

*The Journal of Teaching Language Skills (JTLS)*  
35(1), Spring 2016, ISSN: 2008-8191  
pp. 111-138

Genre Analysis and Genre-mixing Across Various  
Realizations of Academic Book Introductions in  
Applied Linguistics

**Alireza Jalilifar\***  
Professor

Shahid Chamran University of Ahvaz  
ar.jalilifar@gmail.com

**Zeinab Golkar Musavi**  
M.A, Student

Shahid Chamran University of Ahvaz  
golkar\_z85@yahoo.com

**Abstract**

Motivated by the need to explore the introductory sections of textbooks, the present study attempted to scrutinize three realizations of academic introductions, namely, Preface, Introduction, and Foreword in terms of their functions and potential generic structures in light of Swales's (1990) views of genre. Moreover, the study aimed to investigate genre-mixing as an interdiscursivity element across the above-mentioned texts (Bhatia, 1993). In so doing, a heuristic analysis was adopted to achieve a less biased view of the nature of the variations of introduction and to proceed systematically in developing a potential generic model. Seventy five text samples were extracted to identify the variations in exploiting the moves across the datasets under study. The findings of the study revealed almost similar schematic frameworks for the three manifestations of introductions. Moreover, examining meta-discursive and rhetorical devices across the datasets indicated the ways in which book introduction writers successfully appropriate genre resources and mix a promotional with an informative purpose.

*Keywords:* genre analysis, genre mixing, introduction, textbook

Over the last three decades, English for Specific Purposes (ESP) researchers have employed genre analysis extensively to examine academic texts and their related discourses (e.g., Jalilifar, 2010; Bhatia, 1997, 2004; Bunton, 2002; Dudley-Evans, 1986; Dudley-Evans & Henderson, 1990; Hopkins & Dudley-Evans, 1988; Hyland, 2000, 2004; Hyon, 1996; Martin,

---

Received: 02/04/2016      Accepted: 23/05/2016

\*Corresponding author

Christie, & Rothery, 1987; Nwogu, 1997; Ozturk, 2007; Paltridge, 1997; Samraj, 2008; Swales, 1981, 1990, 2004; Thompson, 1994). This interest in analysis has to a large extent been motivated especially by the need to provide patterns of academic texts to assist English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners and writers to understand and enter the discourse communities and communicate effectively. Genre analysis in ESP which gained popularity with Swales' seminal work about research genres in academic settings resulted in the CARS (Create A Research Space) model (Swales, 1981, 1990). According to Swales (1990), genre analysis is a means of analyzing text in order to justify why genres have acquired certain features.

Among academic materials, textbooks have a significant impact on both scholars and novices. In fact, it is through textbooks that professional writers disseminate their disciplinary views. According to Swales (1995), textbooks as an important pedagogic genre in academic and professional settings should not be excluded from the set of research-process genres because they can combine and apply recent scholarship, incorporate new research findings and generate interesting new topics worth further study. Hyland (2000) suggests that "university textbooks are something of a neglected genre; little is known about their rhetorical structure and their relationship to other genres" (p. 26).

In much the same vein, an introduction section in an academic work is an important part since it should attract the reader. Introduction should be used to orient readers, providing them with the perspective they need to understand the detailed information coming in later sections. According to Bhatia (1997), at a fairly high level of generalization, it is possible to think of *academic introductions* as a super-genre which can be seen to form a colony of related genres. Whether it is an academic discipline, a book, a master or PhD thesis, a conference presentation, a research article, a lecture, or a student essay, an introduction in all its various realizations has a common communicative purpose which can recognize these genres as adjacent or related.

In the introductory pages of academic textbooks, there may be a number of introductory sections which typically occur outside the content of the book, including *preface*, *foreword*, *introduction*, *acknowledgements* and, occasionally, *trajectory*, *preamble* or *prologue*. Most of these introductions share at least one communicative purpose, that is to introduce the book in

focus, hence seemingly a considerable overlap, but some of them are sometimes appropriated by publishers to promote their product. These adjacent or closely related sub-genres have been conventionally used with some degree of independent identification. However, it is not always clear how they differ and the terms are often used interchangeably. Authors may experience confusion if they are not fully aware of genre tendencies and linguistic characteristics of introductory sections, especially when they want their work to serve a promotional purpose in the present professional climate. However, the existing literature on introductory sections of academic textbooks is on its infancy. Apart from a few studies (e.g., Abdollahzadeh & Salarvand, 2013; Kuhl, 2008; Sorayyaei Azar, 2012; Zepetnek, 2010), further empirical research is needed to identify the characteristic conception of textbook introductions. Accordingly, three variations of the above-mentioned academic textbook introductions, namely *Preface*, *Foreword*, and *Introduction* constitute the main focus of this study.

A further issue in relation to these adjacent genres concerns the hybridity of the discourse in which an introduction is written, a phenomenon termed interdiscursivity (Cheng, 2009). Interdiscursivity accounts for various discursive processes and professional practices, often resulting in mixing, embedding and bending of genres in professional contexts (Bhatia, 2004). It is unclear whether these possible discursive processes across adjacent genres need to be restricted in terms of some boundaries, and if it is the case how these boundaries might be defined. Given the focus of this study, then, after exploring the potential functional structure of the three variations of introduction, we also investigated the phenomenon of genre-mixing within them.

With the paucity of research on genre-mixing, it is important to identify ways of operationalizing our frameworks. Thus, the study provides empirically based frameworks that allow us to identify how each text type serves its communicative and promotional purposes. The current study aims to answer the following questions:

1. What macro structures (i.e. moves) characterize the introductory sections (introduction, preface, and foreword) of academic textbooks in the discipline of applied linguistics?

