The Discourse Structure of Research Article Introductions: Re-visited with Evidence from Arabic

Lafi M. Al-Harbi
Kuwait University,
Kuwait

Abstract. This study reports on the rhetorical organization of the Arabic RA introductions in social sciences. It attempts to further the understanding of the academic discourse particularly when considering non-English rhetoric and Semitics for that matter.

Using Swales CARS schema, the study recognizes a systematic description of the Arabic rhetoric, comprising 'early-announcement' as well as CARS-related structures. Reference to and contrast with a range of culturo-linguistic rhetorical contexts, including English, were made and the CARS-move model of analyzing RA introductions is enhanced so as to endorse global application.

Introduction

The introductory section, as many rhetoricians would agree, is the most challenging part of the Research Article (RA). The RA introduction, which is purposely persuasive, comprises complex negotiations of the existing knowledge, the findings and theories, and the writer's hypothesis. In fact, introducing a RA "is not simply a wrestling with words to fit the facts, but is also strongly modulated by perceptions of the anticipated reactions of peer-colleagues" (Swales and Najjar 1987:175). Academics, when writing their RAs, do not simply report their findings and what they think, but they are ultimately engaged in communicative exchange with peer researchers in a specific culturo-linguistic context.

Over three decades by now, a good number of studies on the academic discourse have been devoted to the analysis of the research article genre (Samraj 2002 and Burgess 2002). The examination focused on the rhetorical organization of various sub-genres of the RA , such as introduction (Swales 1981 & 1990, Lopez 1982, Swales and Najjar 1987, Najjar 1990, Taylor and Tigguag 1991, Duzak 1994, Ahmad 1997, Burgess 2002, Fakhri 2004), historical perspectives (Atkinson 1993), discussion section (Hopkins and Dudley-Evans 1988, Thompson 1993), citation of previous research (Swales 1986, Jacoby 1987), and the abstract that accompanies the RA (Lores 2004, Martin 2003), the disciplinary differences in RA and its sub-genres (Samraj 2002, Tibbo 1992). With implicit pedagogy in mind, some linguistic and/or cultural contrasts have recently entered into the RA genre debate (Fredrickson and Swales 1994, Burgess 2002, Jogthong 2001, Duszak 1994, Ahmad 1997, Najjar 1990, Fakhri 2004, Talyor and Tingguag 1991). There are, of course, a number of obvious reasons for such a concern.

Many of these studies have focused on the examination of English texts, either in a mono culturo-linguistic context, or contrasted with other linguistic/rhetorical settings. In the latter case, it seems that the research environment overtly evolves around N/NN-English writing with the pedagogical aim so as to promote the acquisition of the canonical patterning. In fact, there has been lesser search into the rhetorical patterns and the cultural norms of RA introductions in cultures other than English. The literature on the RA introductions has reported a limited impact from other languages than English, including that of Spanish (Burgess 2002); Japanese (Hinds 1983); Chinese (Taylor and Tingguag 1991); Malay (Ahmad 1997); Thai (Jogthong 2001);

Table 1.   A CARS model for article introductions (Swales 1990:141)

Move				
Move		ONE	Establishing a territory	
	Step	1	Claiming centrality and/or	
	Step	2	Making topic generalization (s) and/or	Declining rhetorical
	Step	3	Reviewing items of previous research	effort
Move		TWO	Establishing a niche	
	Step	1A	Counter-claiming or	
	Step	1B	Indicating a gap or	
	Step	1C	Question-raising Or	Weakening knowledge
	Step	1D	Continuing a tradition	claims
Move		THREE	Occupying a niche	
Step	1A		Outlining purposes or	
Step	1B		Announcing present research	
Step	2		Announcing principle findings	Increasing
Step	3		Indicating RA structure	explicitness

Swedish (Fredrickson and Swales 1994); Polish (Duszak 1994); and Arabic (Najjar 1990 and Fakhri 2004). As it may be the case, this study attempts to fill the gap of knowledge on the Semitic cultural conventions of RA introductions, Arabic is the case in hand. In so doing, this study hopes to add to global understanding of the cognitive structure of the RA introductions.

Related analyses

In 1990, a detailed assessment of a large body of research that has been conducted on the RA genre was outlined by Swales. In addition to a detailed review of earlier literature since the 1980s, Swales proposed what is widely known as the Create-A-Research-Space (CARS) model for analyzing the rhetorical organization of the RA introductions. In 1993, Bhatia added an important volume of studies that reported furthered applications of Swales' CARS-move model. Similarly, Ahmad 1997 and Jogthong 2001 have further the reviews on recent examinations of RA introductions. What we will be interested here are these recent attempts that share concerns with the present study, in particular, as they were conducted in the same line with the current development of the analysis of RA introductions and adopt CARS framework. In this sense, they possess potential contrasts with the findings of the present study. The next discussion of the relevant analyses will be preceded by an explanation of the Swales seminal work on the rhetorical move analysis of RA introductions. The attempt, here, will not be made to validate Swales model, rather to recap on the essential components of the model and its development, with an eye on the question of the model's applicability, particularly when applied to non-English data.

Swales modeling of the analysis of the introduction section of the RA (1981 & 1990) inspired most of the analyses on the topic thereafter. The initial model, in 1981, comprises a four-move schema, and was set to examine the cognitive, rhetorical and linguistic variations in 48 English-written RA introductions, in 'hard sciences', social sciences and medicine. The four-move structure was: (1) Establishing the field, (2) Summarizing previous research, (3) Preparing for present research, and (4) Introducing present research. Later, in 1990, the 1981 four-move structure was reduced into three-move schema, each of which is realized in the form of a number of sub-steps with 'and/or' association mood. (CARS model in table 1). The major differences between the two postulates are related to the way in which previous literature is reported; i.e. the last sub-step in move 1 (reviewing previous research) and move 2 (establishing a niche). In fact, as we shall see later in Najjar 1990, Lopez 1982, Fredrickson and Swales 1994, and Ahmad 1997, 'summarizing previous research' is the rhetorical move that has varying realizations for several cognitive and culturo-linguistic rhetorical applications. Furthermore, a number of herewith-reported analyses have questioned the legitimacy of the move order in the CARS model, as well as cautiously call for reconsideration of a number of sub-steps on the basis of the rhetorical choices reported in the academics writing in a variety of disciplines as well as in different cultural settings.

In a contrastive study of Polish and English RA introductions writing, Duszak 1994 expected the

J. King Saud Univ., Vol. 22, *Arts* (1), Riyadh (2010/1431H.)

3

CARS model to have "some potential as a preliminary indicator of areas of (in)computability among various writing styles". She added, it "is 'lax' enough to admit of an intervening role of some other parameters of discourse and cultural validity" (pp. 299-300). At the same time, she questioned the model's application to non-English data, and argued for "relaxation or some refinement of the original formula" (p.299). As for the ordering of CARS moves, she found out in her Polish data that "the order of moves is secondary" (p.299), as the Polish writers "tended to put 'things on hold' and exercise restraint in outlining their goals. Instead, they concentrated on entering a given field so as to clear ground for their prospective engagements"(p.309). Taylor and Tingguag (1991) have pedagogical address of some culturo-linguistic contrasts in the writing of English and Chinese RA introductions and found out that there are disciplinary and cultural dissimilarities between the two groups. They asserted that "there is an internationalization of scientific discourse that is nevertheless heavily qualified by significant variations in both regional and disciplinary cultures" (p.332). Chinese scholars "avoid elaboration, using deletion patterns, writing at less lengthy and citing fewer references" (p.330). In an interesting finding, which is related to the cultural preference of move 2, their study suggested that the "Chinese scholars find it less acceptable to identify by name and to summarize the work of others whom they will then proceed to 'expose' in move 3" (p.331). Taylor and Tingguag attributed the rhetorical differences to some distinction between the Anglo and the Chinese scientific cultures.

