

**RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF INTRODUCTIONS IN AN UNDERGRADUATE
ENGLISH STUDIES COURSE**

Joseph Benjamin Archibald Afful (PhD)

Department of English

University of Cape Coast

Cape Coast, Ghana

**RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF INTRODUCTIONS IN AN UNDERGRADUATE
ENGLISH LITERARY STUDIES COURSE**

Abstract

Recent discourse analytical studies have highlighted the importance of rhetorical moves in student writing. In this paper, I explore the rhetoric of introductions of examination essays written by second-year English students in a Ghanaian university. Drawing on a modified version of Swales' move analysis, I consider the generic structure and linguistic features of introductions. Analysis of the textual data pointed to three key findings. Firstly, the English Studies students do, in fact, introduce their essays, using a three-move rhetorical structure consisting of contextualizing, engaging closely with the examination prompt, and previewing the essay. Secondly, a two-sequence move pattern is preferred and Move 2 (engaging closely with prompt) occupies the greatest space for most students. The third finding relates to the use of personal pronouns, discourse verbs, and purpose expressions in the last move (previewing) of the introduction. These findings have important implications for both writing pedagogy and future research in the rhetoric of disciplinary writing at undergraduate level.

Key words: English Studies, genre, introduction, rhetoric, undergraduates,

INTRODUCTION

The focus of studies on student writing in the last two decades has shifted from the linguistic features of texts produced by the learners and the cognitive practices involved in text production (Flower & Hayes, 1981) to socio-cultural variables affecting written production such as audience and circumstances surrounding text production and most recently to the construction of the writer's identity. Such perception has often meant going beyond the text to concentrate on the social dynamics of the social context. Despite this concern with social context, the study of text and how, in particular, the rhetorical and epistemological ramifications play out in capturing disciplinary practices remain equally important and valid in academic writing and research such as the present one.

In the present research, I analyze the rhetoric of introductions to essays written by undergraduates in the examinations of one particular English course. I proceed by offering a brief sketch of the literature terrain concerning rhetoric in academic writing, focusing on undergraduate student writing. I then discuss the conceptual framework that underpins this study and the methodological procedure used. Thereafter, the analysis and discussion follow. Finally, I conclude with implications based on the findings of the study.

LITERATURE REVIEW

In the last two decades the social view of academic writing has sought to underscore the fact that different disciplines or sub-disciplines utilize rhetorical routines in ways that characterize their fields, leading to some scholars describing rhetoric as “epistemic” (e.g. Enos & Brown, 1993). The assumption underlying this considerable interest being shown

in studies concerned with the discourse of different disciplines is that by possessing meta-cognitive knowledge of the epistemology and rhetoric of the various disciplines, the enculturation of students, with specific regard to various forms of academic writing, will be facilitated.

One crucial rhetorical aspect of academic writing which has received considerable attention is the introduction. The most prominent study on this aspect in English for Specific Purposes (ESP) is Swales' (1981). Swales explored the rhetoric of the introduction of research articles (RAs), pioneering the CARS (create a research space) model, although initial criticism led to its revision. In his revised work, Swales (1990a) indicates three "moves" which are undertaken by expert writers: establishing a territory, establishing a niche, and occupying the niche. The Swalesian approach has not only been germinal but also continues to be popular in the investigation of the introduction section in published writing (Crookes, 1986; Hyland, 2000; Varghese & Abraham, 2004) and postgraduate writing (e.g. Bunton, 2002, 2005; Samraj, 2005). Employing Swales' rhetorical approach, these studies in published and postgraduate writing have highlighted differences in the generic structure of introductions in various genres and disciplines.

Obviously influenced by Swales' (1981) work, as early as 1984 Scarcella turned attention to the rhetoric of introduction in undergraduate writing. Scarcella distinguished between the introduction of native and non-native students in an American institution, claiming, among other things, that non-native learners of English tended to use repetitious linguistic elements unlike native speakers who used metatextual elements. Since Scarcella's study there have been countless studies seeking to understand how undergraduates, orient their readers in their introduction either exclusively or in relation

to other organizational units (e.g. Henry & Roseberry, 1997; Wu, 1997; Adika, 1999). Of note is a set of studies, which deals with specific disciplinary contexts, either in single disciplines such as Economics (Jordan, 1988; Lukmani, 1994), Biology (Lawe-Davies, 1998), Geography (Hewings, 1999, 2000), Literature (Wilder, 2002), Oceanography (Kelly & Bazerman, 2003), History of Science (North, 2003) Sociology (Starfield, 1999) or multiple disciplines (Kusel, 1992). In this set of studies, there is an attempt to show the distinctiveness of either a discipline or the similarity and dissimilarities of introductions against a chosen variable, often linguistic. In particular, Kelly and Bazerman's (2003) study reports the density of cohesive ties in the introduction of oceanography compared to other rhetorical units such as the methodology, discussion and conclusion. North's work focuses on thematization as a key linguistic feature in the introduction of undergraduate writing in History of Science. In turn, Starfield's (2004) research among students in a South African university in a foundation Sociology course identifies specific lexical features such as complex nominalization, metatextual elements, and impersonality. Kusel's (1992) work on the other hand approaches the examination of introductions in five disciplines (Teacher Education, English Literature, History, Geography, and Language Teaching) from a rhetorical-functional approach. Not surprisingly, it is less systematic and focused in its comment on language choices.

