HOW A RESEARCH ARTICLE INTRUDUCTION STRUCTURED? THE ANALYSIS OF SWALES MODEL (CARS) ON ENGLISH RESEARCH ARTICLE INTRODUCTIONS

Hijjatul Qamariah[1] and Sri Wahyuni[2]
[1]STKIP Bina Bangsa Getsempena Banda Aceh
[2]STKIP Bina Bangsa Getsempena Banda Aceh
hijja@stkipgetsempena.ac.id

Abstract
Research article has been regarded as the most valuable tool in spreading and disseminating research findings around the globe. Knowledge and new information are easily obtained through research articles. However, writing a research article is not easy. Several requirements need to be fulfilled in order to be accepted by the publisher. The weakness of research articles that make those are rejected by the publisher is believed because the papers lack of establishing a territory of the topic discussed and showing the publisher that the paper proposed is worthy enough to be accepted. The essential part of the article is not announced clearly, the gaps that other articles or pervious researches fail to address are not filled. Thus, the article is merely announcing the description of the research but it is not worth to be published in a good journal. One of ways to solve the problem is by writing a good introduction. The most prominent part of a research article is the introduction where the author shows the core point of his research article deserves publishers' attention. The well known and accepted model of article introduction structure is Swales model know as CARS (Create a Research Space). This model has been believed as a typical way a research article introduction structured around the globe. Therefore, this study tried to portray the way how a research article introduction written based on the common convention of good article introduction. The procedure of how the article introduction structured based on Swales Model is pictured. And some English research article introductions written is analyzed to show the organization of Swales model research article introduction. It is hoped that this study can provide a solution for writers especially novice writers to write a good research article introduction.

Keywords: *Research Article Introduction, Swales Model, CARS*

INTRODUCTION

Written academic discourse is inevitably linked to spreading and exchanging knowledge and information among individuals, groups and members across institution and discourse community. Conclusively, the process of disseminating knowledge among those people in academic discipline is imposed by the differences of language and culture. That noteworthy condition definitely has gained many linguists, educators and researchers' attention across discipline to conduct research in intercultural analysis on written academic discourse. To involve in a certain academic discourse community, the writers significantly need to understand and know the belief and value of that discourse community (Swales, 1990). Otherwise, they are not able to joint and participate in the process of exchanging and disseminating knowledge.

The effort of facilitating students in writing more academic and acceptable in English discourse community has challenged researchers in academic rhetoric

to create breakthrough of English rhetoric style. The highlight of the solution is started in genre analysis. Genre analysis investigates different types of genre, function or communicative purpose and the process of how texts are composed (Swales, 1990). The communication purpose of text is the key point how the writers presents their writing and communicate with readers. In addition, Bathia (as cited in Askehave and Swales, 2001) revealed that communication purpose is the main characteristic of a genre because the purpose will unravel the unsolved problem in a question.

Several decades ago, the intention of rhetoric analysis extensively focused on research article introduction. This focus is not without reasons and consideration. Firstly, research articles are considered as familiar academic written discourses that are practical in all field and discipline. Second, research article introductions are normally structured by purpose, method and result which are easy to compare between disciplines. Thirdly, introduction of research articles are always the most difficult part for writers in producing academic writing. Finally, introduction is always the first impression for publisher to consider a research article whether it is accepted or rejected (Jogthong, 2001).

Safnil (2013) further explains that research Article Introductions (RAIs) has become an important section of all sections in research article because of two significant reasons. First, since it comes first in the article where readers will read it first before reading other sections. Second, as it introduces the entire article, it will determine whether or not readers read other sections of article. He also asserts that the importance of introduction section in the article is because of its position and function.

The introduction of research article also represent the connection between the readers and the authors' work, if it can bridge the gap between the knowledge of the intended readers and the research papers, thus it will show that the introduction is successful (Safnil, 2013).