Spanish and English RA introductions were contrastively examined by Burgess 2002 through the writing of 104 texts in language related journals. Her results suggest that while the N-English texts display the CARS patterning, the Spanish texts however were characterized by move 2 deletion. In particular, deletion of move 2 is indeed quite common not only among the Spanish writers but also among the Malaysian academics (Ahmad 1997) as well as among the Swedish (Fredrickson and Swales 1994). Additional findings, which coincide with our findings, are the report in the Spanish-Spanish texts "there are introductions composed entirely of move 3 (Occupying a niche) and more elaborate introductions which open with a statement of the purpose of the study reported"(p.210). More interestingly, her conclusion characterized the NN as having: (1) a tendency to delete move 2 (niche establishment); (2) lengthy realizations of move 1 step 2 (topic generalization); (3) a lower incidence of move 1 step

3 (reviewing preview research); and (4) 'abrupt' onset of move 3 step 1A/1B (propose/present research content).

Swedish RA introductions were independently examined by Fredrickson and Swales 1994 in the field of modern Swedish language. Three interesting findings were reached. First, the CARS schematic moves were found to be not so popular in Swedish writing. Second, establishing the niche move (move 2) was found to be frequently missing in Swedish introductions. The third and more interesting finding was that the Swedish writers favor a story-like pattern at the beginning of the introduction as attention-getting device, over the niche establishing steps identified in CARS model.

RA introductions of English and Malay were examined by Ahmad 1997 in texts written by Malaysian academics. Her analysis showed that although that 13 of the 20 introductions have all the three-moves schema, only seven follow the 1-2-3 patterning and four have cycles of moves. Move 2 was notably missing in 35% of the data. Significantly, Ahmad noted that even in those RAs where the niche move (move 2) is established but the previous work of others is rarely criticized or evaluated. Her conclusion was that Malaysian writers are "cautious and hesitant in announcing their move 3" (p.295). In what may cause the Malay RA introductions to be somewhat ambiguous, she noted that there were no attempts made "to indicate the structure of the whole RA, nor is there evidence for the announcement of principle findings" (p.296). In the same line with the Polish data (Duszak 1994), she attributed these deviations of the native CARS-schema to the Malaysian academic culture.

Thai RA introductions were examined by Jogthong 2001 in education and medical sciences. Interesting findings of Jogthong study characterized the Thai introductions as having (a) no challenge of pervious research, and (b) no disclose of the findings achieved in the accompanying RA. The Thai scholars seem to avoid challenging others' research, exhibit little assertiveness and even engage in self-criticism. Jogthong attributed these results to the lack of competitive environment in the Thai academic culture.

Apart from the attempt made by Najjar 1990, the Arabic standard conventions for writing RA introductions are yet to be formally stated. In his dissertation, Najjar examined 48 published RA introductions in agricultural sciences.The study has a number of interesting findings; discussion of some will be integrated within the relevant findings in the present study. The majority of Najjar's corpus fits

within the CARS schema, as they begin with 'topic generalization' or 'centrality claim'. Within the CARS framework, the study reports (a) 56% of the introductions have a territory-establishing move (move 1), (b) 'niche-establishment' move (move 2) falls in the least frequency of use, and (c) purposive statements, as means of realizing niche occupancy, are commonly (90%) used. The study reports that writers of Arabic RA introductions "review the findings of previous research twice, once in presenting the problem and solution or the research question and once again in the literature review subsection" (p.142). With respect to the earlier literature (move 2), "there were no challenges to the work of others", although Najjar defines gap indication as "the existence of no or few previous studies on the topic" (p.104). In this regard, the study attributed such phenomenon to either disciplinary norms (the applied nature of the agricultural sciences) or to "the degree of maturity of agricultural research in the Arab world" (p.142). Another study involving Arabic discourse is Fakhri's 2004, which has a good potential of describing the Arabic introductions. However, the corpus is incomparable with the academic community as adopted in the previously cited analyses. Fakhri's corpus, "selected for convenience and availability" (p.1125), comprises 28 reports ('diraasaat') drawn form a non-referred cultural magazine issued by the Arab League, where the writers are identified according to their employment ranks as a 'researcher' ('baHeth'/'ustaath') with apparently a first-degree level of academic training. It is, then self-evident that only "in 7 instances the introductions were explicitly indicated," and the writing is characterized by "limited discussion of previous research", "only 9 introductions include some indication of the [report] structure" and full of "repetitive and flowery language" (p.1124).

At an alternative front, Samraj 2002 examined, within the framework of CARS model, 12 English RA introductions for disciplinary variations in Wildlife Behavior and Conservation Biology. As a first set of the study's findings, the most notable differences between the two disciplines were mainly related to the territory establishment (move 1), where centrality claims were not used, and "the current research is mainly justified in terms of gaps in previous research" (p.14-15). The study attributed differences in the organizational structure of the RA introductions to differences in the disciplinary norms. In an elaborate conclusion, the study argued, "the discussion of previous research should not be a part of any particular move in the model. Instead, it should be a freestanding sub-set that can be employed in the realization of any step in the introduction" (p.16). Significantly, as a second set of the study findings, Samraj suggested a modified version of the CARS model, so as to accommodate the differences in the rhetorical structures reported in the two disciplines.

The study aim, corpus and procedure

Aim

This study is motivated by the large gap in the body of knowledge on the academic discourse, particularly when related to languages other than English. The attempt is made here to examine the discourse structure of the Arabic RA introductions as found in published RAs in social sciences. In so doing, the analysis assesses the rhetorical conventions that writers of Arabic RA introductions use to organize the communicative segments through which the knowledge claims are exchanged in the Arabic context. The introductory segment, particularly in RA, is known to carry the burden of the knowledge the writer wishes to exchange with other members of the research community, hence appealing to the focus of present study. It is also important to examine variations of writers' judgments across rhetorical contexts, for instance in Arabic and English. However, this, I believe, is an independent task that can only be researched after the Arabic rhetorical conventions are sufficiently explained and recognized in a variety of disciplinary settings. In this respect, the present study takes a step in that direction.

Methodologically, the investigation is guided by the well-established and widely quoted model of analyzing the discourse structure of the RA introduction genre, that is the 1990 Swales' CARS model. Our pilot study, as well as Najjar 1990 and Fakhri 2004, confirm that CARS three-move schema is applicable to Arabic data, and hence adequate to describe most of the rhetorical choices encountered in the Arabic RA introductions. In particular, the 'move' and 'step' categories, and the way in which they are associated in the CARS model, provide appropriate tools to trace the rhetorical maneuvers in the Arabic RA introductions. Nonetheless, the study intends, based on its findings, to suggest an addition of *early announcement* move, as well as few moderate additions to the CARS model, particularly at the level of step association, so as to improve the model's applicability in a global context, particularly to non-English corpus.