While it cannot be denied that all these studies conducted into the introduction in undergraduate writing have contributed to our understanding of disciplinarity, very little is known about the rhetoric that underlines undergraduates' introductions in an African context. In this study, the case for focusing on Ghanaian students is made, given the immense role English plays in the educational, economic, and political life of Ghana.

AIM OF THE PRESENT STUDY

The present study aims at exploring the rhetoric of introductions in second-year undergraduate examination writing at an English-medium university in Ghana, a Sub-Saharan setting. The following questions address this concern:

- Do English Literary Studies students introduce their essays, and how much textual space is given to the introduction, relative to the text as a whole?
- How many moves are used in introductions of English Literary Studies essays?
- How much space is given to each move in the English Literary Studies introductions?
- How are the moves within the introduction of English Literary Studies essays sequenced?
- How are the moves within the introduction of English Literary Studies essays linguistically instantiated?

Such an examination is worth considering in light of the implication it has for the scholarship on disciplinary discourse at the undergraduate level. An added contribution of the present study is the widening of contexts in the extant literature on disciplinary studies, given that none of the previous disciplinary studies has included undergraduates from Ghana, a country which remains one of the few African countries where English continues to be used as the sole official language.

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Research Design

This study adopts a qualitative research paradigm. Specifically, I deploy discourse analytical approach in examining the textual data. In addition, descriptive statistics such as frequency counts and mean are used, where relevant, to help determine trends and patterns regarding the frequency, textual space, and sequence of moves in the introductions.

Educational Setting

I chose the University of Cape Coast (UCC), a public university in Ghana that offers various programs to local and international students. Given the rare circumstance of Ghana as one of a few post-colonial settings that continues to use English as its sole official language, English is used as the instructional language at all levels of education. At UCC, as in all Ghanaian universities, English is used in all departments, the exception being departments of Ghanaian language departments and foreign languages. UCC is chosen for this study because of my involvement there as a lecturer. Consequently, I could draw on my role as an ‘insider’ for the benefit of the research.

Like all other universities in Ghana, English language remains one of the entry requirements into UCC. Once a student is admitted into the university, s/he is required to take a compulsory writing course, Communicative Skills (CS), termed English for Academic Purposes and Freshman Composition elsewhere. In UCC, CS as an institutional requirement ensures that students are introduced to study skills, aspects of language use, and general writing skills throughout the first year. First-year

undergraduates are taken through both the micro and macro aspects of writing in order to facilitate their gradual transition from the pre-university level to the university level (Gogovi, personal communication 2003).

Data

The source of data for the present study is a total of 60 examination essay answers produced by second-year English Studies students to the following examination prompts:

- a) Identify and explain the significance of any three literary device used in Jared Angira's 'No Coffin No Grave'
- b) With reference to any two sonnets comment on the significance and structure of the sonnet

These examination essays were written in *Introduction to Literature*, a core course for all students in the Department of English, designed to assist students to sharpen their literary skills for both enjoyment and analytical work in further literary studies. This course was felt to encourage sustained extended writing. In general, the textual data shared two features: a) they were selected from the 2001/2002 academic year at Level 200, and b) the texts were examination answers in a two-hour paper. Examination essays of second-year undergraduates were chosen, given that the students had benefited from CS and were likely to have made the transition from the secondary school and to evince disciplinary practices in their writing.

Analytical Framework

Two key steps were taken in the analysis in order to operationalize the key variables (that is, ‘introduction’ and ‘move’) in the present study and to consider the unit of measurement with respect to the research questions.

First, I define ‘introduction’ in terms of both structure and function. Structurally, the introduction is considered as the first of a cluster of paragraphs, while functionally, it is seen as a group of sentences expressing a unified meaning in terms of orienting readers towards the ‘body’ of the essay. To qualify as an introduction, a cluster of sentences needs to satisfy both criterial features. Also, after a preliminary analysis of sample introductions, I adopted a modified version of Swales’ (1981, 1990) move analysis of introductions of research articles in order to look for functional communicative units. I selected “move” as the basic unit for the analysis of the introductions as it seemed likely that it had the potential to provide answers to my research questions. I reckoned that a move in a text is a functional unit used for an identifiable purpose and can vary in size. Although a move contains at least one proposition (Connor, 2000), it is not co-terminous with structural units such as a sentence and paragraph.