The 1990s model of genre analysis on the three-moves introduction proposed in seminal work by Swales called CARS (Create a Research Space) has been regarded as a breakthrough in academic writing style of English, that is very helpful for NNS who will study in English discourse community. The CARS model has been used as a basic framework in analyzing research article introductions (RAIs) and has been employed in analyzing research article from different languages, for instances a research conducted by Ahmad in 1997 and also been applied in many different discipline (Samraj, 2002).

The basic application of CARS is connecting the communication purpose in the text through move. The 1990s version of CARS model is organized by three movements–move one (1) is called establishing centrality, move two (2) is establishing a niche and move three (3) is named occupying the niche. Every move has several steps which contain some points, for instances, there are some points that underscore move 1 namely: claiming centrality; making topic generalization(s) and; reviewing items of previous research. Move 2 moreover, is underlined by counter-claiming; indicating a gap; question-raising and; continuing a tradition. Finally move 3 is highlighted by outlining purposes; announcing present research; announcing principal findings and; indicating research article structure. Those important points are

not always stated in every move in research introduction, some might be overlooked and some research introductions are typically stressed by particular points. It depends on different discipline and different languages of research introductions.

of this study. There are some points of each move are present in particular article and some points are ought to be stated in

Further, CARS model is revised in order to match all particular types of RAIs. Thus the updated version of CARS is known as CARS model 2004 (Briones, 2012), this version will be employed in the analysis part

each article. Thus it make the latest version is more flexible to apply on distinctive feature of RAIs.

Move 1 Establishing a territory Step 1 Claiming centrality (And/or) Step 2 Making topic generalization(s) (And/or) Step 3 Reviewing items of previous research **Move 2 Establishing a niche** Step 1A Counter-claiming (Or) Step 1B Indicating a gap (Or) Step 1 C Question-raising (Or Step 1D Continuing a tradition **Move 3 Occupying the niche** Step 1A Outlining purposes (Or) Step 1B Announcing present research Step 2 Announcing principal findings Step 3 Indicating RA structure
Move 1: Establishing a territory (citations required)*via** Topic generalizations of increasing specificity **Move 2: Establishing a niche (citations possible)*** via** Step 1A: Indicating a gap or Step 1B: Adding to what is known Step 2: Presenting positive justification (optional) **Move 3 Occupying the Niche** Step 1 Outlining purposes or stating the nature of the present research (OBLIGATORY) Step 2 Listing research questions or hypothesis (PISF)* Step 3 Definitional clarifications (optional Step 4 Summarizing methods (optional) Step 5 Announcing principal findings (PISF**) Step 6 Stating the value of the present research (PISF) Step 7 Indicating structure of the research paper (PISF) *Step 2-4 are not only optional but less fixed in their order of occurrence than the others *PISF – Present In Some Fields

A 2004 Swales' CARS Model

Based on the explanation above, the authors attempt to clearly provide the reader with the implementation of the Swales model in writing the 'introduction' section of an article. Some examples of good English article introductions which represent the Swales model are presented and analyzed to see the organization of the model.

METHODOLOGY

This study is a type of qualitative research by applying a library research method, where data were compiled from secondary sources. This study presented the explanation, evidence, as well as conflicting arguments from other authors towards the reported issues (Mctaggart, 1996).

Data and source of data

The main source of data was taken from several books, and articles that are related to the research article organization and Swales' model application on Research Article Introductions (RAIs). Important databases such as ERIC (Educational Resource Information Center), Ebscohost and LBA (Linguistics behavior Abstract) were used to search research articles that apply Swales' model.

Instrument

The instrument used for analyzing the RAI sections was an updated version of Swales' (2004) Create A Research Space (CARS) model. This version is believed to be appropriate for illustrating a good article introduction.

RESEARCH FINDING

This section presents the procedure of how research article introduction is written. The analysis of some research article introductions is also shown.

The Procedure of CARS in Organizing Introduction Section

Swales model or widely known as CARS is applied for introduction section of research article. Three specific of rhetorical move that commonly appeared in introduction section of English articles have been stated by Swales as obligatory. Thus, the following explanation is how CARS procedurally applied in writing introduction.