Corpus

The study corpus consists of fifty-four RA introductions reporting on a number of sub-disciplines of social sciences, which were published between 1980 and 1990 in three leading journals: *The Arab Journal for the Humanities* (52%), the *Journal of the Social Sciences* (33%), and the *Annals of the Faculty of Arts* (15%), which are published by the University of Kuwait. The RAs are mostly single authored (95%), with a very few co-authored (6%). A single-authored RA is rather common in Arabic, particularly in the field of social sciences. All the RAs examined have clearly identified introductions *(muqadimah)*, which are preceded by abstracts (*xulaSah*, or *mulaxaS*) and are usually followed by the "methodology" as a sub-section in the empirical analyses. The average length of the introduction is 404 words, which seems to be a typical length for an RA introduction in Arabic (395 words in Najjar 1990).

The RAs report on empirical (19%) and narrative (82%) examinations in the following sub-disciplines of social sciences: mass media (Med), linguistics (Ling), sociology (Soc), philosophy (Phil), psychology (Psy), history (His), politics (Pol), geography (Geo), and education (Edu). Epistemological RAs and those which are in the form of reports, reviews are excluded from the analysis. The discourse community, which this analysis represents, is a homogeneous representation of the Arab academic community. The RA writers are (1) all native speakers of Arabic, (2) academics working in academic institutions, (3) representing ten Arab countries: Jordan, the United Arab Emirates, Iraq, Kuwait, Bahrain, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Algiers, Morocco, and Egypt. And (4) they have attained the highest academic training (doctorate). In addition, the academic journals, from which the corpus is selected, are all refereed and highly reputed in the field of social sciences.

Procedure

Initially, the corpus is inspected, by means of multiple readings, to familiarize oneself with the Arabic rhetorical patterns. Then, for each introduction, moves and steps are coded independently by the researcher and two bilingual linguists. Cases of suspect, seven introductions, are ultimately resolved after discussion. The description of the corpus, adopted here, rests on the bases of the macro and microstructures of moves and steps for each of the Arabic AR introductions. In accordance with the macro-analysis of the move structure, the corpus is divided into two main categories; the first includes introductions, which demonstrate a clear departure from the CARS schema, and hence identified according to the function they signify: an *early announcement* of the accompanying research. The second category includes introductions that concurred with the CARS-move structure, hence identified as CARS moves and went to a further microanalysis. The focus of the microanalysis of the ACRS-moves is (following Burgess 2002);

(1) Would they include all the three moves?
(2) Would they include these moves and steps in sequence?
(3) Would they have the same steps association as proposed in the model?

To maintain a manageable size of examples, we use illustrative segments of the introductions, and present them in Latin transliterations and English translations for ease of reference. The English translation presents the source rhetorical structure as much as possible. Proper names and indicative titles are kept anonymous. For ease of reference, each illustrative example is indexed for discipline, year of publication, and journal page number.

Discussion of findings

Early announcement introductions

This category of Arabic RA introductions, which represents one fifth of the corpus, comprises an *early announcement* rhetorical move intended to direct the reader's attention to the accompanying RA; either in the form of stating the RA purpose, or outlining the RA featured content. We have independently identified this type of introduction for a number of reasons. First, the Arab academic discourse has been characterized, as early as the ninth century, by the use of an early announcement protocol (ASSuli 946 (335 Hijri)) (discussion will follow). Second, the literature on the contemporary RA genre analysis has reported incidents of this sort of introduction in languages other than English, such as Polish (Duszak 1994), Swedish (Fredrickson and Swales 1994), Spanish (Burgess 2002), as well as Arabic (Najjar 1990). Therefore, we expected this introduction type to be part of a global modeling of RA introductions. An additional factor, which reasons an independent consideration of the *early announcement* introductions, is related to the CARS model. According to the CARS three-move schema, this introduction type operates categorically at 'occupancy-the-niche' level (move 3), which presupposes the establishment of a niche (move 2) and perhaps an engagement of the previous literature (move 1). However, in the *early announcement* introductions, these two feasible moves seem to operate elsewhere in the remaining sub-sections of

the RA, if the writer so desires. Thus, an introduction, which operates on a single move, does not fit within the schematic three-move structure of CARS.

The following discussion focuses on the single-move Arabic introductions that are initiated with an early announcement of the accompanying research. In eleven introductions (10 introductions in Najjar 1990), the writer introduces the researched topic by means of either a statement of intent, as in example (1), or by a detailed description of the basic features of the accompanying article, as in example (2).

(1) yahdifu haathaa al-baHTHu –?asaasan- ?ilaa lafti naDHari al-mufakiriina fi mayaadiini ad-diraasaati al-islaamiyati ila …(Phil:87:42)
This research aims, originally, to draw the attention of [the] 'philosophers' in the field of Islamic studies to ....

(2) tasta`riDu haathihi ad-diraasatu mushkilata at-tadafuqi al-?ixbaarii ad-dawalii fi bu`daihaa at-taarixii wa al-falsafii . (Med:89:4).
This study addresses the question of international news-flow in its historical and philosophical dimensions.

Verbs like *tahdif* (aims to) *tatanaawal* (deals with), *tasta9riD* (surveys, researches) and *tunaaqish* (discusses) are found to be rather common in *early announcement* introductions. The second significant feature of this type of RA introductions is related to the writer's attempt to outline the RA components. The writer here uses what is best be described as a 'list statement', as in example (3):

(3) …sawfa ?uHaawilu fi al-bidayati an atHadaTHa `an anwaa`i ?istexdaami ?al-alfaaDHi …, THumma aDribu amTHilatan mina al-?istixdaami al-waDHifii … hathihi ad-diraasatu tadrisu Taa?fatan min al-?amTHaali … THumma taqDii ?ilaa qaDiyatin haamatin, wa hiya al-?istixdaamu al-waDHifiiu `inda at-ta`liim…(Ling:90:28)
…at the beginning, I will 'address' types of lexical use … , then [I will] provide examples from the functional use [of the lexical items]…. This study investigates types of idioms…, then it moves to an important issue; that is the functional use [of idiomatic expressions] in teaching.

(4) likay nata`arrfa jayidan `ala al-`alaaqati al-waTHiqati bayna al-mawaadi al-?ijtimaa`iyati wa al-`uluumi al-?ijtimaa`iyati , laabudda mina

at-ta`arDi ?ilaa taTawri mafhuumi al-mawaadi al-?ijtimaa`iyati ?awalan, wa at-ta`arfi `ala maahiyati kullin mina al-mawaadi al-?ijtimaa`iyati THaaniyan , wa`amali muwazantin bayna haathayini al-maydaanaini THaaliTHan wa?axiiran, lilkashfi `an ?awjehi ash-shabahi wanuqaaTi al-?ixtilaafi baynahumaa. (Soc:83:31).
To fully understand the relationship between social studies [at school] and the social sciences, we must first, discuss the development of social studies; second, acknowledge the content of social studies; and third [finally], compare the two fields, in order to show similarities and differences.