2. What textual devices (micro-features) in these texts help to uncover possible hidden genre(s) mixed with the genre in focus?

## Method

### The Design of the Study

This study adopted a mixed-method design. In the first place, we explored the potential macro structure of the texts under study, counted frequencies and percentages of the occurrence of the communicative moves, and ran a number of statistical tests, using statistical software package of SPSS. In the second place, we searched out possible genre(s) hidden or mixed in the main genre.

### Theoretical Framework

Inspired by the necessity to understand specialized discourse, the present study aimed to develop a framework to describe the macro structure of introductory sections of applied linguistics textbooks. Move analysis on the basis of surface linguistic clues in this study was done using a bottom-up approach that views genre as content and function. To obtain a less biased schematic structure of genres, a bottom-up processing approach, based on grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967), which is, though slightly dated, still an accepted qualitative research approach, was adopted. To be called grounded theory, a study needs to meet two basic criteria: (a) the data analysis follows the specific sequential coding system, and (b) the analysis produces some theory as an outcome of the investigation. In grounded theory, a logical, three-level system is used to describe coding: open coding, axial (or theoretical) coding, and selective coding (Dörnyei, 2007). Open coding is the first level, in which the textual data is *broken open* into chunks. Each segment is assigned a category label, which is abstract and conceptual rather than descriptive, in order to stimulate new ideas. In axial coding, the researcher makes connections between categories and groups them into more encompassing concepts that subsume several subcategories. Selective coding is the final stage in grounded theory analysis, in which a kernel category is selected to concentrate on in the rest of the analysis.

A subsidiary goal of this study was checking whether genres are mixed or blended in the context of introductory genres. Bhatia (1997) argues that

mixing “private intentions” with “socially recognized communicative purposes” results in genre mixing (p. 187). The first and foremost communicative purpose behind academic texts in general and textbook introductions in specific is transacting or imparting knowledge. However, there might be a private intention that is camouflaged but can be uncovered through detailed exploration of textual devices. To put it in another way, there is a clear concern on the part of the writers to look for readership. That is, academic writers try to promote their research indirectly, and this can best be accomplished in textbook introductions.

### Data Collection

The overall dataset used in the present study was narrowed down based on certain criteria. The analysis was restricted to text samples taken from the front matter of solely applied linguistics textbooks in order to avoid any uncorroborated overgeneralization of the results due to possible discipline-specific characteristics. Accordingly, those textbooks including an introductory section entitled *Introduction*, *Preface*, or *Foreword* positioned before or exactly after the contents page and not part of the text units or chapters were selected. The textbooks were necessarily published within the period of 1983 to 2013 to control any likely variation due to the variable of time.

In accord with grounded theory, there was a need for the data to be saturated so that the researchers would be able to cover the variation of the potential macro structure they were investigating to the fullest, and thus propose a reliable model (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Accordingly, data collection ended once new text samples no longer disclosed new features. Therefore, the collection of data was a continuing process and the researchers had no knowledge of how many samples would suffice. Finally, the analysis led to the collection of 75 texts from an e-book database including 720 e-books in the field of applied linguistics as well as 140 printed textbooks from the library of Shahid Chamran University of Ahvaz (15 forewords, 30 introductions, and 30 prefaces codified as F#1, F#2, F#3 ...F#15; I #1, I#2, I#3, ... I#30; P#1, P#2, P#3, ... P#30). It is worth noting that the majority of the textbooks within the e-book database embraced a preface or an

introduction in their front end, and a foreword was hardly seen among the textbooks. Lack of textbooks containing a foreword to choose from, then, led to searching out those printed books from the library.

After selecting and codifying the texts, the main coder went through the text, broke it into sentences and started the investigation with the aim of identifying the macro structures of the texts in terms of recurring patterns or moves. The researchers, then, attempted to make a connection between those sentences which implied a similar content and communicative purpose and put them under the same category. The category was marked with the move type according to its functional orientation. Although the texts at the first level of analysis were divided into individual sentences, this did not mean an individual sentence was always regarded as a move since a move was defined in this study by its function not its physical length.

### **Pilot Study**

The subjectivity of qualitative research often leads to questioning the reliability of its results (Bachman & Palmer, 1996; Gamaroff, 2000). Shohamy, Gordon, and Kraemer (1992) believe that if there is no inter-coder reliability, there can be no validity. Thus in order to guarantee the reliability of the present work and to reduce the probable risk of human errors in consequence of manual data analysis, a pilot phase was conducted. In so doing, the first 24 text samples— eight representing each variation under study— were selected to be piloted.

A checklist was, then, designed including items on the moves already identified by the main coder within the texts. The checklist was comprised of 12 items, each item accounting for one of the identified moves. The items consisted of the main coder's judgment on the instances of the moves provided. Following specific explanations considering the theoretical frameworks underlying the study, two PhD students at Shahid Chamran University of Ahvaz who had attended advanced courses on genre issues were requested to judge the codification of the text samples attempted by the main coder. Inviting coders other than the main researchers was assumed to fulfill the purpose of minimizing the likely risk of subjectivity associated with this kind of analysis. It also seemed that affording the coders with a checklist

might be more practical than providing them with the original texts lacking the main coder's judgment. They, then, were asked to verify or reject the identified moves. In addition, there was an open-ended question as the last item which invited the coders to provide their own judgment in case of rejecting the main coder's justification and suggest the potential moves which probably would have been unnoticed by the main coder. Finally, due to the fact that the items within the checklist were of dichotomous options, Cohen's Kappa statistics was selected to investigate estimates of inter-coder agreement (Cohen, 1960). The average coefficient of 88%, eventually, showed a high agreement among the coders.