1. The first move is known as *establishing a territory*, where writers need to establish his/her area of study. In this move the writers should develop his/her specific area of studies where they have to claim this is the area of study and this is the concern by stating that this area of study is central, important, interesting and relevant to the current knowledge.
2. The second move is called *establishing a niche*. In this move, the writers should tell the readers/audiences that this is the background of the study that is worth to discuss. The statement that the current study is worth to discuss derives from the citation from the previous studies in M1. Thus, it goes from the territory he/she develop before into the specific part of its area. In this move, there are two steps that can be included to establish a specific area of the study. The first is step 1A *indicating a gap* or 1B *adding to what is known*, this is optional whether the writers intend to develop his/her specific area by stating the gap or limitation from the previous research in the same area, thus it will make the present research is different and improved from the previous one, or by adding more theoretical information or knowledge to the previous research in order to improved and recovered the research. This optional step is commonly enriched by more citations from the current studies. Another step is presenting positive justification, which is optional, whether the writers need to include justification or not. It is marked by personal comment from the writers

that this area is worthwhile and contributes to the improvement.

3. The last move is familiarly called *occupying the niche* in the 1999's model or *presenting the present work* in the 2004's. In this move, the writers should acclaim and explain the present research descriptively, including the purpose of it to the readers. This is an obligatory step in move 3, which ubiquitously appear in any disciplines of knowledge. Moreover, other steps are optional, and probable in some discipline.

Create a Research Space (CARS) Schema In Introduction

Regarding the organization of introduction section, this study employs the revised version of Swales' model or commonly called as 2004 model. It is to show the flexibility of Swales' model to be applied in any differences disciplines.

Move 1 Establishing Territory

Establishing territory or called move 1 is regarded as the ultimate phase in writing a research article introduction. The writers, in this move, focus themselves by claiming a point that will be discussed in the research and reviewing arguments of previous research. Swales (1990: 144) states that there are a few linguistic signals that are typically found in introduction, in move 1 for example, the statements that are commonly exist such as,

> Recently, there has been wide interest in …
> The explication of the relationship between ….is a classic problem of …Knowledge of … has a great importance for …
> The study of … has become an important aspect of …
> The effect of … has been studied extensively in recent years.
> Many investigators have recently turned to …
> The relationship between…has been studied by any authors

Those statements above include the centrality claims of the authors about the study proposed, whether the claims is interesting, central, important, etc.

Moreover, some claims of reviewing items of the previous research are also stated. However, in the updated version 2004, those claims however, are reduced to be move 1. Move 1shows how authors perceive the research as important, central, interesting, problematic and relevant to discuss. Moreover, reviewing the previous researches is seen as an obligatory and important point to state in move 1 either in earlier or the latest version (Swales, 2004:230). Swales (1990, 148-153) claimed that citations determine what has been done and they point out to what has not been done, thus writers/researchers prepare a space for new research.

Move 2 Establishing a Niche

Move 2 however, is presumed to be linked with indicating a gap of the previous research and extending previous knowledge. In updated version, however, the step such as extending the previous research is categorized as continuing the tradition in the prior model. According to Swales (1990:144), in establishing a niche, a step *question raising* in the previous model of CARS is not considered contributes to establishing a niche but reviewing the previous research is counted to be worthwhile in establishing move 2. Move 2 primarily assists the developing of move 3 *occupying the niche which* generally links to present research. In this

part authors or writers fill the gap of the previous studies and expand the knowledge of those studies to establish the significant of idea that they want to discuss. Positively, move 2 becomes a path for the present research to be ensued but contrast the previous research (Golebiowski, 1999:235). In addition, Swales and Feak (1994) argue that most occurrences of Move 2 in research articles set up a space by indicating a gap, by showing that the research story so far is not yet complete, thus making Move 2 a particular kind of critique (p. 186).