The analysis of my textual data indicated the presence of three moves, as shown below:

Move 1: Contextualizing issue(s) raised in examination prompt

Move 2: Engaging closely with the issue(s)

Move 3: Previewing the structure of the essay

Essentially, Move 1 (contextualizing) backgrounds the issues raised in an examination prompt and differs from Swales’ (1990) move, as no attempt is made towards suggesting

the centrality of the issue. Move 2 (engaging closely with the exam prompt) exemplifies a greater and closer engagement with issues raised in the examination prompt. Move 3 (previewing structure of essay) basically previews the essay's structure or declares the writer's purpose. I have chosen to use *v-ing* phrases in labeling the moves in the introduction, instead of noun phrases to show that the focus of my analysis is on what the examinees are trying to do in their texts.

Due to space constraint, only one example of an introduction is offered below to show how the generic structure as well as associated linguistic features is manifested.

| | |
|----------|--|
| (Move 1) | Fitting burial is the earnest desire of every person who dies. However, it would be very disgusting and unbearable when, if possible, the dead realizes that he or she was not given what he wanted/ |
| (Move 2) | This is very true in this beautiful run-on-line poem 'No Coffin No Grave' by Jared Angira.) |
| (Move 3) | He used significant literary devices to achieve this wonderful poem. Among these devices are sound effects, institutional irony and imagery. |
| EST 16 | |

Figure 1 A Sample Move Analysis of the Introduction

As shown in Figure 1, a generalization or contextualization is made in Move 1 by referring to a common human expectation. The candidate continues in Move 2 by relating this general observation to a specific literary text. We see, therefore, a transition from the general-to-specific plane. The examinee further asserts in Move 3 that this perception is given a stylistic treatment through devices such as “sound effects, institutional irony, and imagery”, thus indicating the devices s/he wishes to discuss in the ‘body’ of the essay. In short, the sample above shows purposeful activity going on in distinct but related stages.

Besides the Swalesian model of move analysis, it was important to also consider the unit of measurement of the introductions, given that I chose to examine textual space allocated to the moves, among others. The T-unit – the main clause as well as subordinate clause/s – was used as a unit of measurement in order to provide a fair means of judging each student’s length of text. With the operationalization of the introduction and move completed, it was necessary to ensure the reliability of the identification of both variables, that is, the introduction and the moves. Two doctoral students in Applied Linguistics in my department were contacted to assist in this regard. The inter-rater reliability scores obtained in performing these tasks are presented below:

Table 1 Inter-rater Reliability of Identification of Introduction Section of Essays

| Discipline | Inter-reliability score | Percentage |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------|
| English Introduction | 50 | 94 |

Table 2 Inter-rater Reliability of Identification of Moves in Introductions of Essays

| Discipline | Inter-reliability score | Percentage |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------|
| English (n=56) | | |
| Move 1 (total number=30) | 25 | 83 |
| Move 2 (total number=44) | 39 | 89 |
| Move 3 (total number=43) | 38 | 90 |

Both scores in the two assignments were considered adequate to allow for the discussion of the results, which is presented in the next section. In line with current practices regarding ethics in research, the data on which I draw for my analysis were obtained with the permission of the university. Besides, the principles of anonymity and confidentiality of the writers of the various texts cited are upheld by referring to codes.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

I present my findings in line with the research questions formulated in an earlier section. First, I present a quantitative account of the textual space of the entire disciplinary text and its accompanying space for introductions. I then follow up with a report on the moves identified in the introductions in terms of the frequency of occurrence, textual space, and sequence. Finally, drawing on some examples, I illustrate the linguistic features associated with the moves.

Occurrence of Introduction and its Relation to Entire Text Length

Table 3 displays the length of both the entire English text and English introductions

Table 3 Text Length of English Essays in Terms of T-units

| <i>Features</i> | <i>Raw Counts</i> | <i>Percentage</i> |
|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Text | | |
| Overall | 2144 | 100 |
| Mean | 36 | |
| Introduction | | |
| Presence (56) | | |
| Absence (4) | | |
| Total | 284 | 13 |
| Mean | 5 | |

As shown in the above table (3), 2144 represents the total number of T-units in the entire data set of 60 essays, while the average number of T-units per essay is 36. According to Table 3, of the 60 scripts, fifty-six candidates introduced their essays. Also, the proportion of the entire essays taken by the introduction essays is 13%. Although writing guides or manuals do not recommend the textual space to be devoted to an introduction in relation to an essay, it seems to me that such a proportion which English Studies students on the average allocate to the introduction of their essays is within acceptable limits.

In general, the above findings suggest that the English Studies candidates in the present study deem the introduction rhetorically important. Their rhetorical behavior seems to find general support in theorization on disciplinary variation, as espoused by Bazerman (1981) and Becher (1989), who suggest that given the discursive nature of the Humanities, including English Studies, one way in which academic writing in the Humanities seeks to establish a credible perspective is by offering an introduction, an important aspect of which is orienting the reader..