Examples (3) and (4) illustrate the RA component exposition in *early announcement* introductions, which is typically marked by a 'list statement' move (corresponding somehow to step 3 of move 3 in CARS). This 'list statement' move is provoked by the writer's aim to give a chronological account of the RA components; either in the form of (a) first, second, third …, as in example (4), or in the form of (b) at the beginning…, then … , as in example (3). In a more obvious representative illustration of the *early announcement* introductions, the writer in example 4) introduces a narrative RA using a single 42-word paragraph. Early declaration and extent elaboration of the RA components are the two main objectives that appear to motivate the writer to use 'list statement' rhetoric. Apparently, the writer of Arabic RA introduction refrains from using the 'list statement' pattern and perhaps resorts to a shorter version, if the writer wishes to incorporate the 'indicating-RA-structure' with the literature review (see the discussion of 'occupying-the-niche' move).

(5) hal hunaaka `alaaqatun bayna al-?infaaqi al-`askarii fi xx wabayina al-?infaaqi al-`askarii fi yy ? wahal hunaaka ?anmaaTu sibaaqin liltasaluHi bayna xx wabayna yy? wahal yumkinu diraasatu HawaadiTHi al-Harbi bayna xx wa yy min xilaali tatabu`i al-?uTuri at-taarixiyati liwaaridati al-?asliHati ?ilaa xx ? … (Pol:88:17).
Is there any relationship between the military expenditure in xx and in yy? Are there any [comparable] patterns of armament between xx and yy? Is it possible to study the wars between xx and yy, through tracing the history of armament of xx ? …

In a single incident in example (5), the

introduction begins with a question-raising rhetoric (corresponding to step 1C in move 2 in CARS). This introduction has a dual rhetorical purpose; to proclaim the RA intent in the first interrogative statement, and to disclose the RA structure in the second. The writer's rhetorical intention by using the question-raising technique is seemingly to suggest that the accompanying research will evolve around these 'important' questions. There are two obvious reasons for this infrequent introduction type not be generalized to Arabic RAs; though it shows relevance to the *early announcement* category. Firstly, it is reported in a single incident in our corpus, which indicates the question-raising is an exceptional rhetoric among the Arabic writing scholars. Secondly, this rhetorical choice, be the case as it may, seems to be forced by a disciplinary mode. It seems that Arab politicians inspire their audience through surprising questions. Cross-disciplinary examination is required, here, to trace the frequency of this rhetorical incident in a larger corpus.

The analysis of the *early announcement* introductions shows that 'territory establishment' (move 1 in CARS) does not survive in this type of introductions. This may suggest that when the Arabic writer chooses to announce the research content at the beginning of the introduction, it is not, then, expected that the writer will go back to express interest in the researched field. Such a rhetorical function that may be established in an independent section in an empirical research or dispensed where it fits in a narrative research.

Furthermore, the Arabic writing has a long tradition of the *early announcement* rhetoric, which goes back to as early as the ninth century (ASSuli 946 (335 Hijri), pp.26-31). ASSuli reports in 'adab al-kitab' (The book writing) that after the obligatory opening 'al-basmalah' (in the name of Allah, the mercy, the merciful), the Arab writers often use 'amma ba3d' (p.31). A rhetorical device that signals the opening of the issue in question. A trace of this rhetorical feature of Arabic writing is lacking in the literature, nevertheless, Ayad (2001:5) initiates the introduction of his book saying "inna mawDo3 hatha al-3amal …" (The theme/subject of this work is …), followed by a number of paragraphs outlining the actual structure of the book. Questions related to the amplitude of use of the same rhetorical move by the Arab academics, and whether or not it has disciplinary restrictions, remain open. Related findings, reached in the present study, cannot be attributed to any period of time beyond its corpus, i.e. RAs written in 1980s. In the examined corpus, 20% of Arabic writers prompt to introduce their RAs by means of a statement of intent and/or an outline the accompanying research (see table (2)). The majority (80%) of the RA writers seem to subscribe to other rhetorical devices. They may claim central interest in the researched field, illustrate the importance of the topic under question, and/or demand advancement of knowledge.

What is of great importance, here, is not the frequency of occurrence of the *early announcement* techniques in the Arabic corpus, rather the fact that this rhetorical approach has been reported, at various rates of occurrence, in a number of languages other than English. It has been reported, for instance, in Polish where writers "concentrated on entering a given field so as to clear ground for their prospective engagements" (Duszak 1994:309); in Swedish, where writers favor a story-like pattern, at the beginning of the introduction (Fredrickson and Swales 1994); and in Spanish, as Burgess reported "introductions composed entirely of move 3" (2002:210). As this is the case, one may propose the *early announcement* pattern as an alternative rhetorical move in CARS schema, allowing the RA introduction to be established out of an independent *early-announcement* rhetorical move, even at lesser degree of regularity.

Table 2. Move frequency in the Arabic RA introductions

Move	Sub-move	No	%
early announcement introductions		11	20%
Create-A-Research-Space Moves		43	80%
			% in CARS
	Establishing-a-territory	35	65 %
	Establishing-a-niche	34	63 %
	Occupying-the-niche	39	72 %

'*Create-A-Research-Space*' introductions (CARS)

In this part of the study, the analysis focuses on the rhetorical moves found in the Arabic RAs, which correspond to the three-move structure in CARS schema, and hence labeled *Create-A-Research-Space* (CARS) introductions. In addition, the integrated nature of some rhetorical steps imposes cross-step microanalysis, and hence recommends re-correlation of some steps in the CARS schema. Previously reported findings in the literature are purposely contrasted so as to illustrate the relevant findings and hence further substantiate the study's suggestions.

Interestingly, the findings reported in table (2) suggest that thirty-four of the examination introductions have rhetorical moves corresponding to the CARS schema. It seems that the majority of writers of Arabic RA who have chosen not to announce their researched topic at the onset of the introduction will resort to the three-move rhetorical

options to introduce the accompanying research.

The macro analysis of the CARS patterns shows that the 'establishing-a-territory' move (M-1) and the 'establishing-a-niche' move (M-2) are used in 65% and 63% of the CARS schema, respectively. Whereas the 'occupying-the-niche' move (M-3) has a greater use (93 %) in the overall corpus. It, or functionally similar constructions, establishes the *early announcement* (11 introductions) and engaging various move combinations in CARS introductions (39 introductions).

Establishing-a-territory Move (M-1)

The following discussion of *establishing-a-territory* (M-1) move starts with its frequency of use, as an independent rhetorical choice, followed by a microanalysis of different rhetorical steps within the move structure. The 'and/or' copula proposed in CARS model as a combining device, which allows the writer to draw upon a single step or combine two or more steps while engaging M-1, will be particularly examined in the context of Arabic RA introduction. Finally, the various move combinations involving M-1 will be examined so as to determine its rhetorical weight vis-à-vis other potentially applicable moves within the structure of the Arabic RA introductions.

Table 3. Step constructions in 'establishing-a-territory' move (M-1)

Steps	% in (M 1)
Step 1-1 (*claiming centrality*)	37%
1-1	--
1-1 + 1-2	45%
1-1 + 1-3	25%
1-1+ 1-2 + 1-3	30%
Step 1-2 (*topic generalization*)	80%
1-2	34%
1-1 + 1-2*	22%
1-2 + 1-3	27%
1-1+ 1-2 + 1-3*	15%
Step 1-3 (*literature review*)	43%
1-3	4%
1-1 +1-3*	22%
1-2 + 1-3*	48%
1-1+ 1-2 + 1-3*	26%

* Repeated

The analysis of *establishing-a-territory* move (M 1) reveals a number of interesting findings. First, M-1 is reported (65%) in various combinations in the CARS patterns. It seems that the *establishing-a-territory* rhetoric is the second favored rhetorical options to introduce the RA for most of the writers, who have chosen not to prompt the announcement of their research.