As CARS model investigates the connection between the organizations of moves in text by also identifying linguistic feature of text, Swales (1990: 154) revealed some signals for move 2, those are as follows:

> *However*, the previously mentioned methods *suffer from some* limitations …
> The first group …*cannot* treat … and is *limited to* …
> The second group … is *time consuming* and *therefore expensive*, and its… is *not sufficiently accurate*.
> Both *suffer from the dependency on* …

Those statements above are mostly signaled by contrastive conjunctions which are signaling the step of indicating a gap between the present and the previous research.

Move 3 Occupying the Niche/Presenting the Present work

Furthermore, move 3 as the last move in CARS is initiated by outlining purpose and stating the nature of the present research which is indicated as step 1.This step of move 3 moreover, always exists in every examined RAI (Golebioswki, 1999:235-236). In some disciplines of knowledge, some other points such as listing the research question and hypothesis, announcing the research findings, stating the value of present research and structuring the research paper might be presented. It depends on and optional for certain disciplines of knowledge.

Some typical signals of Move 3 in introduction of RA can be culled as follows:

> *This* paper reports on the results obtained …
> The aim of *the present* paper is to give …
> In *this* paper *we* give preliminary results of …
> The main purpose of the experiment reported *here* was to …
> *This* study was designed to evaluate …
> The *present* work extends the use the last model...
> We *now* report the interaction of … (Swales, 1990: 160).

In updated version of CARS model, some extensions of move 3 are clearly seen in some optional steps that can be present in some disciplines of knowledge or fields. Step 2, 3, 4 and 6 of move 3 —*listing research question and hypothesis*, *definitional clarifications, summarizing methods*, and *stating the value of present research* —are those optional steps.

The following analysis is conducted toward some article introductions written in English, which are taken from international journal. The analysis was done by underlining each sentence differently to mark each move and step. Move 1 is underlined once, move 2 is underlined twice and move 3 is underlined bold.

Mobile apps for science learning: Review of research

Janet Mannheimer Zydney*, Zachary Warner
School of Education, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH 45221, United States

Introduction

Mobile devices are becoming increasingly popular and connected with our daily lives. Each new version of these devices brings innovative features that make them more convenient and affordable and new apps continually become available that make our lives easier. These advances have prompted educators and researchers to utilize these devices to promote teaching and learning. There is great potential in using mobile devices to transform how we learn by changing the traditional classroom to one that is more interactive and engaging (Shen, Wang, & Pan, 2008). It allows educators to teach without being restricted by time and place, enabling learning to continue after class is over or outside the classroom in places where learning occurs naturally (Huang, Lin, & Cheng, 2010). It also gives educators the ability to connect with learners on a more personal level with devices that they use on a regular basis (Ward, Finley, Keil, & Clay, 2013). Finally, sensing technologies enable learning to be personalized and customized to the individual learner (Chu, Hwang, Tsai, & Tseng, 2010).

Given the prevalence of mobile devices in education, research on mobile learning is rapidly increasing (Hung & Zhang, 2012; Hwang & Tsai, 2011; Wu et al., 2012) and thus has been reviewed in several studies (Cheung & Hew, 2009; Hung &Zhang, 2012; Hwang & Tsai, 2011; Hwang & Wu, 2014; Wu et al., 2012). Some reviews focused on specific aspects of mobile learning, such as mobile learning games (Avouris & Yiannoutsou, 2012; Schmitz, Klemke, & Specht, 2012), mobile computer supported collaborative learning (Hsu & Ching, 2013), or mobile apps (Jeng, Wu, Huang, Tan, & Yang, 2010). Trends in the literature have also been reported across multiple reviews. For example, reviews have shown that mobile learning is highly motivating for students (Hsu & Ching, 2013; Hwang &Wu, 2014; Schmitz et al., 2012). On the other hand, some of the findings from these past reviews have been contradictory. For example, reviews reported mixed findings on the effect of mobile environments on learning outcomes.