Frequency of Moves

With respect to the frequency of occurrence of moves, I expected all three moves to be present in the introductions, with Move 2 (engaging) being the most frequently used move, as it represents the clearest opportunity for examinees to show their understanding of the examination prompts. Table 4 thus displays the frequency of each of the three moves in the introductions.

Table 4 Frequency of Occurrence of Moves in Introduction of Texts

| Rhetorical Pattern | Raw Count (Total=56) | Percentage |
|--------------------|----------------------|------------|
| Move 1 | 30 | 54 |
| Move 2 | 44 | 79 |
| Move 3 | 43 | 77 |

Table 4 shows that seventy-nine percent of the introductions employed Move 2. Also, just a little above fifty percent of the introductions utilized Move 1. Thus, all the three moves were used in varying degrees by the students.

There are two issues that need to be addressed in order to relate the above findings to extant works: functional categories and frequency of Moves 2 and 3 in the data. That my finding corresponds to the three functional categories (contextualizing, engaging, and previewing) is similar to the finding in Henry and Roseberry's (1997) work and is surprising, given the assorted nature of the data set of the latter study. A possible reason may be the inclusion of more student essays, perhaps examination essays, in the data, though no mention is made of how many of each of the varied genres is involved in the study. On the other hand, the functional categories of the introductions in the present study do not tally with those in Kusel's (1992) study, as they entail further categories: claiming centrality, previous research, and indicating gap. Obviously, the difference lies in the curriculum genres involved – mine an examination essay and the other course work essays. The second issue is that for English Studies, which constantly requires that students provide a purpose statement, it is surprising to note that it was rather Move 2 (engaging) that appeared most frequently, though the difference as indicated in Table 4 is minimal, and possibly a matter of degree rather than kind. It can

be argued further that for the English Studies students in the present research determining the rhetorical importance of Moves 2 and 3 is a matter of continual struggle.

Textual Space of Moves

Concerning textual space allocated to each of the moves, I expected examinees to allocate more textual space to Move 2 (engaging). My view was that the frequency of occurrence together with the textual space allocated to a move could determine its the relative rhetorical importance. Table 5 summarizes the textual space given to each of the three moves.

Table 5 Textual Space of Moves in Introductions of English Studies Texts

| Rhetorical Pattern | Count T-units(Total=284) | Percentage |
|--------------------|--------------------------|------------|
| Move 1 | 70 | 25 |
| Move 2 | 131 | 46 |
| Move 3 | 83 | 29 |

As indicated in Table 5, Move 2 occupies the greatest textual space, 46 percent, in the introductions written by the English students. The next move that occupies a reasonably large space was Move 3 (29 per cent), though not significantly different.

This general trend could be attributed to the written task students are engaged in. Since it is Move 2 (engaging) which offers examinees the opportunity right from the beginning to evince understanding of the examination prompt and to make a lasting impression on the reader, it is not surprising that students preferred this move. Thus, students referred to names of, for instance, literary devices and accompanying examples. Students are aware of the need to show more commitment to answering examination

prompts, thus ultimately displaying their grasp of the conceptual terrain in their various courses or disciplines, similar to the finding in Henry and Roseberry (1997).

Sequencing of Moves

In terms of the sequencing of moves, I expected students to deploy a three-move pattern that systematically proceeds from the general to the specific, as outlined in English writing manuals. Table 6 below shows the actual sequence of moves used by examinees in the present study.

Table 6 Sequence of Moves in Introductions of English Studies Texts

| Rhetorical Pattern | Count T-units | Percentage |
|--------------------------------|---------------|------------|
| 3 Move Sequence (To=20) | | |
| 1 > 2 > 3 | 14 | 70 |
| 1 > 3 > 2 | 2 | 10 |
| 2 > 1 > 3 | 2 | 10 |
| 3 > 1 > 2 | 2 | 10 |
| 2-Move Sequence (To=25) | | |
| 1 > 2 | 8 | 32 |
| 1 > 3 | 4 | 16 |
| 2 > 3 | 13 | 13 |
| 1 Move (Total=11) | | |
| 1 | - | - |
| 2 | 5 | 45 |
| 3 | 6 | 55 |

Table 6 shows that most of the examinees preferred a clear linear structure of Move 1 > 2 > 3 sequence-move. Eighty per cent of the introductions had sequence variation. Additionally, students appeared to oscillate between the two-sequence move

(25) and the three-sequence move (20), making it difficult to ascertain which move pattern is more rhetorically important than the other. Nevertheless, it is clear that English students generally operate within the general-specific pattern of English rhetoric.