Second, as in table (3), findings show that 'topic generalization' (step 2) is the most commonly utilized step to realize the territory of knowledge on the researched topic, although both 'topic generalization' (step 2) and 'claiming centrality' (step 1) are closely associated with the review of the related literature. In terms of cause and effect, it seems that Arabic RA introduction writers review the related studies for the sake of making general statements concerning the researched topic more than they are willing to claim centrality on the field as a whole.

Third, further analysis of the sub-steps within the M-1 structure indicates that Arab writers supplement statements such as "the researched topic is part of a well-established field" with review of the relevant studies on the topic. In particular, neither 'claiming centrality' (step 1-1) nor 'topic generalization' (step 1-2) is utilized without some sort of a reference to previous literature on the topic at question, though an independent report of the related literature is rather occasional. Some over-generalizations of earlier treatments of the researched topic are typically used, either explicitly by means of identifying the literature to which they refer, or implicitly by means of employing passive constructions to signal a reference to the amplitude of knowledge in general (examples 7 and 8 (see also examples 9-14)). Jacoby 1987 referred to this as a 'summary' whereby a reference is made to the state of knowledge as a whole rather than to a specifically named source of reference.

The orderly connection of associating 'claiming centrality' and 'topic generalization' steps, at one hand, and the 'literature review' step, at another, challenges the 'and/or' connection as suggested in the CARS model. Suitably, the rhetorical options of 'claiming centrality' and 'topic generalization' are to be mutually combined by means of 'or' option, and combined by means of 'and' relationship with 'literature review'.

The following examples in 6, 7 and 8 will illustrate the use of the *territory establishment* move in the corpus. While the illustration in (6) demonstrates full-step construction of M-1, the examples in (7) and (8) illustrate partial step constructions: 1-1 and 1-3 in (7), and steps 1-2 and 1-3 in (8).

(6) min ?ahami ?ahdaafi al-`ilmi, al-fihemu wat-tanabu?u wat-taHakumu. wafihemu DHahiratin maa , ma`naahu ?iktishaafi al-`alaaqati al-waDHifiyati baynahaa wabayna Xayrahaa…(1-1) walam yatawaana al-`ulamaa?u wal-mufakiruna fi al-majaali as-siluukii [topic] `an muHaawalti at-tawaSuli ila aT-Turuqi wal-wasaa?ili al-latii tusaa`idu `ala fahemi watafsiiri

aDH-Dhwaahiri as-suluukiyati (1-2) …?iqtaraHa xx taSniifa ?ab`aadi al-qiyaasi as-suluukii ila bu`daini (1-3) (Psy:81:52).

Among the main objectives of science, [are] understanding, prediction, and control. Understanding of a phenomenon means the discovery of its relationship to other …(1-1). Scientists and philosophers in the field of behavioral science (topic) spared no effort to reach out for means and methods to help understanding and explaining behavior (1-2). xx suggested a classification of behavioral measurement into two dimensions (1-3) …

(7) tu`tabaru DHahiratu al-furuuqi al-fardiyati mina aDH-DHahiraati an-nafsiyati al-latii shaXlat baala `ulama?i an-nafsi wat-tarbiyati limudatin laysat bil-qaSiirati (1-1) … waqad ?ashaar xx ?ilaa Daruurati al-?ihtimaami bikullin mina aT-Tariiqati wal-lmuta`alimi `inda waD`i al-baraamiji at-ta`liimiyati …(1-3) (Edu:81:53)

The question of individual differences is one of the issues that have concerned psychologists and educators for a long time (1-1) … XX identified the importance of both the methodology and the learner in curriculum design (1-3)...

The Arabic RA writer draws on a number of linguistic devices in an attempt to establish a territory of knowledge on the research topic. For instance, the passive structure, with the verbs like *tu9tabaru* ([it is] considered…) in (7) and *shaa`a* ([it is] known) in (8), enables the writer to accomplish an implicit authority of knowledge in the researched field. The use of passive structure, here, indicates that the humble writer does not make the knowledge-establishment claim; rather it seems that a higher authority generates such cooperative conclusion, which is the research community in large where the writer is a member.

Going back to table (3), it shows that 'topic generalization' (step 1-2), either alone or in combined constructions, is the most commonly used pattern (80%) to realize *establishing-a-territory* of knowledge on the researched topic in the Arabic RA introductions. The introduction in (8) is a good illustration of such rhetoric.

(8) …laqad shaa`a fi as-sanawaati al-?axiirati ?istixdaamu ta`biiri aS-Surati al-munTabi`ati …(1-2) walaakin laysa hunaaka ba`adu diraasaatun waafiatun `an haathihi aDH-DHaahirati …(1-3)(Med:80:1)
…the use of stereotype [has become] widely spread, lately…(1-2) however, there aren't enough studies about this phenomenon yet…(1-3)

The 'literature review' (step 1-3), as shown in table (3), establishes the second common step within the rhetorical structure of *establishing-a-territory* move. Hence, in most of the cases, it complements centrality statements as well as topic statements (examples (6) and (7)).

The conclusion drawn from various analyses of the *establishing-a-territory* move in Arabic RA introductions suggest that writers review related studies for one of the following reasons (arranged according to frequency of use): (a) to make a general statement with respect to the topic at question, (b) to claim that the topic is central to the researched field, (c) to pursue a traditional trend, or occasionally (d) to propose that the amplitude of knowledge of the researched field needs improvement, with the possibility of a germination of one or more reasons to realize *establishing-a-territory* rhetoric. In general, the analysis here suggests that some sort of a reference to the related studies in the literature is an important component of the Arabic RA introductions.

Establishing-a-niche Move (M 2).

The analysis of the *establishing-a-niche* move (M 2) of the Arabic RA introductions suggests the following rhetorical patterns:

1. The *establishing-a-niche* move (M 2) is used in 34 introductions (63% of the whole corpus). In 72% of the rhetorical options within CARS moves, (M 2) is used in combined constructions involving both the *establishing-a-territory* (M 1*)*, and the *occupying-the-niche* (M 3).

2. When M 2 is used (in 34 introductions); it takes one of the following rhetorical options (arranged according to frequency of use):
   a. 'Continuing a tradition' (2-1D) is used in 21 introductions (48%)
   b. 'Indicating a gap' (2-1B) is used in 16 introductions (36%).

3. A lesser use for the following rhetorical options within the *establishing-a-niche* move (M 2):
   a. 'Question-raising' (2-1C) is used in (14%),
   b. 'Countering a claim' (2-1A) is used in (2%).

The findings in (1) suggest the use of *establishing-a-niche* move in 34 cases (63% of CARS pattern). This finding is in line with the rhetorical options used in the Swedish RA introductions (65% in Fredrickson and Swales 1994), in the English introductions (61% in Crookes 1986), and in the Spanish introductions (57% in Lopez 1982).