### **Procedure**

Subsequent to the analysis of all the texts, a Kruskal-Wallis H test was chosen as the non-parametric test for data analysis in which more than two comparisons can be carried out. However, by increasing the chances of obtaining significance, performing a multiple comparison generates problems in relation to p-value interpretation. Through Bonferroni adjustment, a method used to counteract the problems, the traditional .05 definition of significance was divided by the number of groups (i.e.,  $.05/3$ ).

The Kruskal-Wallis test revealed that at least one pair of groups differed. However, the test did not disclose any more information considering where exactly the difference laid. Moreover, merely using the concept of statistical significance is not necessarily a good idea since it is heavily dependent upon sample size. What matters, ultimately, is whether the size of that difference is meaningful in practical sense. To this purpose, calculating the effect size, that is, a measure describing the magnitude of the observed difference between two groups, can be really helpful. As indicated by Cohen (1988), the *r* values show the size of the observed difference where an *r* value of .1 indicates small difference, an *r* value of .3 indicates a medium effect size, and an *r* value of .5 indicates a large effect size. In so doing, a series of Mann-Whitney tests were performed to ascertain which pairs of groups differ significantly from one another.

As the final step of developing the potential model, the data underwent a procedure, according to Swales (1990), in which the identified moves were

assigned into three categories, namely, obligatory, conventional, and optional based on their percentage of occurrence within the genre variation in focus. Accordingly, where a particular move occurred repeatedly with a frequency of more than 67%, it was labeled as obligatory. Moves observed less frequently, that is, moves for which the frequency fell between 66% and 33%, were considered as conventional. Finally, moves which occurred sporadically (i.e., the move frequency was less than 33%) were assigned into the optional category.

## Results and Discussion

### The Identified Moves in the Three Datasets

In adopting a functional criterion for the identification of the moves, we chose titles according to their common functional orientation. What follows is the functional value of each move identified in the datasets. In the examples that follow, the distinct lexical clues that are regarded as the key expressions for each move are given in bold.

*Describing the book's focus* introduces what is covered in the book. The writer sets the stage for the reader by setting the overall themes of the book, or by establishing definitions and methodology that are used throughout the book. Other times, it clarifies the scope of the book and describes its content in greater detail. Note the following example:

This *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning* brings together a broad-based, state-of-the-art overview of current knowledge and research into the following domains of second language teaching and learning: social contexts of L2 learning, research methodologies in L2 learning, acquisition, and teaching....(I#14)

*Specifying the purpose* expresses explicitly or implicitly the writer's purpose for writing the book. The writer goes through what the book is aimed at as shown below:

**The purpose of this book** is to provide teachers with tools and techniques for analyzing and subjecting to critical scrutiny the syllabuses with which they are working. **It is also intended to provide**

concepts and procedures for those teachers who are in a position to take part in the development of their own syllabuses. (I#22)

*Specifying the readership*, functionally, serves to identify the audience by naming the potential readers who can make use of the book and benefit from it. Sometimes the educational level or background knowledge required by the reader is expressed as shown below.

**This handbook is for anyone who** is teaching or planning to teach English as a foreign language anywhere in the world. But **it is especially for those who:**

-are non-native speakers of English

-have little or no formal training as English teachers, or were trained some time ago(I#6)

*Expressing gratitude* is exploited by writers to acknowledge, thank, and appreciate specific people and institutions that were helpful to them during the time of writing. It is a place for the writers to name-drop and reminisce contributors in the course of book's compilation. Contributors might include colleagues, students, editors, sabbaticals, family members, and everyone who ever cast an eye on the pages of the book or lent an ear over coffee. Note the following example:

There are many people who could be **thanked** for their help in the production of this book. Eli Hinkel gave us a great deal... Mary Hillemeier and Naomi Silverman of Taylor & Francis were similarly enthusiastic.... The reviewers of the book before it was published provided many helpful and frank comments which led us to see the book through others' eyes. We are very **grateful** for this. (P#17)

*Establishing the genesis of the work* is exploited by writers to explain how they came to write the book. Through this move, they offer their motivation, inspiration, reasons and justifications for developing the book. It shows years-long adventure from dissertations to finished books, including papers, seminars, visiting positions and also how it was nurtured by mentors,

colleagues and foundations to highlight the hard work and the endeavor behind.

**This book started life as** CLCS Occasional Paper No. 3- entitled *The Age Factor in Second Language Acquisition*- and the original aim of the first edition of the book, which appeared in 1989, was simply to update and extend the paper in question. (F#15)

*Claiming centrality* states that the topic of the book forms part of a significant research area that is worth investigating. For Swales (1990), the goal of *claiming centrality*, of course in RA, is to convince members of the discourse community that the to-be-reported research is important and crucial for either temporal, quantitative or qualitative reasons as illustrated in the following example:

**The last few decades** have seen **an upsurge of research interest** in metaphor and figurative language. **This interest** has also become part of **a larger** enquiry into the relationship between language and other processes of mind, an enquiry that is producing the field known as cognitive linguistics. (I#15)

*Outlining the organization of the book* is used to guide readers to the content in each section of the book. The writers might make chapter by chapter reference and mention the number and the order of the chapters to help the audience to recognize those parts of the content which they might find appropriate. Some writers even try to describe the preferred ways in which a book could be approached for instructional or learning purposes. This move is characterized by a considerable use of endophoric markers which refer to other parts of the text (Hyland, 2004), and which, as interpersonal devices (Halliday, 1973), are a means of making the text more interactive and thus more easily accessible to the reader as noted in the following example:

**The book begins with** a chapter on language learning in early childhood. This background is important because both second language research and second language teaching have been influenced.... **In Chapter 2**, several theories that have been advanced to explain second

language learning are presented and discussed. **In Chapter 3**, we turn our attention to.... (I#18)

*Explaining changes to new edition* is employed to describe in what respects the new edition differs from its previous one.

