

THE APPLICATION OF FARS IN NATIVE SPEAKER OF ENGLISH AND EFL TEXTS

Imam Munandar

STAIN Gajah Putih Takengon, Indonesia
imameducator@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

The research shows that in term of frequency of segment relation, the NS's text shows the dominant use elaborative relation. On the other hand, EFL text predominantly employs List relation which is slightly higher from Causal relation which comes in the second place. The NS text also reveals lower degree of explicitness which is indicated by low occurrence of conjunction realized in unmarked way. Hypotaxis in the NS's text is almost equal in number as parataxis, and by comparison it has higher number of hypotactic relation compared with the EFL text. On the other hand, EFL text shows higher degree of explicitness, which is identified by higher number of conjunctions employment which is mostly realized in unmarked way. All of these features of text can be linked to the types of texts and linguistic and cultural background of the writers. The NS's text which predominantly uses elaborative relation can be linked to the writer-responsible theory. This is where the writers have responsibility to make their text become as comprehensible as possible. Elaborative relation is purposed to advance the flow of understanding of the text by readers by providing clarification and other relevant information. Higher number of hypotactic relations can be influenced by Aristotelian argumentation which encourages writers to argue their point of view. Low explicitness in NS's text reflects the higher English proficiency of the writers in making the text become coherent without heavily relying on conjunction. On the other hand, EFL text uses larger number of List and Causal relations which is expectedly found in an argumentative text. Its higher number of unmarked conjunction indicates the writer's heavy reliance on conjunction in making the text coherent. The lower degree of hypotactic relation is linked to politeness strategy and keeping harmony following the Confucianism tradition of writing. Consequently, paratactic relation is tended to be used to avoid aggressiveness in presenting a point of view.

Keywords: *FARS rhetoric; anglo-non anglo; writing convention; teaching writing; EFL*

INTRODUCTION

It is widely believed that a writer employs different text relations in achieving various communicative purposes. In attempting to identify these relations, there have been two models that have been purposed, which are known as Framework for the Analysis of the Relational Structure (FARS) and Rhetorical Structure Theory (RST). However, these models are not exclusively different. RST is the model on which FARS is based. It tries to define all relations between parts of the text. It recognizes thirteen relations (Mann et al., 1992). RST distinguishes two categories of relations: nucleus-satellite and multinuclear. Except for Sequence, Contrast and Joint relations, RST maintains that there always exist nucleus and satellite between two propositions. This is the central characteristics of RST model.

RST's claim on nucleus and satellite is challenged by FARS. Although it does not completely reject the pervasiveness of nucleus and satellite in the text, FARS suggests that nucleus and satellite cannot always present in the text. The model believes that there are 29 types of relation the writer use to make their text coherent and achieve the intended communicative goal. In text analysis, it considers taxis relation and the hierarchical structure of the text. Furthermore, as the form of a text is shaped by writers' communicative purpose, FARS is proposed to analyze and figure out what relations are used to achieve those goals. These relations are found from the general to specific level of the text. Moreover, since a text has one goal which is built smaller goals, FARS also necessarily analyzes how a writer constructs simple communication purposes for an ultimate goal of building a mega complex communicative goal. These two models also have been applied to analyze cross-culturally produced writing, with an aim at identifying how the linguistic and cultural background of the writer influences a piece of writing he/she produces.

In this paper, I attempt to analyze two different texts- a text which is produced in Anglo academic community which I label as Native speaker (NS) text, and an English Foreign Language (EFL) learner text on the basis of FARS analysis. The analysis will involve (1) the frequency of relation- to see what relation appear in different levels and what relation is dominant in each text, (2) the relational hierarchy, which is the identification of relations appearing at text levels, (3) The identification of

paratactic and hypotactic relations and their occurrence in each text, and (4) the explicitness of each relation, which considers linguistics signals in joining two propositions. In the discussion, Furthermore, I will demonstrate how might the features of two analyzed texts are different by considering the linguistic and cultural background of the authors. Besides, a comparison between CARS and FARS analysis also will be presented, and finally in the conclusion I will draw the main point of the discussion and discuss the applicability of FARS and CARS models for pedagogical practices.