Somehow, it is slightly higher than the frequency of use of the same rhetorical options reported in Najjar 1990 (44%). Disciplinary dissimilarities, agricultural scientists in Najjar vs social scientists in the present analysis, might suggest some impact on the Arabic-writers' rhetorical options.

The vast majority of the reported literature on RA genre earlier makes it evident that *establishing-a-niche* move is the source of a puzzlement and a dispute in a number of culturo-linguistic contexts for a number of reasons (see for example; Najjar 1990, Fredrickson and Swales 1994, Ahmad 1997, Burgess 2002, and Lopez 1982). In fact, the purpose of the *establishing-a-niche*, as being rhetorically realized in the CARS introductions, is not to illustrate the writer's solicitation of all the relevant claims made in the literature, a rhetorical device sets up the relevant sub-sections--perhaps after the writer establishes the study claims, rather to employ just the applicable claims required to recognized one of its sub-options. Misreading of this purpose may lead one to think of the niche statements in the introduction as to fulfill the same purpose as the literature citation in the research as a whole (Fakhri 2002). As the above-mentioned studies collectively suggest, the *establishing-a-niche* move is evidently utilized in a variety of ways in accordance with the linguistic, socio-cultural, and disciplinary environments in which the RA introductions are situated.

Turning to the findings in (3.b) and (3.a); where the latter rhetorical option (countering a claim) is exceptionally rare among the writers of the Arabic RA introductions, the former (question-raising) is unsurprisingly the rhetorical option that the writers choose not to use. Like the Arabic writers, Jogthong 2001 reported a rare use of 'question-raising' rhetoric in 2 out of 22 Thai introductions (9%), and hence validated on the basis of the rhetorical options available within the Thai cultural.

Recall that the *niche-establishment* move engages the identification of a gap in previous analysis, in addition to countering earlier made claims, hypotheses and theories. These rhetorical decisions provoke complex socio-rhetorical maneuvers, which are seemingly complicated to negotiate, given a close research community like Arabic, where researchers are usually familiar with each other's work (see also Najjar 1990). In the Arabic context, the relationship between RA writers and readers is physically and linguistically limited. Najjar 1990 has endorsed that unlike writing intended for an international research community, countering others claims does not seem to be a major concern for the writers of the Arabic RA introductions. While establishing a research

space, Arabic writers may utilize elaborate statements to provide historical background, to define the researched topic, and occasionally to explain how the topic has been developed outside the Arabic tradition. Writers of Arabic RA introductions use 'we', 'they' and 'passive structure' to refer to the field in general, as a form of cultural 'positive politeness' (see examples 9-14).

In what might be conventionally referred to as gap-indicating statements, the analysis reports inclusion of such statements in 36% of the rhetorical options available in *niche-establishment* move. Slightly lesser frequency (26%) was reported for Arabic introductions in Najjar 1990, but relatively comparable finding (41%) was reported for Thai introductions (Jogthong 2001), and in (42%) of the English introductions (Swales 1981).

As shown in the following examples (9-16), there is no reference made to a gap in a particular theory, nor is a challenge made to a specific finding. Instead, the writers of the Arabic RA introductions make general statements to announce that the scope knowledge on the research topic is inadequate due to lacking treatment of such a topic in Arabic.

(9) lam yanal [The subject] ?illaa ?ihtimaaman haamishiyan …
    [The subject] received, but, marginal attention…

(10) ...naHtaaju ?ila darajatin `aaliyatin min fahmi [the subject]...
    We need a high degree of understanding of [the subject]…

(11) ...lam yusbaq ?an ?ujriyat diraasaatun min qablu [on the subject]
    Investigations [on the subject] have never been carried out …

(12) ...lam yastaDii`uu [former researchers] at-tawaSula ?ila [a solution]...
    [Former researchers] were unable to reach [a solution for the subject]

(13) ...maa zilnaa duwna balwarati al-mawDuu`i...
    We are still far from crystallizing the point....

(14) ...?inna al-mar?a yandahishu liqilati ad-diraasaati wal-buHuuthi al-maydaaniyati [on the subject]...
    The scarcity of studies and field examinations [of the subject] is surprising …

The patterns exemplified in (9) through (14) are

relatively common rhetoric to exhibit the choices made by the writers of Arabic RA introductions to 'establishment a niche' on the researched topic. In addition, statements in (15) and (16) below are the typical rhetorical expressions used by writers of Arabic RA introductions to signal what is labeled in Swales' CARS schema as gap-indicating statements. In these expressions, the verb 'yabduu' (it seems) is frequently used to indicate probability, as the writers dispute the Arabic treatment of the topic.

(15) ...yabduu mina al-masHi al-maktabii ?anna al-baaHitha al-`arabiia maa zaala Xaafilan `ani al-?ahamiyati al-`ilmiyati lil-mawDuu`i , wayataDiHu thaalika min qilati , warubamaa in`idaami ad-diraasaati al-`arabiyati Hawlahu... (Psy:82:50).

...it seems, from searching the literature, that Arabic researchers are still unaware of the scientific importance of the subject. This is clear [if we consider] the scarce Arabic studies on the subject (none)

16)...yabduu lanaa ?ana ad-diraasaati al-latii tu`aaliju haTHaa al-mawDuu`a takaadu takuunu qalilatan biwajhin `aamin , wamu`DHamuhaa nuSHira biluXati al-?injiliiziyati... (Geo:90:43)

...it seems that [Arabic] studies that deal with this subject are generally very rare and that most of what has been published [on the subject] is [written] in English...

***Occupying-the-niche* Move (M 3)**

The main findings with reference to '*occupying-the-niche*' move are listed herewith, hence presented in accordance with the frequency of use for ease of reference. Illustrative explanation of the rhetorical sub-steps of M 3 will follow.

1. *Occupying-the-niche* move is used in 50 introductions (93% of the whole corpus). In 11 introductions, it establishes single-move introductions, referred to, in the present study, as the *early-announcement* move, and in 39 introductions it combines various rhetorical constructions within CARS patterns (63% in full CARS structures, and 10% in a binary combination with either M1 or and M2).

2. A close examination of the *occupying-the-niche* move reveals the following sub-step patterns:

　2.1. The promissory steps (1A and 1B) are used in 48 introductions, as in the following:

　　a. 'Outlining-purpose' (1A) is used alone in 12 introductions.

　　b. 'Announcing present research' (1B) is

used alone in 23 introductions.

　　c. A combination of both 1A & 1B is used in 13 introductions.

　2.2. 'Outlining RA structure' (step 3) is used in 25 introductions, mostly in a binary combination with either step 1A or 1B.

　2.3. Step 2 (announcing findings) is used in 7 introductions, mostly in a binary combination with either step 1A or step 1B.

The findings in (1) above suggest that *occupying-the-niche* move is an essential rhetorical component of the Arabic RA introductions. Such a promissory statement is adequate to introduce the Arabic RA, but it is most likely to be supplemented with additional statements (*territory-establishing* and/or *niche-establishing*) to form a full-fledged Arabic RA introduction.

The fact that *occupying-the-niche* move is missing in 4 introductions out of the entire corpus is not a surprising result. Swales and Najjar 1987 reported a similar number of missing M-3s and Crookes 1986 reported one case missing in 18 introductions. The analysis shows that whenever *occupying-the-niche* move is missing from *al-muqademah* (introduction), the following section in the Arabic RA is identified as 'the present study/analysis', where the theme and the composition of the RA are explicitly announced.