The preference of students for the general-specific pattern in the sequencing of moves may be attributable to one key factor: a “cultural explanation” (Kelly *et al.*, 2002); that is, the institutional demand that exposes students to English rhetoric as taught in CS at the research site. Specifically, that students’ preferred the general-to-specific pattern (that is, Move 1 > 2 > 3) can be attributed to the influence of the teaching of CS at UCC, which explicitly instructs all students to include background information and thesis statements in their essays. My awareness of the nature and teaching and learning of CS is based on an interview I had with the CS Program Coordinator, a colleague, and my earlier and continuing experience in teaching CS.

Linguistic Realizations of the Moves

Having discussed the moves in introductions written by English Studies students in the previous section, I now turn to the key linguistic features that are instantiated in Move 1, followed by Move 2, and then Move 3.

Move 1

The salient linguistic expressions in Move 1 (contextualizing) of the English introductions discussed here include repetition of key terms, definitions with attributions, and discourse verbs.

A key linguistic feature in Move 1, repetition of key terms was largely prompt-driven. In tandem with Hult's (1986), English Studies students used these lexical reiterations at both the word and phrasal levels to contextualize their essay. For example, nominals such as "fitting burial", "literary devices", "sonnet", and "structure" tended to be repeated. This contrasts with Reynold's (1996) work on repetitions as a rhetorical device in undergraduate writing, where he argues that repetitions are likely to be realized as sentences in an argumentative discourse requiring a proposition to be debated. Further, these key words are not only repeated but also thematized. Indeed, some scholars have suggested that thematization of key terms has a rhetorical dimension (MacDonald, 1994; Samraj, 1995; North, 2003). In the present study, thematization revolves around nominals such as "No Coffin No Grave", "literary devices" and "structure" in response to the relevant examination prompts.

Even more interestingly, when examinees answered the same examination prompt, there were noticeable differences in the key terms that were thematized, thus indicating stylistic differences. For example, although the below examples are in response to the same examination prompt, thematization is different, with that in EST 16 being "fitting burial" and EST 20 being "literary devices":

- 1 Fitting burial is the earnest desire of every person who dies. However, it would be very disgusting and unbearable when, if possible, the dead realizes that he or she was not given what he wanted. (EST 16).
2. Literary devices are used to make poems beautiful, rich, and interesting. (EST 20).

The second key linguistic feature in Move 1 is definitions. This seems to be prompt driven however, as they tended to occur in answers responding to examination prompt 2, rather than examination prompt 1. The examples below highlight this view:

3. Structure in poetry can be defined as the poet's division of the poem into various stanzas, the idea conveyed in each stanza, rhyming scheme, and its importance to the overall poem. (EST 47)
4. A sonnet is a poem that contains basically fourteen lines. (EST 51)

As shown in the above examples, students do not attribute their definitions to sources such as theorized knowledge, as reported in Baynham's (1999) work among first-year nursing students. Where students allude to experience as an authoritative source, this is lexicalized through metatextual elements in verbal processes such as "can be defined" as in Example EST 47: "Structure in poetry can be defined as the poet's division of the poem. . . ." However, generally, the relational verb 'be' and its variants were often used. This latter group of verbs is associated with the type of definitions Flowerdew (1992) and Temmerman (1999:172) label as "formal", that is, the form "X is Y for which Z holds", where Y is the higher category to which X belongs and Z gives the specific characteristics that distinguish X from the other members of category Y.

Two inter-related factors can explain the use of definitions in the introductions. The first relates to the different ways in which course lecturers of the undergraduate students possibly treat attribution of definitions in examination essays. Thus, the junior undergraduates' way of defining terms without any attribution as though it is communally owned may be valued in English Literary Studies. Second, it may well be that the type of writing task as well as genre that students are engaged in determines to a large extent whether they need to indicate the source of their definition or not.

Move 2

Three key linguistic features are exemplified in Move 2: lexical repetition, discourse verbs, and a story-like schema.

Understandably, repetition of key terms continues to be used in Move 2: “Jared Angira”, “No Coffin No Grave” and “literary devices”. For instance, lexicalization in the English introductions yields expressions such as “theme”, “politicians/political figure/political leader”, “Jared Angira”, “literary devices”, “burial” , “death” in examination prompt 1 as well as “sonnet” , “Shakespearean”, “Petrarchan”, “sestet”, “quatrain”, “couplet”, “structure”, “rhyme pattern” in texts in response to examination prompt 2. Such key terms, otherwise described as dominant by Markels (1981), are continually present either directly (by reiteration) or inferentially (as synonyms, collocations, superordinates, and pronominal references). As argued elsewhere (Hult, 1986), the tendency for examinees to either repeat these key terms or their variants especially in Move 2 achieves two things: maintenance and development of thematic saliency.

