ISSN 1648-2824 KALBŲ STUDIJOS. 2003. 4 NR. * STUDIES ABOUT LANGUAGES. 2003. NO. 4

TAIKOMOJI KALBOTYRA/APPLIED LINGUISTICS

Textual Organisation of RP Introductions in *Kalbotyra*: a Contrastive Study

Ieva Stasiūnaitė, Inesa Šeškauskienė

Abstract. The paper analyses the textual organisation of linguistic research paper (RP) introductions produced by non-native speakers of English and published in the journal *Kalbotyra* in two periods — 1970s and 1990s. The analysis is based on the well-established CARS (Create a Research Space) model elaborated by John Swales. There are two parameters taken into consideration — representation and arrangement of moves and steps, structural parts of a RP introduction. The least representative in both periods turned out to be Move 2, or establishing a niche. In terms of steps, the most frequent step in both periods seems to be announcing present research. 1970s seem to have given preference to the steps other than gap filling or reviewing previous research their frequency is much higher in the 1990s. The feature is concerned with a different understanding of academic discourse community, access to Western writing traditions influence of Russian schools and requirements of the journal.

Introduction

The English rhetoric has recently shown particular interest in research paper (RP, or RA – research article) writing and analysing its structural and linguistic peculiarities. This can be obviously attested by a number of books and articles written by acknowledged specialists in the field (Swales and Feak, 2000, Swales, 1990, Bhatia, 1993, Swales and Feak, 1994). Swales (1990) seems to have established his line of research, generally known as "genre analysis". His IMRAD (introduction, methods, results and discussion) model has been widely recognised and used as a basis for writing RPs in different fields of research. His books (Swales, 1990, Swales and Feak, 2000) seem to have instigated contrastive studies between closer or more distant cultures, like English and Chinese, English and Japanese, English and Finnish etc. (see Connor, 1996, Mauranen, 1993) and between different fields of study/disciplines (see Swales and Feak, 2000). The interest and need for such type of study is obviously due to the marked influence of the writer's general (national) culture and language upon established RP writing conventions. Whether these conventions are acquired by imitating somebody's authoritative paper, or perhaps some other way, is an open question. Nowadays, with IT operating wide and fast, RP writing conventions are genre-specific, which accounts for the fact that writing conventions become well-known and very often working across culture boundaries.

The present paper focuses on the analysis of linguistic RP introductions, the key function of which is to justify the topic (see Mauranen, 1993: 36); to persuade the readers to read the text and accept the topic of the study. Hence the relevance of the introductory section and the analytic study of introductions, particularly those written by non-native speakers of English. The influence of the target language, on the one hand, and that of the background culture of the writer, on the other hand, can hardly be questioned. The writing conventions, therefore, vary from language/culture to language/culture.

In Lithuania, the RP rhetoric is a fairly new issue. A consistent study of writing matters in Lithuania started about ten years ago. Some university syllabi have also had the issue included. In this context, the Department of English Philology of Vilnius University has had some experience in teaching and study of RP writing peculiarities. More general issues in the area have been covered by Katkuvienė (2003), whereas a number of papers produced by students focus on rather specific RP writing issues (see Čeredničenko, 2001, Kaulinytė, 2001). However, Katkuvienė (ibid.) focuses on general implications of writing as a cross-cultural activity rather than specific issues of research paper writing.

Therefore, the present paper humbly seeks how to continue the tradition. The study is limited to the analysis of structural organisation of RP articles in terms of moves and steps (CARS model below). The articles were published in the linguistic journal Kalbotyra in two periods – 1970s and 1990s. So the contrastive study is aimed at two focal issues — first, comparing Swales' model to the RP introductions produced by Lithuanian linguists in Kalbotyra in general, and second, establishing the similarities and differences of the articles produced in two periods — 1970s and 1990s. Before starting to discuss the results of the original papers, the framework of analysis, or CARS model, is presented.