Most units contain **minor changes** in the form of extra examples or brief additions to the text.... **A major addition of this new edition** is the set of exercises and questions at the end of each unit.... **The frequent practices have been kept and occasionally revised or extended in the new edition**.... (P#4)

*Taking responsibility for slips* acknowledges the writers' accountability for the weaknesses of their book in advance. This move serves two functions of admiring the book and making apologies to the readership at the same time. In the example below, the writers refer to opinions contributed by other people to give credibility to the book and point to their attempt to avoid any likely slip. Then, they turn to show deference to the readers and apologize indirectly for weaknesses.

We are all too conscious that, despite **the best efforts of those who have given us the benefits of their insights and advice**, the book has many weaknesses. For these, of course, **we alone are responsible**. (F#15)

*Referring to other related (supplementary) sources* is exploited by writers to refer to supplementary or more advanced sources, software packages, or websites. The discourse of this move is usually hybrid and combines features of other genres. The example below shows how an electronic address has been cut and pasted into the genre in focus, which is one form of constitutive intertextuality or interdiscursivity (Fairclough, 1992).

Additional sources for this book, including chapter-by-chapter glossaries, flashcards, and Web links, can be found at **<http://www.thomsonedu.com/psychology/dcarroll>**. (P#8)

To show the significance of the book, some writers may resort to *Evaluating the book* and refer to the previous editions of the book and how well they have been received.

But also **of importance**, based on **the feedback and suggestions of professors using the** first edition of the book.... (P#6)

*Eliciting the response* welcomes the readers to pass any comment on the writer's work. Meanwhile, this move is a means of showing modesty and humility to the reader which might have a great impact on the reader.

**I would be delighted to hear from students or professors who are using this book.** (P#7)

### Quantitative Analysis

In order to develop a model (or models) of genre for the three variations of academic book introductions under study, it was necessary to conduct quantitative analyses. Therefore, as the first step towards quantifying the data, we scrutinized the texts one by one to calculate the frequency of occurrence of each identified move within each dataset (see Table 1).

Table 1  
*Frequencies and Percentages of Occurrence of Moves in the Three Datasets*

Move Types	Prefaces N= 30 (%)	Introductions N=30 (%)	Forewords N=15 (%)
Describing the book's focus	27 (90) ***	23 (77) ***	13 (87) ***
Specifying the readership	21 (70) ***	20 (67) ***	13 (87) ***
Specifying the purpose	22 (73) ***	21 (70) ***	10 (67) ***
Expressing gratitude	27 (90) ***	15 (50) **	7 (47) **
Outlining organization	11 (37) **	20 (10) *	3 (47) **
Claiming centrality	14 (47) **	13 (43) **	6 (40) **
Establishing the genesis of the book	11 (37) **	3 (67) ***	7 (20) *

Move Types	Prefaces N= 30 (%)		Introductions N=30 (%)	Forewords N=15 (%)
Explaining changes to the new edition	8 (27) *		0	0
Taking responsibility for slips	3 (3) *		0	1 (7) *
Evaluating the book	2 (10) *		0	0
Eliciting a response	1 (7) *		0	0
Referring to related/additional sources	1 (3) *		0	0

Note: \*\*\* = obligatory, \*\* = conventional, and \* = optional

As shown in Table 1, the most frequent moves of Preface were *describing the book's focus* as well as *expressing gratitude* with the same frequency of occurrence of 27 out of 30 samples. Findings in relation to *expressing gratitude* are somewhat consistent with that of Kuhl's (2008) study in which this move, referred to as *acknowledging other's contributors*, was regarded as the second most frequent move. However, findings are at odds with Sorayyaei Azar's (2012) study in which this move, referred to as *acknowledgements*, was treated as the least frequent move. Within Introduction, *describing the book's focus* occurred with the highest frequency, 23 (N = 30). Both *describing the book's focus* and *specifying the readership* were the most frequent moves as well, occurring in 13 out of 15 of the forewords. As can be understood from the table, *describing the book's focus* constituted the most frequent move in the three datasets, and *specifying the purpose* was the second most frequent move across Prefaces, Introductions and Forewords. In addition, Prefaces favored *specifying the readership* as the third most frequent move. Regarding Introductions, the same move also ranked third along with *outlining organization*, whereas Forewords included it as the most frequent one along with *describing the book's focus*. As a result, based on frequency analysis, *describing the book's focus*, *specifying the purpose* and *specifying the readership* stand out in all the datasets.

Interestingly, *describing the book's focus* was not reported in either Kuhl's (2008) or Sorayyaei Azar's (2012) study. Nevertheless, *Specifying the purpose* and *specifying the readership* with the same frequency of occurrence occupied the most frequent position in Kuhl's (2008) study; hence the present

findings are somewhat in agreement with those of Kuhi's research. On the other hand, results from Sorayyaei Azar's (2012) study showed various degrees for the frequency of occurrence of these two moves. Although he referred to these moves as steps called *purpose* and *announcing audience* used in realizing the move entitled *establishing orientations*, their functions resembled the moves *specifying the purpose* and *specifying the readership* in the current study. In his study, *purpose* was identified as the most frequent step, whereas *audience* was taken as the least frequent, followed by *acknowledgments*.

In order to determine if Preface, Introduction, and Foreword writers significantly differed in their use of rhetorical moves, the frequencies were then submitted to a Kruskal-Wallis test with academic book introduction variation as the categorical grouping variable. The Kruskal-Wallis test examined the possible significant difference for each move separately across the three groups.