Hwang and Wu (2014) did a review on mobile learning studies spanning 2008e2012 from select journals and found that 83% of the studies that measured learning achievements reported positive outcomes. Similarly, Hsu and Ching (2013) reviewed studies on mobile computer-supported collaborative learning from 2004 to 2011 and reported that six of the nine studies found positive improvements in students' understanding and application of concepts. In contrast to these positive findings, Schmitz et al. (2012) reviewed studies on mobile games from 2001 to 2011 and found that there was not sufficient evidence on whether mobile games improved learning outcomes. Similarly, Cheung and Hew (2009) reviewed studies on mobile devices from 2000 to 2008 and found no significant differences in students' test scores for studies that compared mobile devices to equivalent paper-and-pencil treatments. They also reported that claims of enhanced learning were often not experimentally tested. (M1)

Although there have been several valuable syntheses of previous studies on mobile learning, there are areas that require further examination. For example, there is strong potential for using mobile learning in the area of science education due to a number of aspects that make it unique and well suited to the affordances of mobile technology. Much of science takes place outside of the classroom and is arguably better studied in its natural environment, while other science content is impossible to see with the naked eye and requires graphical visualizations for students to be able to fully understand it. In addition, scientific system models cannot be completely comprehended without an immersive experience that demonstrates how the variables interact. These distinct aspects of science learning are well aligned with the mobility of newer devices as well as their ability to display interactive, three-dimensional graphics and simulations. However, there have been no reviews of research conducted to date on mobile learning in science.

Furthermore, only a few studies reviewed the attributes or design patterns/features of mobile apps (Avouris & Yiannoutsou, 2012; Jeng et al., 2010; Schmitz et al., 2012), and two of these studies were focused specifically on games. Also, none of the studies on mobile learning thoroughly examined the specific theoretical foundations underlying the mobile learning research, although one review by Cheung and Hew (2009) noted that much of the research was not theoretically grounded. Given the mixed results on the effectiveness of mobile environments on learning outcomes, the potential of mobile learning in science education, and the absence of reviews focusing on design features and theoretical foundations of mobile applications, a review is needed to further examine the design and effectiveness of mobile applications being integrated into science education. (M2S1A)

Based on the areas that need further examination, the purpose of this reviewof research is to provide an

updated review of studies on mobile apps, specifically in the area of science learning. The analysis framework used to guide the review was the concept of grounded learning systems design, "a process that involves linking the practices of learning system design with related theory and research" (Hannafin, Hannafin, Land, & Oliver,1997, p.101). This framework provided a lens through which to examine the literature for the connections made between the theoretical foundations, its corresponding design principles and features, and the validated research outcomes (Hannafin et al., 1997).(M3S1) To apply this framework, the review examined the literature for its alignment of the mobile app's design features, the underlying theoretical foundations, and the resulting outcomes related to science learning, as well as discussed their interrelationship with one another. ((M3S4) This framework formed the basis for the research questions for this review, which are as follows:
1. What is common to the mobile app design used in science mobile app studies including:
a) the general app characteristics?
b) the specific design features?
2. What are the theoretical foundations common to mobile app studies in science?
3. What are the measured outcomes related to science learning associated with mobile app studies in science? (M3S2)

As seen from the above analysis, move 1 scattered from paragraphs one and two. Move 1 on this article is rich with quotes from other researchers. And this is in accordance with the format on the Swales model that move 1 must have citation. In the two paragraphs there is no insertion of move 2 or 3. Move 2 is contained in paragraphs three and four which is indicated by step indicating gap (Although there have been several ....)

The last paragraph is a move 3 consisting of several types of steps. The first is move 3 step 1 where the authors announce the purpose of the research, then there are also move 3 and step 4 that is where the author summarizes the research method and the introduction of this article closed with move 3 step 2 that describes the research question which is the step of choice. In accordance with the Swales format, this article's introduction is systematically composed of M1-M2S1A-M3S1-M3S4-M3S2.