CARS Model

The genre framework for the analysis of written texts has been extensively used for teaching or research purposes (Ashkehave & Swales, 2001, Flowerdew, 2000). The CARS model is one of the acknowledged patterns

implemented in the study of RP introductions. Here its brief overview is given.

CARS, or Create a Research Space, model in the English writing tradition is a widely acknowledged structural pattern of a RP introduction. According to Swales (1990: 141) and Swales and Feak (1994: 175), it consists of the following parts:

Move 1 *Establishing a research territory*

Step 1 Claiming centrality – CL.C (optional)[1]
Step 2 Making topic generalisations—TG (optional)
Step 3 Reviewing items of previous research—PR.R (obligatory)

Move 2 *Establishing a niche*

Step 1A Counter-claiming—CC
or
Step 1B Indicating a gap—GAP
or
Step 1C Question raising—QR
or
Step 1D Continuing a tradition—CT
(it is obligatory to choose one of the four)

Move 3 *Occupying the niche*

Step 1A Outlining purposes
or
Step 1B Announcing present research—APR
(one of the two—1A or 1B—is obligatory)
Step 2 Announcing principal findings (or results, RES)
Step 3 Indicating the RP structure (STR)

The wide recognition given to the model could be well motivated by social needs — a need to establish in the eyes of the discourse community the relevance of the research (Move 1), a need to relate the actual research in terms of that significance (Move 2) and a need to show how the niche will be occupied and supported (Move 3). Out of the three steps in Move 1, the first step is obviously most appealing to the readership by claiming that there are many investigators active in the area, whereas the other two are more general and pertain to the current state of knowledge. However, the third move seems to be the weightiest and therefore, obligatory for those who are studying how to write RPs (Swales & Feak, 1994: 175).

Move 2 establishes the author's motivation and the rationale for the paper, even though, according to Swales (1990: 158), in the sequence of moves it does not necessarily follow the literature review.

Move 3 has several varieties: purposive, where the author indicates his/her main purposes, or descriptive, where he/she describes the features of his/her research (Swales & Feak, 1994: 190). In general, RP introductions could be regarded as "encapsulated problem-solution texts" (Swales, 1990: 138).

[1] The explanations given in round brackets about whether the step is optional or obligatory, in our opinion, highlight the relevance of the step and thus, serve as pedagogical implications.

Materials and Methods

The corpus material of the present study consists of 28 randomly selected introductions of RPs written in English by non-native speakers and published in the linguistic journal Kalbotyra in two periods – 1970s and 1990s. The prevailing majority of the authors are Lithuanian (non-native) speakers of English (NNS). All the papers pertain to the domain of Romance and Germanic linguistics. The list of the RPs under investigation is given after the whole body of the article text and the bibliography.

There are two points to be discussed in this context: first, several RPs were contributed to the target journal by the same authors. Second, though written in English, the texts seem to be heavily influenced by their native culture and language, mainly Lithuanian. So the analysis is based on the investigation of RP introductions written in the 1970s and those contributed in the 1990s. Afterwards some contrastive peculiarities are singled out as to the similarities and differences of both periods and possible reasons for the established tendencies.

The framework of investigation has two main parts: firstly, structural models/patterns established in terms of the presence/absence of moves/steps and second, their arrangement is analysed. Afterwards statistical calculations are made and an interpretation of the results offered.

Structural Models: Results and Discussion

1970s

In this section, the structural patterns of RPs produced by NNS of English are established and major tendencies of the period outlined. So, there have been 4 major structural types (see Table 1) identified in the total corpus of 14 introductions:

Table 1. Structural Types of RP Introductions in 1970s

Types	1	2	3	4
Moves* / Samples	1, 2, 3	1, 3	1	-
No	3	9	1	1
%	21.4	64.4	7.1	7.1

*Moves 1, 2, 3 correspond to the ones enumerated in Swales' CARS model (see section 2)

The figures show that the majority of the authors (64.4%) tend to skip Move 2, or establishing a niche (type 2 in Table 1), which is unusual, since this is one of the key steps in creating a research space and thus preparing for one's own investigation. Moreover, if compared to the established pattern of RP introductions containing all three moves (type 1 in Table 1), articles of type 2, which opt for establishing a territory and occupying it without establishing a proper niche for their own research, outnumber the first pattern thrice.