Table 2

*Kruskal-Wallis H Test for the Identified Moves across the Three Datasets*

Move Types	Chi-Square(X <sup>2</sup> )	df	Asymp. Sig (p)
Outlining organization	10.166	2	0.006
Establishing the genesis of the book	8.418	2	0.015

The results of Kruskal-Wallis for comparing the move frequencies across the three variations revealed a statistically significant difference according to the adjusted p-value of .017 in the use of two moves, namely, *outlining organization* as well as *establishing the genesis of the work*, and an insignificant difference in relation to the other remaining ten identified moves. At this point, the results revealed that there was at least one pair out of three pairs of groups under comparison that behaved differently. To see, then, where exactly the observed difference existed and to estimate the effect size of that difference, a set of Mann-Whitney tests of three pairwise comparisons (i.e. Preface vs Introduction, Preface vs Foreword, and Introduction vs Foreword) was performed for each significantly different move as shown by

Kruskal-Wallis. By and large, two series of Mann-Whitney tests were executed. The results are presented as follows.

Table 3

*Mann-Whitney Test Results for Outlining Organization*

Compared pairs	p-value	effect size (r)
Prefaces vs. Introductions	.021	.30
Prefaces vs. Forewords	.260	.16
Introductions vs. Forewords	.004	.43

To perform a post hoc test for *Outlining organization*, three instances of Mann-Whitney U test were carried out to estimate the size of the observed difference for this move. Two pairs of Prefaces versus Introductions and Introductions versus Forewords indicated meaningful p-values, and the difference observed in the occurrence frequency of the move for these pairs of groups in this study was medium, ( $r = .30$ ) and ( $r = .43$ ), respectively. However, the p-value for Prefaces versus Forewords in terms of the employment of this move was insignificant, that is, more than .05, and its effect size was too small ( $r = .16$ ) to be called significant based on the sample size. Therefore, the results suggested that Introduction was responsible for the observed difference in the sense that writers exploited this move more frequently in their writing in comparison with preface and foreword writers.

Table 4

*Mann-Whitney Test Results for Establishing the Genesis of the Work*

Compared pairs	p-value	effect size
Prefaces vs. Introductions	.015	.31
Prefaces vs. Forewords	.523	.09
Introductions vs. Forewords	.006	.41

After revealing the significant p-value for *establishing the genesis of the work* through Kruskal-Wallis, three instances of Mann-Whitney U test were conducted, this time to estimate the size of the observed difference for this move. The tests showed that the difference existed in two pairs of Prefaces versus Introductions as well as Introductions versus Forewords both with

medium effect sizes of .31 and .41, respectively. However, comparison of Prefaces versus Forewords indicated no significant difference, and calculating the effect size acknowledged the result. As can be observed from the statistical test, the observed difference across the datasets reported by Kruskal-Wallis may be explained by the existence of Introduction which is common with the two significant pairs, whereas the other two datasets were similar in terms of their frequency of occurrence when located in the same pair to be compared.

### Move Categorization

As the next step towards developing a model, there was a need to convert the move frequencies into percentages to make the scale of the data interval and then determine which moves could be considered as obligatory, conventional, or optional (See Table 1). To put forward a more comprehensive model of macro structure, then, it is common to take into account only the obligatory and conventional moves and discard the optional ones from the developing model due to the fact that the presence of such optional moves might be explained in the light of individual maneuver any member of a discourse community deserves to take throughout the process of writing within any genre framework. These optional moves might not be considered as the genre specific conventions the writers are supposed to follow. Table 5 presents the ultimate results of move analysis for each of the three text genres under study.

Table 5

*The Schematic Structures for the Three Variations on Introduction*

Move type	Preface	Introduction	Foreword
Describing the book's focus	✓	✓	✓
Expressing gratitude	✓	✓	✓
Specifying the purpose	✓	✓	✓
Specifying the readership	✓	✓	✓
Claiming centrality	✓	✓	✓

Outlining organization	✓	✓	–
Establishing the genesis of the book	✓	–	✓

As shown in the table above, all the three proposed models of genre are similar in terms of the five moves of *describing the book's focus*, *specifying the purpose*, *specifying the readership*, *expressing gratitude* and *claiming centrality*. The only serious discrepancy deals with how these book introductions treat *outlining organization* and *establishing the genesis of the book*. *Outlining organization* certainly serves an academic communicative purpose for a book introduction, whereas *establishing the genesis of the book* verifies the importance of the work through referring to the hard work, serious endeavor, and valid sources behind the compilation of the book, and thus it serves a promotional communicative purpose rather than an academic one. Simply put, Introduction constitutes only *outlining organization*, Foreword comprises solely *establishing the genesis of the book* and Preface includes both. Despite the fact that the three adjacent genres under study displayed a remarkable degree of overlap in terms of employment of common moves, interestingly, the difference in terms of the two moves (i.e., *outlining organization* and *establishing the genesis of the book*) supports Bhatia's (1997) study in which Preface, Introduction and Foreword were distinguished by the communicative purpose(s) that they serve. Accordingly, Preface is academic as well as promotional, whereas Introduction is mainly academic and Foreword tends to be mainly promotional.

### Genre-Mixing

At first glance, it seems that most of these moves might serve a quite informative communicative purpose, a type of communicative purpose that is primary for academic introductions. However, there is an aspect of the development of academic introductions which was unveiled through detailed exploration of linguistic features and textual devices, and that is a clear concern on the part of the writers to look for readership even though sometimes there is a deliberate attempt to conceal it. Swales (1990) asserts research article writers try to promote their research indirectly. Promoting the

book has, however, turned somewhat into a dominant attempt. Here the reader is provided with the evidence, picked out from Introductions, to show how a writer could promote his work.