Examinees also use discourse verbs such as “use” and “talks” in Examples 5-7. (Another type of ‘discourse verbs’ is discussed later). These verbs highlight what the examinees perceive the poet to be doing in the literary text:

5. There is no point disputing the fact that Jared Angira uses appropriate literary devices to make effective the message he wants to put across and also to arouse the interest of the reader and enhance the meaning of the poem to the reader. (EST 10)
6. In Jared Angira’s ‘No Coffin No Grave’ he talks about a politician who was murdered in a night club and who had many dreams to accomplish during his reign and even wished to be buried under a tree in his palace. (EST 15)

These discourse verbs tend to be neutral, that is, non-committal, as the examinees merely report what they perceive the writer of the text to be doing. One thing though that is noted from the present study is the limited range of such discourse verbs used by the examinees.

Other linguistic markers include material, verbal, and relational verbs as well as adverbials to highlight a story-like schema. For instance, as shown in Example 5, there is the active use of verbs such as “wanted”, “to be buried”, “had” and “wished”. Further verbs such as “murdered”, “had”, and “wished to be buried” are also used in Example 6. Both sets of examples are accompanied by adverbials such as “after his death” and “in a night club” and “under a tree” and “in his palace”. Together, these active verbs and adverbs give a story-like quality to Move 2, although it can be argued that this is prompt driven.

Move 3

Concerning Move 3 in this study, three striking linguistic features are used: purpose expressions, personal pronouns, and discourse verbs.

Students respond to both examination prompts in Move 3 by both announcing their purpose by using expressions such as “would...like to talk” and “am going to write...”, “would like to refer”, and “I’m going” as evidenced in Examples 7 and 8:

7. There are a lot of literary devices used. Some of these are onomatopoeia, personification, simile, symbolism, imagery, irony, and many others. I would therefore like to talk about the most dominant literary devices used. These are personification, symbolism and irony. (EST 3).
8. I am going to write about the use of personification, symbolism, and simile in the poem. (EST 25).

9. I would like to refer to the Shakespearean sonnets 3 and 12 for my comment on the significance of the structure of the sonnet. (EST 33).
10. With reference to the sonnet three and eighteen, I'm going to comment on the significance of the structure of the sonnets. (EST 35)

English Studies students use these purpose/futuristic expressions to declare their intention of structuring the essay. To the extent that English students in the present study tended to outline the purpose in the last move of their introductions, my finding is consistent with other studies (Henry & Roseberry, 1997; Hyland, 1990; Kusel, 1992). It is easy to allude to the examination prompt and the disciplinary norms at the junior undergraduate level as possible factors in explaining this situation.

The second notable language feature in Move 3 in the introductions concerns personal pronouns, the dominant of which is the first person 'I', as shown in Examples 7-10. Second, while the examinee in Example 9 attempts to marry both the demands for a personal voice and formality by using "I" and "would like", Example 10 appears more informal through the use of a contracted form. Nonetheless, in both cases, there is the visible presence of an agency seen as a guide to the reader, thus recalling Tang and John's (1999) study of the use of personal pronouns. Occasionally, the personal plural pronoun "we" was used, as evident in Example 11:

11. We have the Shakespearean sonnets and the Petrarchan sonnets.
Examples of each are Sonnet 3, 'Look into the Glass and Tell the face'
by W. Shakespeare and 'Death be not proud' by Donne John. (EST 51)

This use of "we" may refer to the discourse community of literary analysts, of whom the examinee considers himself/herself a member aspires to be part of. In very rare circumstances, students attempt to make themselves 'invisible' in Move 3 in two main ways. The first was by simply alluding to the third person, "the poet" as in Example 12.

In the second instance, as shown in Example 13, the examinee places the agency on the genre, “essay”.

12. The poet uses three main literary devices to bring out his message. They are irony, diction, and imagery (EST 17)

13. This essay will focus on the significance of the structure of sonnets three and eighteen. (EST 38)

It is also possible that such examinees as shown in the above examples may still be interested in ensuring an impersonal and objective tone in their essays.

The use of the personal pronoun as a dominant linguistic feature of Move 3 in the introductions is consistent with the literature (e.g. Hyland 2000, Tang & John 1999). Specifically, it is in tandem with Hyland’s (2000) argument that in the hands of neophyte writers the personal pronoun is likely to be used as an organizing device in the introduction. In general, the use of the personal pronoun by students to make themselves visible in their introduction appears to accord with the widely accepted view of the use of personal pronoun in its various linguistic, pragmatic and rhetorical ramifications as context-dependent (Chang & Swales, 1999; Hyland, 2001, 2002).

The third and final linguistic feature relates to discourse verbs. Although discourse verbs have been discussed in the earlier move (Move 2, engaging), the kind of discourse verbs that is used by students in Move 3 (previewing) differs from the ones used in Move 2. The discourse verbs used in Move 3 reflect what the students themselves are doing: “talk” (Example 7), “write” (Example 8), “refer” (Example 9), and “comment” (Example 10). Other discourse verbs of this category which students in the present study tended to use in their introduction include “discuss” and “focus”. These discourse verbs

are usually in the active voice, showing the active involvement of the examinee in presentation of the answers and their role as navigators.