Interestingly, one article unfolds without any introduction at all, and the author sets out to give the methodology part instead (Introduction 8).

Table 1 gives only a general view of the sequence of moves within each type; actual situation, however, is far from being uniform. Thus, for example, introductions of type 1 cover the following varieties: Moves 1+2+3 (Article 10), Moves 1+2+1+3 (Article 14) and Moves 1+2+3+2+3 (Article 9). In type 2 there are, apart from the pattern given in the table (Moves 1+3), the following varieties: Moves 1+3+1 (Article 5), Moves 3+1 (Article 13) or even Move 1+3+1+M[2] (Article 2). The above patterns illustrate an inclination of the authors to claim centrality or indicate a niche, or occupy the niche more than once.

The other parameter of this research is concerned with the arrangement of moves and its conformity to the arrangement established by Swales (1990). Below is given Table 2, which illustrates a relationship between the representation (R) and the arrangement (A) of moves in the introductions under investigation. +R indicates that the articles manifest the presence and -R – the absence of the representation parameter; +A – conformity with, -A – lack of congruence with the sequence of the CARS model. The analysis of the data verified against the two parameters produced the following 4 varieties:

+R +A (conforms to the CARS model)

+R -A (the pattern contains all the moves, but their arrangement fails to conform to the established model)

-R +A (not all moves are represented, but those that are represented manifest an arrangement in accordance with the established model)

-R -A (neither of the two parameters is followed).

Table 2. Textual Patterns of RP Introductions of 1970s

Structure / Samples	CARS model	Modified versions		
	+R +A	+R -A	-R +A	-R -A
No	1	2	5	5
%	7.1	14.3	35.7	35.7

Interestingly, the figures manifest a tendency to use other than the CARS model; only 1 introduction out of 14 ideally followed the established pattern.

The introductions, which contain all structural parts, but arranged in other than the established sequence, are also very few (see +R ,-A in Table 2). Major patterns established in the collected corpus of introductions are those which either lack a move or two, but the remaining are arranged according to the established model, or fail to conform to either of the two parameters: representation and arrangement. Within the most numerously represented modified versions as provided in the last two columns of Table 2 (-R +A and -R -A) there have been several patterns of step sequence established.

The modified version -R +A, which pertains to the RPs containing only some of the moves suggested by Swales, which follow the established sequence and make up 35.7%, are exemplified by Introductions 1, 3, 4, 6 and 7.

Introduction 1:
TG, APR in TG[3], RES

Introduction 3, 7:
TG, APR, RES

Introduction 4:
TG, APR in TG

Introduction 6:
TG, APR

Introductions of this version, first of all, manifest uniformity in the recurrence of the sequence TG+APR+RES and second, all of them are devoid of steps within Move 2. In other words, they manifest a tendency to skip a step indicating a niche in a broader context of research: after a general introduction major aims of the study are formulated.

The third modified version -R, -A (35.7%) is exemplified by introductions 2, 5, 11, 12, 13. Introduction 12, apart from manifesting a number of steps, which might recur more than once, has two discernible parts: general and specific. In respect to these, it is represented by the following sequence of steps:

Introduction 12:
General (CL.C, TG intermingled with PR.R)
Specific (CL.C, TG, APR embedded in TG)

Cf. the sequence of moves in the other introductions:

Introduction 2:
CL.C, TG, APR, TG, M, APR, STR

Introduction 5:
CL.C, TG, APR in TG, TG

Introduction 11:
TG, CL.C, TG+PR.R

Introduction 13:
APR, TG

One of the key features of the above introductions is the absence of steps of Move 2, or establishing a niche. The lack of convergence with Swales' model is also manifest in the recurrence of its structural units and differences in their arrangement.