If **you** are a practicing teacher, or a teacher-trainer, looking for new insights and ideas, **you** may just want to add *Success in English Teaching* to **your** personal reference library. In that case, **you** will find the content pages and the index useful to locate the topic **you** are interested in at any given time. The summaries at the end of each chapter should also be useful, quickly providing more background to the topic **you** are investigating. (I#1)

From the first moment the analysts lay eyes on this piece, it reminds them of advertising, and that is more likely due to the fact that the text has been manipulated by the writer to address a specific purpose rather than simply introducing the book. Apparently, clear efforts have been made on the part of the writer through extensive exploitation of the personal pronoun *You* as a linguistic strategy in order to fulfill a commercial purpose. This rhetorical strategy is common with advertising genres (Jalilifar, 2008).

Through the use of personal pronouns as can be seen in the example above, the writer addresses the readers individually and talks to them directly as friends. Cameron (2001) argues that writers favor informal styles and registers of language use, which connote intimacy or solidarity, rather than formal styles. Relying on the use of this rhetorical device, the above writer has put efforts into establishing a connection between himself and his readers in a way that makes the audience feel the writer is standing beside them. Other writers, on the other hand, choose the noun *reader*, in either a plural form or a singular form, in order to attract the potential readership, as shown below.

Many **readers** will be encountering these controversies, theories, and areas of research for the first time, and for those **readers** the book will explain to **them** and open up areas for deeper reading and questioning; many other **readers**, who are more advanced in **their** studies through academic courses or professional training, should find many of **their** own questions explored and many of **their** assumptions questioned. (I#20)

In the above example, although the writer attempts to draw the audience's attention to a part of the message they are looking for, there is still a large distance between the writer and his readers and that is certainly due to the use of the third person plural pronoun contrary to the former example in which the personal pronoun *You* connotes a higher degree of solidarity and narrows down the gap between the writer and the reader.

In fact, the power of rhetoric aims to exploit feelings using persuasive discourse as well as making the impact of one's ideas on the addressee increase to his or her advantage. The use of the personal pronouns *I* and *You* can express sociable styles and connote a higher degree of intimacy (Cameron, 2001). The example below shows how these interpersonal markers have been employed within the discourse of an academic introduction to make the discourse persuasive and create closeness and affinity.

**You**, like most people approaching qualitative research for the first time, may find this breadth overwhelming. **We** know this well because **we** have experienced it ourselves. **As a result of** that experience, **we** decided to create a practical book that might help reduce the anxiety novice researchers often feel as they begin their qualitative research journey. (P#13)

In the above example, the art of persuasion is enhanced through incorporating interpersonal involvement. The writers here have ventured to ameliorate the relations with the audience. They put themselves in the audience's position and sympathize with them by mentioning the fact that they understand what the readers are expected to get through. They try to make the readers believe that they are experienced enough in the field to be trusted, and then, via the use of a logical conclusion (*as a result of that experience*), turn to express their inspiration and offer their reason for writing the book.

Through careful and conscious rhetorical choices, some writers appear to personally invest in their text so as to project an authoritative self. One of the most obvious and important ways writers can represent themselves to readers, however, is to explicitly affirm their role in the discourse through first person pronouns (Hyland, 2001; Kuo, 1999; Tang & John, 1999). The first

person plural *We* was the most common writer reference in the text samples analyzed; not that there was always more than one writer involved. The two excerpts that follow are a Foreword and an Introduction, extracted from two different books by the same author. We have no knowledge of the probable reason on the part of the writer to choose Introduction for one book and Foreword for the other, while a Foreword is conventionally supposed to be written by someone other than the author. More interestingly, he has made use of first person plural pronoun within his writings differently.

However, **we** wanted to present **readers** with the essentials in terms of conceptual background, theory, and research. (F#9)

In the course of the book **we** shall see that syllabus designers are currently facing a dilemma over the relationship between syllable design and methodology. **We** shall see that the traditional.... (I#22)

In F#9, the use of the first person plural *We* instead of its singular form *I* cannot be explained by the collaborative work. It is likely that he employed *We* to signal the discourse community and his membership as an authoritative voice to that community. On the other hand, the use of *We* within I#22 takes an important interactive role in increasing the intimacy between the writer and the reader in the sense that this language, the choice of *We*, helps to create a sensation that the writer and the reader belong to the same discourse community.

Hyland (2002) argues that the authorial pronoun is a significant means of promoting a competent scholarly identity and gaining acceptance for one's ideas. There is a range of rhetorical and linguistic resources, variously called appraisal (Martin, 2000), evaluation (Hunston & Thompson, 2000), and stance (Hyland, 1999) that enable the writers to take up positions and express judgments. Taking a stance and demonstrating confidence clearly implies that the writer is a distinctive, individual creator with a firm position and rights to ownership of his or her perspectives and text. The writers in the instances below are totally visible.

The process has **involved me** in the detailed consideration of a number of well-entrenched assumptions... This is **not the first time I** have

undertaken such an enquiry.... **I** have spent **my professional life** in trying.... (P#9)

*Teaching by principles* is in many ways a product of **my three decades** of instruction and research in teaching English as a Second/Foreign Language. During that time, it has been **my pleasure** and **challenge** to teach and to learn from **hundreds of students in my courses**. I am grateful for all those inquisitive minds-now **scattered around the world**...I am also indebted to teachers **in many countries of the world**, especially in those countries where **I had the honor of lecturing and teaching**: Brazil, the Dominican Republic... (P#4)

The points at which writers choose to make themselves visible in their texts through self-reference along with deliberate mention of their achievements and contributions have considerable rhetorical importance in the sense that visibility acts as the sensational news headline which hooks viewers to their TV sets for a long time to follow the detailed account of the story. In the examples, stance features are expressed by explicit self-representation elements (e.g. *I, my, we*), and potential positive adjectives and nouns (such as *professional, pleasure, challenge*). The writers have intruded into the texts to positively show their attitudes, feelings, and evaluation toward their own book. Writers use these strategies directly and explicitly to show their own status as an author of the book toward the readers with the aim of giving credibility to their book.