Clearly, the linguistic features that have featured prominently across the various moves are definition, repetition of key terms, personal pronouns, listing, discourse verbs, and purpose/futuristic expressions. Specifically, the point to note from the illustrations offered so far is that the first person pronouns, discourse verbs, purpose/futuristic expressions clearly distinguish Move 3, whereas definitions and repetition of key terms appear to be employed in both Move 1 and Move 2 in varying degrees.

CONCLUSION

In this paper, I have examined the rhetoric of introductions produced by junior undergraduates in an English course from two standpoints: generic structure and linguistic realizations of the moves. Findings from the analysis suggest some clear tendencies. First, English students, in fact, introduce their essays, using a three-move rhetorical structure. Second, a two-sequence move pattern is preferred while Move 2 occupies the greatest space for most candidates. A third key finding relates to the use of personal pronouns, discourse verbs, and purpose expressions in the last move (previewing) of the introduction.

These findings have implications for writing pedagogy and the description of disciplinary rhetoric at the undergraduate level, as well as future research. Pedagogically, a three-move schema of introductions can be recommended to junior English Literary Studies students in order to improve on their writing, given the view that awareness of text structure has been found to be crucial in both reading and writing. Findings from

this study indicate that it may be worthwhile for English Studies teachers to provide explicit instructions on the textual space and frequency of occurrence of moves in students' introductions, given that some students tended to allocate either far more space to Move 1 (the background of their essays), very little space or no space to it, disregarding the overall text length of the essay. Further, as part of this rhetoric-consciousness raising activity for students, explicit discussion of language features in the moves and frequent practice exercises can be undertaken by the English Studies and other subject teachers.

A second significance of the present study lies in the contribution Swales' rhetorical move analysis makes to the description of disciplinary rhetoric in undergraduate writing, given that most studies in this endeavor have focused on Anglo-American and recently Asia-Pacific settings. The adapted model of Swales' (1981, 1990) move analysis approach is particularly helpful in this descriptive endeavor, as it throws light on the specific moves and their linguistic features that are used by English Studies students in their introductions. Swales' model is used as a hypothetical model to test the extent to which it can assist in making undergraduates aware of the stages in their introduction as they negotiate their transition from pre-university stage to university and to begin their socialization in a disciplinary community..

Notwithstanding these findings, there are some limitations which need to be noted in order to guide future research. Given that the present research considered one English Studies course and one year group, further investigation could be extended to similar courses in the English Department or Applied Linguistics and year groups to enhance the generalizability of the findings in the present study and to find out whether seniority has

any impact on the kind of introduction written by English students. The extent to which using introduction impacts quality of writing could also be ascertained as it was not possible to include the data on it here. A comparative study can also be conducted on English and other disciplines or different disciplines in respect of the use of introductions. Finally, the experimental or quasi-experimental research design could further be employed to find a possible causal relationship between instructions on rhetorical features or students' prior knowledge of rhetorical features and students' actual writing in disciplinary communities.

References

- Adika, G. S. K. (1999). An analysis of university students' expository discourse. PhD dissertation. University of Ghana, Ghana.
- Baynham, M. (1999). Double-voicing and the scholarly 'I' on incorporating the words of others in academic discourse. *Text*, 19 (4), 485-504.
- Bazerman, C. (1981). What written knowledge does: Three examples of academic discourse. *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, 11, 361- 387.
- Becher, T. (1989). *Academic tribes and territories: Intellectual enquiry and the cultures of disciplines*. Milton Keynes & Bristol, USA: The Society for Research into Higher Education/Open University Press.
- Bunton, D. (2002). Generic moves in PhD thesis introductions. In J. Flowerdew (Ed.), *Academic discourse* (pp. 5-75). Harlow, England: Longman.
- Bunton, D. (2005). The structure of PhD conclusion chapters. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 4 (3): 207-224.

ESP World, www.esp-world.info, Issue 5 (26), Volume 8, 2009

- Chang, Y. -Y., & Swales, J. (1999). Informal elements in English academic writing: Threats or opportunities for advanced non-native speakers? In C. N. Candlin, & K. Hyland (Eds.), *Writing: Texts, processes and practices* (pp. 145-167). London: Longman.
- Connor, U. (2000). Variation in rhetorical moves in grant proposals of US humanists and scientists. *Text* 20 (1), 1-28.
- Crookes, G. (1986). Towards a validated analysis of scientific text structure. *Applied Linguistics*, 7, 57-70.
- Enos, T. & Brown, S.C. (1993) *Defining the new rhetoric*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Flower, L.S., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 32 (4), 365-367.
- Flowerdew, J. (1992). Definitions in science lectures. *Applied Linguistics*, 13 (2), 202-221.
- Gogovi, G.A.K. (2003) personal communication. University of Cape Coast. Ghana.
- Henry, A., & Roseberry, R. L. (1997). An investigation of the functions, strategies and linguistic features of the introductions and conclusions of essays. *System*, 25 (4), 479-495.
- Hewings, A. (1999). Disciplinary engagement in undergraduate writing: An investigation of clause-initial elements in geography essays. PhD thesis, The University of Birmingham.
- Hewings, A. (2004). Developing discipline-specific writing: An analysis of undergraduate geography essays. In L. Ravelli, & R. Ellis (Eds.), *Academic writing* (pp. 131-152). Sydney: Continuum.