Errors in the written English of native users of sign language:
An exploratory case study of Hong Kong deaf students

Philip Thierfelder[a], Paul Stapleton[b], *
[a]Centre for Sign Linguistics and Deaf Studies,
The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong
[b]Department of English Language Education, Hong Kong Institute of Education, 10 Lo Ping Rd., Taipo, Hong Kong

Introduction

[1]Instruction in many classrooms, particularly in contexts where traditional approaches predominate, tends to be based on an oral delivery by a teacher that is received and largely understood by an audience of students. However, students who are deaf do not have full access to instruction provided orally due to their hearing loss, and this, along with other influencing linguistic factors, can have a significant impact on their progress in school.[2] Studies show that a disproportionate number of deaf students struggle academically compared to their hearing counterparts (Fagan, Pisoni, Horn, & Dillon, 2007; Kyle & Harris, 2006; Paul, 2003; Traxler, 2000), especially in school subjects related to language development.[3] In one study, Traxler (2000) found that deaf people remain around six grade levels behind their hearing peers in terms of reading comprehension.[4] Deaf students in Hong Kong, the context for the present study, are no exception to this worldwide situation; a survey conducted by the Hong Kong Society for the Deaf revealed that deaf and hard of hearing elementary school students have a relatively low level of academic achievement (Hong Kong Society for the Deaf, 2009).[5] Furthermore, government reports have shown that only 3.8% of deaf and hard of hearing people hold post-secondary degrees (Census and Statistics Department, 2014) compared to 22% of the general population (Census and Statistics Department, 2015).[6] However, while deaf students in English-speaking

countries are typically only required to learn to read and write English, those in Hong Kong must learn both written Chinese and English in order to gain access to higher education.[7] This poses an additional challenge for them.[8](M1)Presently, relatively little is known about the linguistic challenges these students face in acquiring literacy in their second written language, English, which is essentially their third language after Hong Kong Sign Language (HKSL) and written Chinese.[9] (M2S1A) In the present study, via an exploratory analysis of the written English of five deaf adults in Hong Kong, patterns of errors are investigated in an effort to build a better picture of what specific difficulties they face in learning to write a foreign language.[10] (M3S1)

As can be seen in the introduction to this article, move 1 is in the first sentence to the eighth sentence. Citation is also present in move 1. Next move 2 that is marked by step indicating a gap, there is in the sentence to the Nine, and the last is move 3 which consists only of step 1 contained in the last sentence; 10. Introduction This article is presented in a systematic manner preceded by M1-M2S1A-M3S1.

Developing reading comprehension: Combining visual and verbal cognitive processes

Gary Woolley
Griffith University

Introduction

The *simple view of reading* (Gough & Tunmer, 1986) provides a model to conceptualise reading comprehension as the product of two dimensions: listening comprehension and word decoding processes (Kirby & Savage, 2008). The model makes it clear that children may differ in respect to the two dimensions and, therefore, require different teaching approaches to support their reading development. For example, a number of researchers have identified the existence of children with poor decoding but with good listening comprehension and children who have good decoding skills but poor listening comprehension (e.g. Catts, Hogan, & Fey, 2003; Snowling & Firth, 1997). Poor decoders have difficulty comprehending because they often spend time and conscious effort decoding individual letters and words, where the meaning is less evident, rather than clustering words into larger meaningful wholes (Idol, 1988; Kendeou, Savage, & Van den Broek, 2009; Robinson, 2001). (M1) Thus, word decoding is necessary but not sufficient for reading comprehension and should be complemented by the development of language comprehension skills (Fielding-Barnsley, Hay, & Ashman, 2005; Woolley, 2006). Conversely, children with good decoding skills and poor listening comprehension have language difficulties that inhibit reading comprehension and are often inappropriately placed in phonic instructional programs (Kendeou et al., 2009). (M21B)

This article focuses on children with good decoding skills but with poor listening comprehension. It will discuss how elaborated mental models of narrative text promote reader comprehension. It is proposed that the efficiency of mental modeling is largely determined by the architecture of working memory and how attentional resources are allocated. It is asserted that the allocation of cognitive resources within working memory can be improved with the incorporation of visual and verbal comprehension strategies. This enables the inferential linking of information and the formation of more elaborated and coherent mental models of story content leading to improved reading comprehension. Furthermore, the article will show how the routine incorporation of multiple comprehension strategies, using a metacognitive framework, can increase students' self-regulation and reading engagement. In doing so, it will address Pressley's (2002) concern that there is a need to develop more multiple-strategy intervention programs that are rich in individual instructional components without simply having them thrown into the mix and made overwhelmingly too complex for teachers to implement. (M3S1)

In the introduction to the following article, the Move1 move consists of Move1 accompanied by the citation used, followed by the present of move 2, but the authors do not expose the gap of the previous research to be answered in his research. The author only adds information to what has been described in move 1, ie step 1B, and the last is where the author describes his current research and the purpose of the research is in Move 3.