The rhetorical promotion of oneself and one's work is not limited to the usage of personal pronouns for self-promotion. Swales (1990) believes that "decisions have to be made about the winsomeness of the appeal to the readership" (p. 137). In so doing, the writers promote their work and validate the contribution their work has made towards the discourse community through the employment of evaluative elements or what Lindeberg (2004) calls boosts, defined as "positive assessment of contribution" (pp. 40-41). According to Bhatia (1997) and Jalilifar (2008), the extensive use of adjectives plays a key role in promotional genres. In the example below, bold lexical items are evaluative terms exploited in the texts to describe and evaluate the book in a positive light.

Within these main parts the book includes **considerable additional** material to give this edition **greater balance** and **coverage**, and to provide examples and **greater practical** guidance for those who are planning and conducting second language research... **We** have attempted to give both **considerable coherence** to the book and to provide researchers with **clear** and deliberately **practical guidance** on all stages of the research process... Overall, this edition provides a **balanced, structured** and **comprehensive** introduction to second language research that sets out both its principles and practice for researchers in a **user-friendly** way... (I#5)

As can be seen above, most often used words are evaluative adjectives combined with nouns to make a strong effect. In some cases, the evaluative adjectives are collocated with evaluative nouns (such as *balance, guidance, coherence...*) to create even a stronger effect.

Bhatia (1993) introduced *establishing needs of the readership* as a rhetorical move in promotional discourse in which the writer perceives a gap in the market and introduces his/her book to fill the gap. Although in the text samples analyzed in the present study this move was not fully realized, cases were found in which the writers devoted special efforts to refer to the needs of the readership. In so doing, as shown in the following example, the writer relies on the subtle use of positively evaluating expressions along with the word *need* contextualized within the dominant move of *specifying the readership*.

It is a book for prospective and new teachers who **need** to learn how to walk into a classroom and effectively accomplish communicative objectives. It **primarily\_addresses the needs** of those in teacher education programs who... (P#4)

Instances of this kind observed throughout the analysis have a large degree of overlap in the communicative purpose they tend to serve, and they serve more or less a common promotional purpose.

### Conclusion

Analyzing genres through the employment of a bottom-up approach afforded the analysts with an opportunity to investigate the genre narrow in focus but broad in vision, in which, besides exploring the potential model for the three manifestations of academic book introductions, the methodology enabled the analysts to unveil the hidden agenda behind the dominant introductory genre, that is, mixing promotional genre with the genre in focus so as to fit a specific purpose rather than merely introducing the book. The identification of approximately similar frameworks for the three text genres in focus suggests that they all intertwine and are largely indistinguishable from each other.

A book introduction like a research article needs to be published. The first reader who comes to read the introductory piece before being published is certainly a publisher. Therefore, a writer needs to take advantage of the art of persuasion to win the acquiescence of the publisher and convince him/her that the book is worth publishing. On the other hand, a book introduction unlike a research article needs to be marketed and sold, and to fulfill this commercial purpose is absolutely a burden on the writer's shoulders. Thus, besides the publisher, students as the main audience for a textbook seeking knowledge from the book need to be addressed. Yet, in most cases, they are not the students themselves who choose a textbook for an academic course, but teachers as another group of readers are usually responsible for selecting a textbook for a specific course, and in such cases that is actually the teacher's choice which leads to maximizing textbook sales. To this end, writers try to bridge the gap between the readers and themselves, using *I* and *you*, and gain the readers' trust and advertise their product. Via extensive use of evaluative noun phrases, including positive potential adjectives and nouns, as another rhetorical device employed throughout the analysis, writers try to marketize the book and convince the readers that the book is worth purchasing. In addition, writers aim to gain recognition and prestige among other expert members of the discourse community and give credibility to their work at the same time. To this purpose, writers, through the use of authorial pronouns and potential positive attitudes intrude their texts to show their stance as members of their discourse community.

The findings of the present study demonstrate that the writers captured the necessity of maintaining generic integrity since the proposed schematic models embrace moves which are mainly academic and fulfill the principal communicative purpose for an introductory genre. Furthermore, thanks to subtle exploitation of metadiscursive devices served to fulfill promotional purposes, a kind of purpose which is common with a colony of promotional genres in which a variety of significantly related genres such as advertisements and sales letters are subsumed. The writers of text samples of this study did not exceed the boundaries of the book introduction genre in order to achieve their private agendas. As a matter of fact, they created introductions which are informative and incorporate promotional elements in a very subtle manner simultaneously. This kind of “appropriation of generic and rhetorical resources, in order to respond to novel communicative situations of the present-day professional context, results” in a mixed or hybrid form of genre, to use Bhatia’s (2002, p. 12) terminology, which serves a mixture of two academic and promotional purposes through the same generic form.

The findings of this research suggest that expert members of the applied linguistic community manipulate the conventionally accepted genres according to the conditions of use which are subject to change over time. Therefore, the study proves that genre theory accounts for integrity of genres and for the phenomenon of genre-mixing simultaneously.