To produce more conclusive results of the period (1970s), the following two tables could be suggested: Table 3 gives a detailed account of steps as represented in the 14 introductions, Table 4 sums up the same information in terms of their occurrence (numerical figures and percentage). Tables 3 and 4 reflect some interesting tendencies. In the 1970s Lithuanian linguists writing in English seem to favour topic generalisations (86% of all introductions) and announcing the present research (86%) rather than reviewing items of previous research (14%), indicating a gap (21%), indicating principal findings (21%) or indicating the RP structure (21%).

[2] M stands for Methodology, which usually is given as a separate section (see Swales & Feak, 1994: 155-167).

[3] In this case, the step of announcing present research (APR) is embedded into making topic generalisations (TG).

Table 3. Representation of Steps in RP Introductions in the 1970s

Samples / CARS model		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Move 1	CL.C		+			+				+		+	+		+
	TG	+	+	+	+	+	+	+			+	+	+	+	+
	PR.R											+	+		
Move 2	CC														
	GAP									+	+				+
	RO														
	CT														
Move 3	APR	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+	+		+	+	+
	RES	+		+				+							
	STR		+							+	+				

8 Research paper No 8 does not have an introduction at all

Table 4. Steps in RP Introductions in the 1970s

CARS model / Samples	Move 1			Move 2				Move 3		
	CL.	TG	PR.	CC	GA	RQ	CT	APR	RES	STR
No	6	12	2		3			12	3	3
%	43	86	14		21			86	21	21

How should these figures be interpreted? Tentatively, the low figures for PR.R and GAP might imply that the authors do not fully identify themselves as members of the academic community and undertake the task of writing their research papers as individuals. Very low figures for STR (indicating the RP structure) refute the widely accepted view that in the majority of cases linguists indicate the structure of their RPs, whereas researchers of exact and natural sciences focus on announcing principal findings in their RP introductions (see, for example, Swales and Feak, 1994: 193-4). On the other hand, the requirements of the journal in the 1970s might have been quite rigorous.

1990s

This section focuses on the other half of the corpus – 14 RPs written in English by NNS and published in the linguistic journal Kalbotyra in the 1990s.

Below is given Table 5, which illustrates the patterns of rhetorical structuring in the above corpus of data against the model suggested by Swales as outlined in Section 2.

Table 5. Structural Types of RP Introductions in the 1990s

Types	**1**	**2**	**3**
Moves / Samples	1, 2, 3	1, 3	1
No	6	7	1
%	43	50	7

The most frequent pattern of structuring the RP introduction (Type 2) clearly lacks Move 2, or, in other words, does not have a clearly defined niche-establishing move. If compared to the RP introduction patterns in the 1970s, the 1990s do not attest gross deviations. However, the structural types of the RPs of the 1990s manifest a fairly even distribution between the fully developed model (Moves 1, 2, 3: establishing a territory, establishing a niche and occupying the niche) and the one lacking the establishing-a-niche move (Type 2, Tables 1 and 5).

To further clarify the diversity within Types 1, 2 and 3 in Table 5, there have been several subtypes established. Within Type 1, there are the following varieties: Moves 3+2+1+M[4] (Article 6), Moves 3+2+1 (Article 11), Moves 2+1+3 (Articles 9 and 10) and Moves 1+2+3+1+3 (Article 14). Within Type 2, there is also a tendency to keep to the following sequence: occupying the niche, then establishing a territory and then again going back to occupying the niche: Moves 1+3 (Articles 1, 3, 5, 7, 12), Moves 1+3+1+3 (Article 13) and Moves 3+1+3 (Article 2). Since Type 3 is meagerly represented (just 1 introduction), it is hardly worth discussing it at all. The results have shown that Moves 1+3 and Moves 2+1+3 seem to be the most frequent.

