussion section; he, however, noted that there were only 8 moves that occurred in cyclic patterns in his data.

(d) Research articles as a whole

Nwogu (1991, 1997) studied medical research articles and developed rhetorical organization models of the whole article. In his 1991 publication, he suggested a nine-move model for medical research articles, which he revised into an eleven-move model in his 1997 publication. In both his models, he suggested that each move is backed up by its constituent elements or sub-moves.

Posteguillo (1999) studied the macrostructure of computer science articles. His findings suggested that the rhetorical organization of computer science articles is quite different from the IMRD (introduction-method-results-discussion) pattern of natural science articles.

Bhatia studied business letters (1991) and legal documents (1993). His contribution to this field is in his detailed demonstration of the procedure of genre analysis (1993). He recommends that when analyzing a genre, the analyst should go through the following seven steps:

1. Placing the given genre-text in a situational context
2. Surveying existing literature
3. Refining the situational/contextual analysis
4. Selecting corpus
5. Studying the institutional context
6. Levels of linguistic analysis
   Level 1: Analysis of lexico-grammatical features
   Level 2: Analysis of text-patterning or textualization
   Level 3: Structural interpretation of the text-genre
7. Specialist information in genre analysis

(Bhatia, 1993, pp. 22-36)
Steps 1 to 3 are on the investigation of the genre and the discourse community: thus the analyst gets acquainted with their historical, socio/cultural, and philosophical background. Surveying the existing literature on the genre in question and other related genres will help the analyst identify the linguistic features commonly used among members of the discourse community. After selecting the corpus, the analyst then studies how the genre is used in the community. In this way, the analyst will familiarize him/herself with the linguistic and social rules that govern the use of the language.

Then, the analyst decides on the level of analysis. Level 1 refers to the statistical analysis of particular lexico-grammatical features including specific verb forms or clause patterns. To complete the analysis, the analyst should attempt an explanation as to why a particular form of word or sentence is used in the genre. Level 2 is the analysis of the function that a particular syntactic feature has in the subject genre. For example, the analyst should answer why so many NPs are seen in the data. Level 3 refers to the textual organization of the genre as represented by cognitive moves analysis.

The last step advises the analyst to consult an expert member of the discourse community to check whether or not his/her ratification of the language use and linguistic features is correct.

Bhatia's genre analysis procedure, like Swales' work, does not limit itself to moves analysis but also includes the study of lexico grammatical features.
2.10 Summary

Swales' genre analysis theory influenced by disciplines like systemics, sociolinguistics and discourse analysis in which genre is socio-cultural and is a type of communicative event flourished in ESP. Studies that are based on Swales' theory look for the prototypical rhetorical structure signaled by lexico-grammatical features. 'Moves analysis' provides the theoretical framework. The researcher, using the move as the unit of analysis, looks for a common, inter-discourse rhetorical structure in a particular genre and tries to explain the rationale behind the conventions. The significance of such analytical studies is that they present theoretical and, more importantly, pedagogical implications, especially for foreign language teaching.