DISCUSSION

Based on three article introductions analyzed, it is found that, those three article introduction follow the format of Swales CARS Model. Those article introductions are clearly seen to have three segmented parts. Where move 1 is clearly seen in the first part, the author builds the topic of the research. And the second part, which is move 2, where the author fills the gap of the previous studies conducted, is also clearly stated in the next part of the introduction. The last part of the instruction is move 3, where this part is stated in the last of the introduction, where it carries the author announcement of the present work and purpose of the current study.

From the analysis, all of articles demonstrate the typical of native speaker writing, where putting the significant of the current study should consume the attention of the publisher. It is because the western discourse community full of competition. Only the significant and worthwhile article is accepted.

Overall, CARS model has a very clear move which is easy to follow. In addition, the application of Swalesian style shows the framework of English native writing style which is worthwhile to be followed if an introduction of academic paper is needed to be presented as native writing style. Beside, this model is useful for EFL or ESL who study in English discourse community.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

This study was set out to explore the Swales model or CARS in writing the introduction of research article. It encompassed the format of the Swales model, the procedure of how that format applied in writing a research article introduction, and the analysis of English research article introductions.

The study portrayed how a research article introduction is actually written. Thus, the procedure of how Swales model employed is describe clearly accompanied by the analysis of three English article introductions. Subsequently, after the analysis conducted, it was found that three English article introductions followed the order of Swales model moves.

It is suggested that this study could give solution for the writers especially university students who are starting writing article papers, and this study can also be a guideline for the academic writing class in learning academic writing in English.

REFERENCES

Askehave, I. & Swale, J. (2001). Genre identification and communication purpose: A problem and possible solution. *Applied Linguistic*, *22*(2), 195-212.

Broines, R. R. Y. (2012). Move analysis of philosophy research article introductions published in the University of Santo Tomas. *Philippine ESL Journal*, *9*, 56-75.

Golebiowski, Z. (1999). Application of Swale' model in the analysis of research papers by polish authors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*. *37*(3), 231-247.

Jogthong, C. (2001). Research Article Introductions in Thai: Genre Analysis of Academic Writing. Unpublished Phd thesis. West Virginia University.

McTaggart, R. (1996). Appraising reports of enquiry. In D. Caulley. H. Moore.& J. anon, *Social Science*

Methodology for Educational Inquiry: A Conceptual Overview. (pp. 1-13). Beijing Teachers College Press. Beijing.

Safnil, S. (2013). A Genre-Based Analysis on the Introductions of Research Articles Written by Indonesian Academics. *TEFLIN Journal*, *24*(2). 180-200.

Samraj, B. (2002). Introductions in research articles: Variations across disciplines. *English for Specific Purposes*, *21*, 1-17.

Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings*. New York: Cambridge University.

Swales, J. M. (2004) *Research genres: Explorations and applications*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Swales, J. M. & Feak, C. B. (1994). *Academic writing for graduate students: Essential tasks and skills*. Michigan: The Michigan University Press.

Thierfelder, P., & Stapleton, P. (2016). Errors in the written English of native users of sign language : An exploratory case study of Hong Kong deaf students. *System*, *58*, 12–24. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2016.03.001

Woolley, G. (2010). Developing reading comprehension: combining visual and verbal cognitive processes. *Australian Journal of Literacy*, *33*(2), 108-125.

Zydney, J. M., & Warner, Z. (2016). Computers & Education Mobile apps for science learning : Review of research. *Computers & Education*, *94*, 1–17. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2015.11.001