Methodology and Analysis

What follow are the NS's and ESL texts which are subjected to FARS analysis in this journal. There are twelve units in the NS's text and seventeen units in EFL text. It is worth pointing out that each unit in these texts is segmented on the basis of a single independent clause which is joined by other clauses by a relational schema. The segmentation also considers the elliptical clause as a single independent unit and thus is eligible for the segmentation. Moreover, the analysis treats the restrictive clause as a dependent unit which is not eligible for segmentation. Conversely, non-restrictive clause is segmented as an independent unit.

a. Native Speaker Text

[1] All writers use the language of their discourse communities, [2] and communicate in ways deemed appropriate to and by their discourse communities. [3] The rhetorical choices made by writers are influenced by cultural norms, values and belief systems prevailing in discourse communities which constitute social contexts of texts. [4] Studies in academic rhetoric (Berkenkotter & Huckin, 1995; Berkenkotter, 1990) clearly show that epistemologies and ideological assumptions of academic cultures are firmly embedded in the conventions of academic genres, [5] which reveal and signal the academic discourse community's norms, values and social ontology. [6] Research into the development of rhetorical conventions of scientific writing reveals a close connection between the formation of a scientific discourse community and the development of discursive strategies for making scientific claims and the appearance of genre textual features (Bazerman, 1988).

[7] At the same time, the cross-cultural studies of academic text organization (e. g Ahmad, 1997; Clyne, 1981, 1991, 1994; Čmejrková, 1994; Duszak, 1994; Golebiowski, 1998, 1999; Gunnarsson, 1993; Mauranen, 1992, 1997; Markkanen & Schröder, 1992; Safnil, 2000) have shown that the rhetorical structure of re-

search prose produced by a non-native English writer, similarly to rhetorical styles of other discursual domains, cannot escape being conditioned by cultural norms, traditions and conventions which underlie the discourse community into which the author has been socialised. [8] Neither can it totally disentangle itself from rules and systemic limitations of the author's mother tongue.

[9] In this paper, we will therefore argue that the writers of specialist academic texts are not influenced entirely by their culture or by their speech community in their writing, [10] but rather that each writer is located at an intersection between culture and discourse community. [11] This particular intersection of culture and discourse community has the potential to be resolved differently in different cultures and in different disciplines. [12] This study will review research in contrastive rhetoric to investigate the impact of cultural and disciplinary factors on text construction at a range of levels in a range of disciplines and across a range of languages.

1-8 F 9-12			
1-3 E 4-8		9-11 LS 12	
1-2 EE 3	4-6 AN 7-8		9-10 E 11
1 L 2	4-5 ED 6	7 E 8	9 AC 10
	4 ED 5		

Fig. 1. Segment relations of the NS's text (the highlighted codes show prominent segments)

b. English Second Language Learner's Text

[1] If a national ID card were to be introduced in Australia, [2] not only will it invade our privacy [3] and endanger our liberty [4] but it will also make Australians more vulnerable to identity theft.

[5] ID cards can easily be lost [6] and be found by people who will abuse it and violate other people privacy. [7] Up to five per cent of cards are lost, stolen or damaged each year, [8] and the result can be denial of service and benefits, and loss of identity. [9] The replacement of a high security, high integrity card involves significant administrative involvement.

[10] Documents must be presented in person to an official. [11] Cards must be processed centrally. [12] This process can take some weeks. [13] The existence of a person's life story in a hundred unrelated databases is one important condition that protects privacy. [14] The bringing together of these separate information centres creates a major privacy vulnerability. [15] Any multi-purpose national ID card has this effect. [16] The concentration of such data on all Australian in a single location could prove disastrous [17] if it was attacked by hackers.

1-4 CE 5-17			
1 CD 2-4	5-12 L 13-17		
2-3 L 4	5-8 CI 9-12	13 A 14-17	
2 L 3	5-6 E 7-8	9 EI 10-12	14-15 E 16-17
	5 LS 6 7 C 8	10-11 LS 12	14 E 15 16 CD 17
	10 L 11		

Fig. 2. Segment relations of the EFL text (the highlighted code show prominent segments)

Frequency of the segment relations

As can be seen, the NS’s text is marked with the significant number of elaborative relation, which is realized in sub-categories of Addition, Extension, and Explanation. Out of eleven occasions of different relations occurrence, five of them are realized in the elaborative relation. It means that there is 54 % of total elaborative relation occurrence. More specifically within elaboration relation, relations of Extension and Addition are dominantly employed, each of which are realized in two times. In comparison, EFL text predominantly utilizes List relation which is realized in six occasions within sixteen times of various relations in the text. It constitutes 37 % of the total relation occurrence. The List relation is realized in sub-types relations of collection and sequence. Of these relations, the former is the most dominant which occurs in four times in the text.