In terms of arrangement and representation of moves, the 1990s do not seem to manifest gross deviations from patterns in the 1970s, as seen from Table 6 below.

Table 6. Textual Patterns in English RP Introductions in the 1990s

Structure / Samples	CARS model	Modified versions		
	+R +A	+R -A	-R +A	-R -A
No	1	5	5	5
%	7	36	21	36

R – representation of moves (either + presence or – absence)

A – arrangement of moves (either + conforming to the established model or – deviating from it)

[4] M stands for the section of Methodology

In the 1990s, the modified version -R -A manifests almost the same frequency as in the 1970s (cf. 35.7% in Table 2). However, the version +R -A shows a clear increase (from 14.3% in the 1970s to 36% in the 1990s). Absolute conformity to the established model (+R +A), similarly to the tendencies in the 1970s, is very low (7.1% and 7%, respectively).

In terms of steps, the corpus of the selected data seems to manifest several combinations. Within the CARS model +R +A, there have been the following varieties established: 1. TG, 2. PR.R, 3. APR in GAP (Introduction 4). The modified version +R -A structurally unfolds as follows:

Introduction 6:
1. APR, 2. GAP,
3. PR.R, (4) M

Introduction 9:
1. GAP, 2. C.CL,
3. TG+PR.R, 4. APR

Introduction 10:
1. GAP +PR.P,
2. TG+PR.R, 3. APR

Introduction 11:
1. APR+GAP,
2. TG+PR.R, 3. C.CL,
4. TG+PR.R

Introduction 14:
1. TG, 2. PR.R,
3. GAP, 4. APR,
5. PR.R, 6. APR.

What calls our attention in the above results is that all introductions manifest a variety of steps and numerous combinations with one another within a single move.

In Type 3 in Table 6 (-R+A) there have been the following varieties established:

Introduction 1: 1. C. CL, 2. TG + PR.R, 3. APR in TG
Introduction 7: 1. TG+PR.R, 2. APR in TG
Introduction 8: 1. TG, 2. PR.R

The above three introductions have one common feature – they all lack steps of Move 2 (establishing a niche). Introduction 8 has neither Move 2 nor Move 3. The remaining steps, however, accord with Swales' model. The most frequent steps are those in which the authors announce their research or give topic generalisations.

Quite a large number of RP introductions of the 1990s do not conform to the established model (-R -A) and can be formally described in the following way:

Introduction 2: APR, TG + PR.R, APR
Introduction 3: PR.R + C.CL, TG, PR.R, APR
Introduction 5: TG + PR.R, CL.C, TG + PR.R, APR
Introduction 12: CL.C + PR.R, PR.R + TG, APR
Introduction 13: TG + PR.R, APR, TG + PR.R, APR.

None of the above varieties have Move 2. If compared to the 1970s, there are just a few non-systematic similarities, e.g. the interruption of APR by other structural parts (Introduction 2 in the 1990s and Introduction 2 in the 1970s). Second, merging TG and PR.R is also characteristic of the -R -A type of the data of the 1970s. Still another tendency is a slight increase of +R -A type (from 14.3% to 36%), which shows that people, even though slowly, tend to accept the widely acknowledged CARS structural model (see section 2 of this paper).

Thus the data of 1990s display a great deal of variability, which could hardly be explained by other than individual rhetorical predispositions. To further clarify the situation in the 1990s, let us refer to Tables 7 and 8 below.

Table 7. Representation of Steps in RP Introductions in the 1990s.

Samples / CARS model		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Move 1	CL.C	+		+		+				+		+	+		
	TG	+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
	PR.R	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Move 2	CC														
	GAP				+		+			+	+	+			+
	RO														
	CT														
Move 3	APR	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	+	+	+
	RES														
	STR														

Interestingly, Move 2 (establishing a niche) is very scarcely represented in the introductions of the period. Moreover, none of them indicate the structure of the RP. Almost all introductions tend to announce the present research. It should be noted that the introductions vary in length, which might have, to some extent, influenced the representation factor.