Looking into the internal combinations of M 3, the analysis shows that the promissory statements are used in 89%, the RA structure-outlining statements are used in 46%, and announcements the study findings are used in 13% of the cases involving various combination of M 3. These findings suggest that *occupying-the-niche* move is most likely to be realized by means of a form of promissory statement, which may establish the entire introduction, as illustrated in the examples (1-3), or may be realized as in examples (17) and (18)).

(17) p.1 min ?ahami ?ahdaafi al-`ilmi …(1-1)...

p.2 walam yatawaana al-`ulamaa?u wal-mufakiriina fi al-majaali as-suluukii `an muHawalati at-tawaSul ...(1-2)...

p.3 ?iqtaraHa xx taSniifa ?ab`aadi al-qiyaasi as-suluukii ... (1-3)...

p.4 tahdifu hathihi ad-diraasaatu ila muHaawalati at-tawfiiqi bayna hathihi al-?itijaahaati… (3-1)... (Psy:81:52)

 p.1 one of the main objectives of science …(1-1) ...

p.2 scientists and philosophers in the field of behavioral science have never given up attempting to reach for...(1-2)

p.3 xx suggested a classification of types of

behavioral measurement.(1-3)

p.4 this study aims to association different directions [on the subject]...(3-1)

(18) p.1 barazati al-juXraafiya as-siyaasiyatu ka`ilmin mustaqillin...(1-1) ...watu`tabaru diraasaatu juXrafiyati al-?intixaabaati iHdaa al-wasaa?ili al-lati yumkinu `an Tariiqahaa tawDiiHu al-?ixtilaafaati al-makaaniyati(1-2)

p.2 waqad daara jadalun Tawiilun Hawla...?illa ?ana al-maktabata al`arabiyata takaadu taxluu min haatha an-naw`i mina ad-diraasaati.(2-1B) lithaa fa?inna haathaa albaHTHa qad ?istahdafa munaaqashata juXrafiyati al-intixaabaati ... (3-1A)...waTaraHa al-manaahija wal-ma`aayira al-mutaba`ata fi diraasaatihaa min naHiyatin ?uxraa , faDlaan `an ?ijraa?i diraasaatin taTbiiqiyatin laha `an dawlati al-kuwaiti wajamhuuriyati maSra al-`arabiyati (3-3) ... (Geo:88:48)

p.1 ...political geography has been established as a science …(1-1) ...the geography of elections is considered to be a method through which regional differences can be explained...(1-2)...

p.2 ...there has been a long-standing debate about ... but the Arabic library has almost no reference to this type of study…(2-1B). For this reason, this research aims to discuss the geography of election … (3-1A)...and to establish relevant methodology and parameters of investigation: On the other hand, in addition to [providing] an empirical investigation [on the subject] in Kuwait and in Egypt (3-3).

In example (17), the writer initiates the RA introduction by situating the research topic within a broader scope of knowledge. The second paragraph gives a general scope of the researched field, which, in particular, incorporates two rhetorical steps; (a) indicating the topic and (b) announcing the writer's intent to continue an established tradition. In the third paragraph, the writer reviews some relevant literature, and in the final paragraph, the writer announces the aim of the RA.

In example (18), the writer initially declares, by means of general statements, that the researched topic is central to the field of Geography. In the second paragraph, the writer claims a gap in the area being researched using what appears to be a cliché among the writers of Arabic RA introductions: "[this] study does not exist in Arabic". The second half of the second paragraph offers the RA aim, namely to introduce the researched theme for the first time in Arabic. In the remaining parts, the writer extends the statement of intent to include the proposed structure

of the RA.

The analysis shows that when the rhetorical decision involves the promissory statements, a single use of 'outlining-purpose' and 'the intended research' is reported in 12 cases, while a single use of 'announcing present research' is used twice as much. Amalgamated use of the two options is reported at more or less the same frequency of use. Yet, one may expect that when the writer chooses to announce intended research, it entail the inculcation of a statement on its purpose, hence, there is an overlap in the rhetorical function of the two options, as in example (18). However, such a connection between the RA purpose and its intention is not a mandatory rhetorical option for the writer. The general conclusion here is that such a trend adopted by the writers of Arabic RA introductions proposes an adjustment to the connection mood ('or') proposed in the model, hence, 'and/or' may best describe the rhetorical choices among the promissory statements. Perhaps, the same reference captured Swales attention causing a single labeling of both options in one numerical reference (steps 1A and 1B).

Conclusions

The attempt was made in this investigation to narrow the gap of knowledge on the discourse structure of the RA introduction. Using Swales CARS model as a tool of analysis, the study reports on the rhetorical organization of the Arabic RA introductions in social sciences. The study acknowledges systematic description of the Arabic rhetoric, the majority of which fits within the general line of CARS-move schema, though rhetorical variations in structure is evident. The CARS-move model of analyzing RA introductions is enhanced with a number of suggestions so as to endorse global application.

The Arabic RA introductions exhibit two systematically traceable sets of rhetorical organizations, though at a different rate of frequency; the *'early-announcement'* of the accompanying research article, and the *'create-a-research-space'*, best be described as long introductions, structures. Rhetorically incompatible with the English introductions, the single-move *'early-announcement'* structures categorically illustrate the rhetorical choices in nearly one fifth of the Arabic RA introductions. A traditional Arabic RA introduction is usually prompted with promissory statements intended to direct reader's attention to the actual research. When the Arabic writer chooses to pronounce the purpose and/or the specific content of

the research at the onset of the introduction, it is not, then, expected that the writer will go back to the researched field to express interest or to justify the research question. Such rhetorical functions might be independently demonstrated pending the methodological framework adopted. Although this conclusion is distinctly evident in the present examination of the Arabic introductions and cautiously acknowledged in Najjar 1990, a follow-up is needed to show the history and the development of the *'early-announcement'* rhetoric, perhaps across disciplines. Contrastively, existing examinations of languages other than English suggest that the 'early announcement' protocol is not idiosyncratic to the Arab academic discourse. Academics writing in Polish, Swedish, and particularly Spanish have assumed comparable rhetoric, for example. On the light of this, the present study suggests an addition of the *'early announcement'* move as an alternative rhetorical choice to the three-move system, in order to enhance the global applicability of CARS model.

The Arab academics who have chosen not to prompt the announcement of their research at the onset of the RA introduction will resort to a relatively longer introduction engaging three-move rhetoric. A fully-fledge Arabic RA introduction starts with a statement establishing the field being researched, followed by a sequence of statements establishing a research space within that field, which may be in the form of either a chronological narration of the history, or a follow-up of a traditional direction that has been previously recognized in the literature. Rhetorically, the state of knowledge on the proposed research is traditionally accomplished, in the Arabic RA writing, through a negative claim that the amplitude of knowledge on the researched topic is inadequate in Arabic, which linguistically epitomized in the cliché '[this research] does not exist in Arabic', hence the proposed research is self-evident. Unlike writing for an international audience, indicating a gap in others work does not seem to be the common practice among members of the Arabic research community. Researchers, in a close research community like Arabic, and for that matter Chinese and Thai, are likely to be familiar with each other's work. An unenthusiastic comment on someone's work, yet constructively intended, will eventually, I believe, be interpreted consequently personal. 'Face-saving politeness' is apparently the policy adopted by most members of the Arabic research community to guide their scholarly communication.