Types of relation		NS text	EFL text
Facilitation- Framing		1	0
List	collection	1	4
	sequence	1	2
Causal	cause	0	1
	evidence	0	1
	Condition	0	2
	Circumstance	0	1
Elaboration	Addition	2	0
	Extension	3	3
	Explanation	1	0
	Instantiation	0	1
Adversative	Collateral	1	0
	Concession	1	0
	Contrast	0	1
Total relations		11	16

Fig. 3. The distribution of schematic relations (The bolds show the most dominant relations)

Taxis relation

In taxis relation, both texts are found to have employed larger number of paratactic relation. There are seven paratactic relations in the NS’s text which constitutes 54 % of the total taxis employed. Meanwhile, EFL text has a considerably higher number of paratactic relations than the NS’s text. It employs thirteen paratactic relations, which makes up 88 % of the total taxis relations. However, in terms of hypotactic relation realization, the two texts have a significant gap. The hypotaxis and parataxis in the NS’s text are almost equal in number. Within eleven segment relations, the NS’s text uses five hypotactic relations, which means that it has 45 % from the total taxis relation employment. On the other hand, EFL text only uses two hypotactic relations which constitute 12 % of total use of the taxis relation. Besides, in terms of hierarchical structure, the realization of hypotactic relation in the NS’s text occurs in the highest hierarchical level of the text and in three occasions in the micro level. Meanwhile, the only hypotactic relation is realized in the micro level of the EFL’s text.

Taxis relations	NS text	EFL text
Paratactic	6	14
Hypotactic	5	2
Total	11	16

Fig. 4. The distribution of paratactic and hypotactic relation

Hierarchical Level	NS’s text	EFL text
Macro-Level 1	1H	1P
Meso-Level 2	2P	1H 1P
	3 1H 2P	3P
Micro-level 4	2H 2P	4P
	5 1H	1H 4P
	6	1P
Total	5H 6P	2H 14P

Fig. 5. The distribution of taxis across all levels (H: Hypotactic, P: Paratactic)

Hierarchical structure

In macro level, the NS’s text employs hypotactic facilitation-framing relation. This relation is considered the main communicative goal of the writer in writing the text. This is based on the assumption that while the lower level of relational structure indicates more specific purpose, the highest level of texts reflects the main purposes of the writer (Golebiowski, 2006). Conversely, EFL text indicates paratactic causal-evidence relation as the main relation. This shows that the main purpose of the writer in writing the text is to provide some evidence to support his argumentation. In meso level, NS’s text is noted by higher concentration of Elaboration relation, with one Adversative and List relations, while in EFL text, Causal and List are more concentrated with one Adversative relation. Furthermore, in micro level, the NS’s text is marked by higher employment of Elaboration relation, with only one List and one Collateral relation. Meanwhile, EFL text shows the dominant use of Elaboration and List relations in micro level of the text, which is accompanied by two causal relations.

Level	NS text	EFL text
Macro-level 1	1F	1CE
Meso-Level 2	1E 1LS	1CD 1L
3	1EE 1AN 1E	1L 1CI 1A
4	1L 1ED 1E 1AC	1L 1EI 2E
Micro-Level 5	1ED	1C 1E 1CD 2LS
6		1L
Total	1F 1AC 1LS 1EE 1AN 3E 1L 2ED	1C 1CE 1CI 1A 4L 1EI 2CD 2LS 3E

Fig. 5. Hierarchical distribution of relations across macro, meso and micro-levels.

Explicitness (Recursiveness and Signaling)

One way of identifying the degree of explicitness in the texts relations is through the identification of conjunctions used to depict the relation between two propositions. It is believed that a relation has a higher degree of explicitness when there are higher number of conjunctions employed and when a proposition is joined by a conjunction in an unmarked way. Conversely, the relation is considered to be less-explicit when there are fewer conjunctions employed and when the two propositions are markedly joined by a conjunction. It is observed that the EFL text uses high-

er frequency of conjunction in joining two segments. Of seventeen segmented units, five of them are joined by conjunctions. Those conjunctions involve *If, and, but*. Within these conjunctions, there are two marked relations and three unmarked relations. Meanwhile the NS's text shows only two relations which are joined by conjunctions of *but, and*. Both of them have unmarked relations. The following are examples of marked and unmarked relation taken from the texts.

In ESL text, these units are related in an **unmarked way**:

[1] **If** a national ID card were to be introduced in Australia,
[2] not only will it invade our privacy..

[16] The concentration of such data on all Australian in a single location could prove disastrous [17] **if** it was attacked by hackers.

In the text, these two conjunctions of "if" are found to have Causal-Condition relation. The following units also are **unmarkedly** linked:

[2] not only will it invade our privacy [3] **and** endanger our liberty

[5] ID cards can easily be lost [6] **and** be found by people who will abuse it and violate other people privacy

In the text, these two conjunctions of "and" realize List-Collection/Sequence relations. Meanwhile, these units are related in a **marked way**:

[7] Up to five per cent of cards are lost, stolen or damaged each year, [8] **and** the result can be denial of service and benefits, and loss of identity.