Table 8. Steps in RP Introductions of 1990s.

CARS model / *Samples*	**Move 1**			**Move 2**				**Move 3**		
	CL.C	TG	PR.R	CC	GAP	RQ	CT	APR	RES	STR
No	6	13	14		6			13		
%	43	93	100		43			93		

Move 1 (establishing a research territory), similarly to the findings of the 1970s, is most numerously represented. Within Move 2 the authors seem to favour the gap filling technique rather than counter claiming, raising a question or continuing a tradition. However, the general tendency to skip Move 2 as manifested in the 1970s has been preserved in the 1990s, too. The figures of the last period, as against

those in the 1970s, might imply that the authors of the 1990s regard themselves as members of the discourse community (especially considering the high frequency of referring to the previous knowledge and indicating gaps there).

To sum up the structural analysis of RP introductions of the 1990s, they are fairly heterogeneous. The prevailing structural type of the period is a combination of Moves 1 and 3. Move 2, however, seems to be favoured by more researchers in the field, if compared to the 1970s. As to the representation and sequence of steps, there is a natural tendency to favour reviewing previous research (PR.R in Move 1), and, interestingly, announcing the present research (APR) in Move 3. None of the introductions under study indicated the structure of the RPs.

Conclusions

A small-scale investigation of 28 RPs written in English by non-native speakers of English in different periods was carried out on the basis of the CARS model in terms of moves and steps as suggested by Swales (1990: 138). There were two parameters of investigation applied: representation of structural parts and their arrangement.

In both periods the most frequent patterns of moves were the following:

Moves 1, 3 (9 and 7)[5]
Moves 1, 2, 3 (3 and 6)

In terms of steps, smaller structural constituents, the analysis manifested a huge diversity of structural patterns. However, there were no regularities in their sequence established. The steps favoured in the 1970s were TG (making topic generalisations, 86%) in Move 1 and APR (announcing the present research, 86%) in Move 3. In the 1990s the most frequently employed steps were PR.R (reviewing previous research) and TG (100% and 97%, respectively) in Move 1 and, like in the 1970s, APR in Move 3. Another unique feature of the 1970s was that the authors tended to split the texts of their introductory sections into general and specific sections, which was not found in the 1990s. Low frequencies of PR.R and GAP in the 1970s (14% and 21%, respectively) suggest that the authors of the period did not try to identify themselves as members of the discourse community; however, in the 1990s the increase of PR.R and GAP (100% and 43%, respectively) illustrate quite the opposite tendency. Other reasons explaining the above tendencies might have been the intuitive, rather than acquired, model of the RP introduction. Many Lithuanian linguists of the time were disciples of Russian schools, and their RPs, including the structure and the layout, might have served as a model for their own papers. In the 1990s, with an easier access to the English sources, including those on the English rhetoric (and RP writing conventions), the need to motivate their research might have been influenced by the explicit Western models of writing, outlined, discussed and elaborated by such linguists as Swales (1990), Feak (see Swales and Feak, 1994 and 2000), Bhatia (1993) and others.

Among other factors influencing the way linguistic investigation is moulded might be stylistic expectations and requirements of the target journal and their individual interpretation by the authors.

Given the small-scale character of the study, the findings can only be regarded as preliminary and tentative. The same hypotheses could and should be verified on a larger amount of data. Lithuanian writing conventions in the area are no less interesting.

[5] In brackets, the first figure indicates the number of RP introductions of the type in the 1st period (1970s) and the second figure pertains to the number of RP introductions in the 2nd period (1990s).