### References

- Abdollahzadeh, E., & Salarvand, H. (2013). Book prefaces in basic, applied, and social sciences: A genre-based study. *Journal of World Applied Sciences*, 28(11), 1618-1626.
- Bachman, L., & Palmer, A. (1996). *Language testing in practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bhatia, V. (1993). *Analysing genre: Language use in professional settings*. New York: Longman.
- Bhatia, V. (1997). Genre mixing in academic introductions. *Journal of English for Specific Purposes*, 16(3), 181-195.

- Bhatia, V. (2002). Applied genre analysis: A multi-perspective model. *Ibérica*, 4, 3-19.
- Bhatia, V. (2004). *Worlds of written discourse: A genre-based view*. London: Continuum.
- Bunton, D. (2002). Generic moves in PhD thesis introductions. In J. Flowerdew (Ed.), *Academic discourse* (pp. 57–75). London: Longman.
- Cameron, D. (2001). *Working with spoken discourse*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Cheng, W. (2009). Income/interest/net: Using internal criteria to determine the aboutness of a text. In Aijmer, K. (Ed.), *Corpora and language teaching* (pp. 157-177). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Cohen, J. (1960). A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 20, 37–46.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analyses for the behavioral sciences* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dudley-Evans, T. (1986). Genre analysis: An investigation of the introduction and discussion sections of MSc dissertations. In M. Coulthard (Ed.), *Talking about text: Studies presented to David Brazil on his retirement* (pp. 128-145). Birmingham: ELR.
- Dudley-Evans, A. & Henderson, W. (1990). The organization of article introductions: evidence of change in economics writing. In A. Dudley-Evans, & W. Henderson (Eds.), *The language of economics: The analysis of economics discourse* (pp. 67-78). London: Modern English Publications in association with the British Council.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). Discourse and text: Linguistic and intertextual analysis within discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 3, 193-217.
- Gamaroff, R. (2000). Rater reliability in language assessment: The bugs of all bears. *System*, 28, 31-35.
- Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1973). *Explorations in the functions of language*. London: Edward Arnold.

- Hopkins, A., & Dudley-Evans, T. (1988). A genre-based investigation of the discussion sections in articles and dissertations. *English for Specific Purposes*, 7(2), 113–22.
- Hunston, S., & Thompson, G. (2000). *Evaluation in text: Authorial stance and the construction of discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hyland, K. (1999). Talking to students: Metadiscourse in introductory course books. *English for Specific Purposes*, 18(1), 3–26.
- Hyland, K. (2000). *Disciplinary discourses: Social interactions in academic writing*. London: Pearson.
- Hyland, K. (2001). Humble servants of the discipline? Self-mention in research article. *English for Specific Purposes*, 20, 207–226.
- Hyland, K. (2002). Authority and invisibility: Authorial identity in academic writing. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34(8), 1091–1112.
- Hyland, K. (2004). *Genre and second language writing*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Hyon, S. (1996). Genre in three traditions: Implications for ESL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30, 693–722.
- Jalilifar, A. (2008). Generic and linguistic analysis of English and Persian blurbs. *Greek Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 24, 79–106.
- Jalilifar, A. (2010). Research article introductions: Sub-disciplinary variations in applied linguistics. *The Journal of Teaching Language Skills (JTLS)*, 2(2), 29–55.
- Kuhi, D. (2008). An analysis of move structure of textbook prefaces. *Asian ESP Journal*, 7, 63–78.
- Kuo, C. (1999). The use of personal pronouns: Role relationships in scientific journal articles. *English for Specific Purposes*, 18, 121–138.
- Lindeberg, A. (2004). *Promotion and politeness: Conflicting scholarly rhetoric in three disciplines*. Turku: Abo Akademi University Press.
- Martin, J. (2000). Beyond exchange: Appraisal systems in English. In S. Hunston & G. Thompson (Eds.), *Evaluation in text: Authorial stance and the construction of discourse* (pp. 142–177). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Martin, J., Christie, F., & Rothery, J. (1987). Social processes in education: A reply to Sawyer and Watson (and others). In I. Reid (Ed.), *The place*

- of genre in learning: Current debates* (pp.35-45). Geelong, Australia: Deakin University Press.
- Nwogu, K. (1997). The medical research paper: Structure and functions. *English for Specific Purposes*, 16(2), 119-38.
- Ozturk, I. (2007). The textual organization of research article introductions in applied linguistics: Variability within a single discipline. *English for Specific Purposes*, 26(1), 25-38.
- Paltridge, B. (1997). *Genre, frames, and writing in research setting*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Samraj, B. (2008). A discourse analysis of master's thesis across disciplines with a focus on introductions. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 7, 55-67.
- Shohamy, E., Gordon, C., & Kraemer, R. (1992). The effect of raters background and training on the reliability of direct writing tests. *Modern Language Journal*, 76, 27-33.
- Sorayyaei Azar, A. (2012). The self-promotion of academic textbooks in the preface section: A genre analysis. *Journal of the Spanish Association of Anglo-American Studies*, 34(2), 147-165.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Swales, J. (1981). *Aspects of article introductions*. Birmingham, England: Language Studies Unit, University of Aston.
- Swales, J. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Swales, J. (1995). The role of the textbook in ESP writing research. *English for Specific Purposes*, 14(1), 3-18.
- Swales, J. (2004). *Research genres: Explorations and applications*. 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, 523-539.

- Thompson, S. (1994). Frameworks and contexts: A genre-based approach to analyzing lecture introductions. *English for Specific Purposes*, 13(2), 86-171.
- Zepetnek, S. T. D. (2010). Towards a taxonomy of the preface in English, French, and German. *Neohelicon*, 37(1), 75-90.