ESP World, www.esp-world.info, Issue 5 (26), Volume 8, 2009

Hult, C. A. (1986). Global marking of rhetorical frame in text and reader evaluation.

In B. Couture (Ed.), *Functional approaches to writing: Research perspectives* (pp. 154-168). London: Frances Pinter.

Hyland, K. (1990). A genre description of the argumentative essay. *RELC Journal* 2, 66-78.

Hyland, K. (2000). *Disciplinary discourses: Social interactions in academic writing*. Harlow, England: Longman.

Hyland, K. (2001). Bringing in the reader: Addressee features in academic articles. *Written Communication*, 18 (4), 549-574.

Jordan, R.R. (1988). The introductory paragraph in Economics essays and examinations. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Academic writing: Process and product* (pp. 63-66). Hong Kong: Modern English Publication and the British Council.

Kelly, G., Bazerman, C., Skukauskaite, A., & Prothero, W. (2002). Rhetorical features of student science writing in introductory university oceanography. Paper presented at the Ontological, Epistemological, Linguistic and Pedagogical Consideration of Language and Science Literacy: Empowering Research and Informing Instruction Conference, University of Victoria, September 12-15, 2002.

Kelly, G., & Bazerman, C. (2003). How students argue scientific claims: A rhetorical-semantic analysis. *Applied Linguistics*, 24 (1), 28-55.

Kusel, P. (1992). Rhetorical approaches to the study and composition of academic essays. *System*, 20, 457-469.

Lukmani, Y. (1994) Discourse patterns and communication strategies in NN writing in examination answers in Economics. *Working Papers in English and Applied*

ESP World, www.esp-world.info, Issue 5 (26), Volume 8, 2009

- Linguistics* (pp. 97-107). Great Britain: University of Cambridge.
- Lawe-Davies, R. (1998). Coherence in tertiary student writing: Writers' skills and readers' expectations. Unpublished doctoral thesis. Graduate School of Education, University of Western Australia.
- MacDonald, S. P. (1994). *Professional academic writing in the humanities and social sciences*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Markels, R.B. (1981). Cohesion patterns in English expository paragraphs. PhD dissertation, Ohio State University.
- North, S. P. (2003). Emergent disciplinarity in an interdisciplinary course: Theme use in undergraduate essays in the writing of science. PhD dissertation, Open University, UK.
- Reynolds, D.W. (1996). Repetition in second language writing. PhD dissertation. Indiana University.
- Samraj, B.T.R. (1995). The nature of academic writing in an interdisciplinary field. PhD dissertation, The University of Michigan.
- Samraj, B. (2005). Master's Theses across Disciplines: An Exploratory Study. Paper presented at Department of English Language and Literature Seminar, National University of Singapore, 30th March, 2005.
- Scarcella, R. (1984). How writers orient their readers in expository essays: A comparative study of native and nonnative English writers. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17, 165-187.
- Starfield, S. (2004). Word power: Negotiating success in a first-year Sociology essay. In L. J. Ravelli & R.A. Ellis (Eds.), *Analyzing academic writing: Contextualized*

ESP World, www.esp-world.info, Issue 5 (26), Volume 8, 2009

- Framework* (pp. 66-83). London/New York: Continuum.
- Swales, J. M. (1981). Aspects of article introduction. *Aston ESP Research Reports*
England: Language Studies Unit. The University of Aston at Birmingham.
- Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*.
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tang, R., & John, S. (1999). The 'I' in identity: Exploring writer identity in student
academic writing through the first person pronoun. *English for Specific Purposes*,
18 (1), 23-39.
- Temmerman, M. (1999). Forms and functions of definitions in classroom language. In R.
Geluykens, & K. Peismaekers (Eds.), *Discourse in professional contexts* (pp. 169-186).
Muenchen: Lincom Europa.
- Varghese, S. A., & Abraham, S. A. (2004). Book-length scholarly essays as a hybrid
genre in science. *Written Communication*, 21 (2), 201-233.
- Wilder, L. (2002). "Getting comfortable with uncertainty": A study of the conventional
values of literary analysis in an undergraduate Literature course. *Written
Communication*, 19 (1), 175-221.
- Wu, S. M. (1997). What's wrong with my introduction? *Working Papers on Language*
(pp. 33-39). Singapore: Centre for English Language Communication, National
University of Singapore.