Bibliography

1. Ashkehave, I. & Swales, J. (2001). Genre Identification and Communicative Purpose: A Problem and a Possible Solution. Applied Linguistics 22/2: 195-212.
2. Bhatia, V. K. (1993). Analysing Genre: Language Use in Professional Settings. London: Longman.
3. Connor, U. (1996). Contrastive Rhetoric: Cross-cultural Aspects of Second Language Writing. Cambridge: CUP.
4. Čeredničenko, I. (2001). Textual Organisation of Lithuanian Mathematical RP Introductions. Unpublished BA thesis. Vilnius: Department of English Philology, Vilnius University.
5. Flowerdew, L. (2000). Using a Genre-based Framework to Teach Organizational Structure in Academic Writing. ELT Journal 54/4: 369-378.
6. Katkuvienė, L. E. (2003). Writing Matters. Vilnius: Vilnius University Publishing House.
7. Kaulinytė, L. (2001). Structuring of Information in MSc Theses of Lithuanian Informatics Students. Unpublished BA thesis. Vilnius: Department of English Philology, University of Vilnius.
8. Mauranen, A. (1993). Cultural Differences in Academic Rhetoric: A Textlinguistic Study. Frankfurt am Main, Berlin, Bern, New York, Paris, Wien: Peter Lang.
9. Swales, J. (1990). Genre Analysis. CUP.
10. Swales, J. and Feak, Ch. (1994). Academic Writing for Graduate Students. Michigan: the University of Michigan Press.
11. Swales, J. and Feak, Ch. (2000). English in Today's Research World: a Writing Guide. Michigan: the University of Michigan Press.

List of RPs under Investigation:

Introductions of 1970s

1. Steponavičius, A. (1970). The English Vowel System in the Period of the Oldest Written Records (VIII-X cc.). Kalbotyra, XXII (3).
2. Kameneckaitė, V. (1972). Determining Factors of Semantic Relations between Verb+Postpositive Factors. Kalbotyra XXII (3).
3. Valeika, L. (1972). Some Functional Aspects of Noun Modifiers in Lithuanian and English. Kalbotyra XXIII(3).
4. Pažūsis, L. (1973). English Loanwords in American Lithuanian: Morphological Integration vs Morphological Non-integration. Kalbotyra XXIV (3).
5. Steponavičius, A. (1973). The Development of Old English Diphthongs. Kalbotyra XXIV (3).
6. Tekorienė, D. (1973). Contextual Means of Expressing Ingressive Action in Modern English. Kalbotyra XXIV (3).
7. Valeika, L. & Meškauskas, A. (1973). Nominalising Transformations of Predicate Nominal Constructions in Lithuanian and English. Kalbotyra XXV (3).

8. Valeika, L. (1973a). Semantic Structural Peculiarities of Possessive Constructions. Kalbotyra XXV (3).

9. Drazdauskienė, L. (1975). Content and Sociolinguistic Aspects of Phatic Speech (in English and Lithuanian). Kalbotyra XXVI (3).

10. Pavilionis, R. (1975). On the Global Conception of Meaning. Kalbotyra XXVI (3).

11. Valeika, L. (1975). Semantic Sentence-types in Lithuanian and English. Kalbotyra XXVI (3).

12. Drazdauskienė, L. (1977). Concerning the Scope and Aspects of Linguistic Stylistics. Kalbotyra XXVIII (3).

13. Geniušienė, E. (1977). Reflexivity in English and Lithuanian. Kalbotyra XXVIII (3).

14. Vitonytė-Genienė, I. (1978). Cohesive Elements of Text Interpretation in Character Drawing Paragraphs of J. B. Priestley's "Angel Pavement". Kalbotyra XXIX (3).

Introductions of 1990s

1. Pilka, A. (1990). On the Concept of Presupposition. Kalbotyra 41(3).

2. Asonkova, M. A. (1992). The Pronominal Variants of Negative syntaxemes in Modern English. Kalbotyra 43(3).

3. Drazdauskienė, M. L. (1994). Exploring the Shared in Language and the Mind. Kalbotyra 44 (3).

4. Drazdauskienė, M. L. (1994a). The Potential Meaning of Language and its Contents. Kalbotyra 44 (3).

5. Steponavičienė, S. (1994). The Size of Word Associative Structures in English and Lithuanian. Kalbotyra 44 (3).

6. Šeškauskienė, I. (1994). On One of the Meanings of about. Kalbotyra 44 (3).