In addition to the suggestion made earlier to add the 'early announcement' move as an alternative rhetorical choice to the three-move model of the RA introductions, further conclusions reached in this examination may recommend a number of revisions to the nature of move order and/or the way in which some sub-steps in a given rhetorical move are associated. First, the majority of Arabic RA introduction are long, hence established with three-move rhetorical choices, the most common of all is the 'occupying-the-niche' move. Arab academics review previously made analyses for the sake of making topic generalization, the rhetorical choice that is commonly utilized to accomplish a territory of knowledge on the field being researched. Claiming centrality on the researched filed is an occasional option. Thus, it follows that the bond between 'claiming centrality' and 'topic generalization' is mutually linked by means of 'or' option, and combined by 'and' relationship with 'literature review'.

Second, the introductions writers practiced concurrent declaration of both 'the RA purpose' and 'the present research'; though the use of an independent option is probable with favorable preference to the latter. Hence, 'and/or' is the appropriate association mood to relate the rhetorical choices among the possible promissory statements with within the 'occupying-the-niche' move.

Third, as the rhetorical option of question-raising technique is exceptional, perhaps for disciplinary restrictions, and countering previously made claims or theory is not a rhetorical option that the Arabic writer may use, it follows that the establishing-a-niche move needs to be reconsidered, with respect to both its sub-steps and its legitimacy. This conclusion, which perhaps reassures the rhetorical choices made by Spanish, Malaysian and Swedish academics, and possibly complements Duszak's suggests the secondary nature of move order in the CARS model.

References

Ahmad, U. (1997). *Scientific research article in Malay: A situated discourse analysis*. Unpublished dissertation, University of Michigan.

ASSuli, Abi Baker, M. Y. (946) (335 Hejri). *'adab al-kitab' (the Book writing)*. Refurbished by: Basaj, A. (1994). dar al-kotob al-3elmaiyah. Lebanon (1994).

Atkinson, D. (1993). *A historical discourse analysis of scientific research written from 1675-1975: The case of the 'Philosophical transactions of the Royal Society of London*. Unpublished dissertation, University of Southern California.

Ayad, M. (2001) (1st Edition). 'mudawinat aSHSHahed fi al-turath al-balaghi al-3arabi, min al-JaHiD illa al-Jurjani' (The tradition of Arabic Rhetoric: from Al-JaaHid to Al-Jurjaani). Safaaqis Press, Morocco.

Bhatia, V. (1993). Analysing Genre: language use in professional settings. London: Longman.

Burgess, S. (2002). 'Packed houses and intimate gatherings:

Audience and rhetorical structure'. In: Flowerdew, J. (Ed.). *Academic Discourse*. Longman. N.Y. pp.197-215

Crookes, G. (1986). 'Towards a validated analysis of scientific structure'. *Applied Linguistics, 7:57-70.*

Duszak, A. (1994). 'Academic discourse and intellectual style'. *J. of Pragmatics, 21:291-313.*

Fakhri, A. (2004). 'Rhetorical properties of Arabic research article introductions'. *J. of Pragmatics, 36,6:1119-1138.*

Fredrickson, K, and J. Swales. (1994). 'Competition and discourse community: Introductions from Nysvenska stuides'. In: Gunnarsson, B. and L. Nordberg. (eds.). *Text and talk in professional context*. Uppsala: ASLA.

Hopkins, A. and T. Dudley-Evans. (1988). 'A genre-based investigation of discussion sections in articles and dissertations'. *English for Specific Purposes,7:113-21.*

Jacoby, S. (1987). 'References to other researchers in literary research articles'. *ELR Journal, 1:33-78.*

Jogthong, C. (2001). *Research article introductions in Thai: genre analysis of academic writing*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV.

Lopez, G. (1982). *Article Introductions in Spanish*. Unpublished M.Sc. Dissertation. Language Studies Unit, University of Aston at Birmingham, UK.

Lores, R. (2004). 'On RA abstract: From rhetorical structure to thematic organization'. *ESP, 23(3):280-302.*

Martin, P. (2003). 'A genre analysis of English and Spanish research paper abstracts in experimental social sciences'. *ESP, 22(1), pp. 25-43.*

Najjar, H. (1990). *Arabic as a research language: The case of the Agricultural Sciences*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation. The University of Michigan, USA.

Samraj, B. (2002). 'Disciplinary variation in abstract: the case of Wildlife Behaviour and Conservation Biology'. In John Flowerdew (ed.). *Academic Discourse.* UK:Pearson Education Limited. pp:40-56.

Swales, J. (1981). 'Aspects of Article Introductions'. Birmingham, UK: The University of Aston, Language Studies unit.

Swales, J. (1986). 'Citation analysis and discourse analysis'. *Applied Linguistics, 7:39-56.*

Swales, J. (1990). *Genre Analysis: English in academic and research Settings*. Cambridge University Press.

Swales, J. and H. Najjar (1987). 'The writing of research article introductions'. *Written Communication, 4:175-92.*

Talyor, G. and Tingguag. C. (1991). 'Linguistics, cultural and sub-cultural issues in contrastive discourse analysis: Anglo-American and Chinese scientific texts'. *Applied Linguistics, 12 (3):317-336.*

Thompson, D. (1993). 'Arguing for experimental facts in sciences: A study of research article results sections in Biochemistry'. *Written Communication, 10:106-128.*

Tibbo, H. R. (1992). 'Abstracting across the disciplines: a content analysis of abstracts from the natural sciences, the social sciences, and the humanities with implications for abstracting standards and online information retrieval'. *Library and Information Science Research, 14(1), 31-56.*

إعادة صياغة "النظم البلاغي في مقدمة الدراسة البحثية"

في المحيط الثقافي للغة العربية.

لافي ماجد الحربي

جامعة الكويت، الكويت

الملخص: تناقش هذه الدراسة النظم البلاغي في مقدمة الدراسة البحثية باللغة العربية في مجال العلوم الانسانية ، بهدف اثراء البحث المعرفي في الخطاب الاكاديمي العالمي .

استخدمت الدراسة أداة التحليل "كارز" CARS-model التي ابتدعها سويلز Swales ، التي شاع استخدامها في تحليلات بلاغية مماثلة في بيئات لغوية عديدة .

خلصت الدراسة إلى أن الخطاب الاكاديمي في مقدمة الدراسة البحثية باللغة العربية يخضع لنظام بلاغي محدد يمكن وصفه بكل دقه ، حيث يتم في 20٪ منها الاعلان المبكر للدراسة البحثية ، بالأضافة إلى اساليب بلاغية تشترك بها اللغة العربية مع بيئات لغوية وثقافية أخرى – من ضمنها الانجليزية.

كما أوردت الدراسة مقارنات مع بيئات لغوية عديدة أخرى لتؤكد أهمية توجيه أداة التحليل "كارز" لتتوافق مع التطبيق العالمي الـذي يستوعب تحليل النظم الخطابي في بيئات لغوية وثقافية عديدة – غير الانجليزية.