7. Bražėnienė, N. (1997). The Stylistic Function of Word Order in English. Kalbotyra 45 (3).

8. Racevičiūtė, R. (1998). On Compositionality of Idioms. Kalbotyra 46 (3).

9. Steponavičienė, S. (1998). Size of Word Association Fields in Lithuanian and American English. Kalbotyra 46 (3).

10. Drazdauskienė, M. L. (1998). A Contribution of Stylistics to the Advanced Analysis of Poetry. Kalbotyra 47 (3).

11. Jasudavičiūtė, R. (1999). Adjectivization as a Derivational Pattern. Kalbotyra 48 (3).

12. Idzelis, R. V. (1998). The Interplay of Spontaneous ("Natural") and Deliberate ("Artificial") in the Study of International English. Kalbotyra 47 (3).

13. Verikaitė, D. (1998). Some Aspects of the Textual Function of the Article in the Text of Zoology. Kalbotyra 46 (3).

14. Mirbakaitė, I. (1999). The Influence of Some Cognitive Strategies on the Acquisition of Derivational Morphology. Kalbotyra 48 (3).

Ieva Stasiūnaitė, Inesa Šeškauskienė

Žurnalo *Kalbotyra* mokslo darbų įvadų teksto tvarka: gretinamoji studija

Santrauka

Šiuo straipsniu siekiama apibūdinti ir palyginti 28 įžangas iš lietuvių autorių angliškai parašytų mokslinių straipsnių. Straipsniai paimti iš *Kalbotyros* žurnalo numerių, spausdintų 1970-1979 ir 1990-1999 metais. Lyginama straipsnių įžangų teksto organizacija, nustatomi struktūriniai įžangų tipai pagal pripažintą J. Swales'o ir kitų šioje srityje dirbančių rašymo specialistų CARS modelį (CARS – *create a research space*). Tiriami du parametrai: skyrių (moves) ir poskyrių (steps) reprezentacija ir išdėstymas (seka). Ryškiausia abiejų dešimtmečių straipsnių įžangų rašymo tendencija yra ta, kad beveik visuose abiejų laikotarpių straipsniuose yra apibendrinamieji straipsnio pradžios teiginiai (move 1, step 2-topic generalisations) bei pateikiami straipsnyje aptariami tyrimo rezultatai (3 skyrius, 1B poskyris – announcing present research). Tačiau jei aštuntajame dešimtmetyje literatūros apžvalgai ir „nišos užpildymo" poskyriams (1 skyrius, 3 poskyris – reviewing items of previous research ir 2 skyrius 1 poskyris) skiriama santykinai nedaug dėmesio (14% ir 21% straipsnių), tai dešimtajame dešimtmetyje jų vartojimo dažnis gerokai išauga (atitinkamai iki 100% ir 43%). Pagrindinės tokių tendencijų priežastys, kaip manoma, yra šios: skirtinga akademinės bendruomenės samprata, Vakarų/Rusijos mokyklų rašymo tradicijų įtaka (bendrosios) ir žurnalo keliami reikalavimai ir individualus jų interpretavimas (specifinės).

Straipsnis įteiktas 2003 01
Parengtas spaudai 2003 06

The authors

Ieva Stasiūnaitė, MA student in English Linguistics at the Department of English Philology, Faculty of Philology, Vilnius University
Address: 5 Universiteto Street, LT-2734 Vilnius, Lithuania
E-mail: ieva.stasiunaite@flf.vu.lt

Inesa Šeškauskienė, Ph.D. in Humanities (Linguistics)
Institution: Department of English Philology, Faculty of Philology, University of Vilnius
Research interests: contrastive linguistics, lexical semantics, contrastive rhetoric and academic writing
Address: 5 Universiteto Street, LT-2734 Vilnius, Lithuania
E-mail: is@lra.lt