While "and" normally creates List relation, in the text, the conjunction of "and" is found to have Causal-Cause relation. Also, these units are **markedly** linked:

[3] endanger our liberty [4] **but** it will also make Australians more vulnerable to identity theft

While "but" normally creates Adversative relation, in the text the conjunction realizes List relation.

Furthermore, in the NS's text, these units are related in **unmarked way**:

[9] In this paper, we will therefore argue that the writers of specialist academic texts are not influenced entirely by their culture or by their speech community in their writing, [10] **but** rather that each writer is located at an intersection between culture and discourse community.

In the text, the conjunction “but” is found to have Adversative-Collateral relation. Also, these units are **unmarkedly** related:

[1] All writers use the language of their discourse communities,
[2] **and** communicate in ways deemed appropriate to and by their discourse communities

The conjunction of “and” is found in the text to serve List-Collection relation.

DISCUSSION

The first discussion will be concerned with the frequency of relation found in the NS and EFL texts. Since Elaboration and List relations are consecutively the most dominant relation in both texts, it is useful to look at their definitions and use. Elaborative relation is purposed to advance the flow of understanding of the text by readers by providing clarification and other relevant information (Golebiowski (2004). Furthermore, List relation occurs when two or more parts of a text that convey proposition which the same topic or aspects of the same topic. It is aimed at providing readers with important points in the text. As the EFL text is an argumentative essay, List is purposed to give readers proponents that support the argumentation of the writer so that the persuasive purpose can be achieved.

The fact that NS’s text employs a larger number of Elaborative relations can be linked to two situations. First, in the introductory session of an academic text, writers are normally required to provide readers with extra information before processing to the main discussion. This extra information can be the background of the research, aims and the structure of the academic text in presenting findings of the research. This kind of information is realized in additive and extensive as well as explanatory propositions employed in the text. By providing elaborative information, a writer is presenting a more comprehensible text that brings about the audience’s understanding of the information in the text.

The second situation can be related to the linguistics and academic communities of the writer. As known, the authors of the text come from the English language academic community. I will argue that the theory of *writer-responsible* of English academic culture may explain this situation. *Writer-responsible* is introduced by Hind (1987, as cited in Kaplan, 1988, p. 291) in distinguishing text produced in Anglo from non-Anglo academic communities. He defines the term as a text in which its writer is responsible to make their texts to be clear to the readers. In his study, he points out that Anglo academic text is writer responsible where writers are found to be involved in making their texts as comprehensible as possible for their audiences. Relating to the NS text analyzed here, it can be assumed that the dominant use of elaborative relations reflects the writers' attempt to make the text become clear for readers so that the purpose of communication can be achieved.

For the EFL text, besides being noted with high occurrence of List relation, EFL text has considerable number of Clausal relations. It is employed in five times and thus comes to second place below List relation which is used in six times. The Causal relation is illustrated as the relation that conveys the main argumentation in a text (Kamyab, 1997, as cited in Golebiowski, 2004). High occurrence of Causal relation can be linked to the nature of an argumentative essay. This type of essays demands a larger persuasive ability of the writer and thus Causal relation here help the writer achieve this persuasive goal. The writer may use the Evidence, Cause-effect, Condition and Circumstance relations in achieving this purpose. The Causal-Evidence relation realized in the highest level of the text tells us that the text attributes its general purpose as providing the evidence of negative impact if the new ID card is introduced. Within lower level of the text, it uses sub-categories of Causal relation along with other relations (see Fig 5).

Furthermore, the discussion about taxis will be specified in hypotactic relation in the texts since this relation is what makes the two texts are contrast. By definition, hypotactic relation is described as the relation that links a more prominent proposition with a peripheral proposition in a text. It implies that within two segments, one of them contains key information that a writer wants to convey to audience. Unlike paratactic relation that brings subject-matter relation, hypotactic relation is seen as a rhetorical relation that indicates that writers stand at a certain point in the text. They

are not neutral. By employing hypotactic relation, the writer attempt to make a particular proposition become salient. Additionally, the writer makes one proposition more prominent and suppresses another to be less prominent. This is especially found in Concession and Collateral relations employed in the NS's text. The information in the salient segment is the information that the writer emphasizes to the readers. By contrast, paratactic relation is viewed as "where all part of textual schema are equally prominent in terms of their discursal functions" (Golebiowski, 2006, p.260). In this relation, a writer assumes that information in both segments is at the same importance, which indicates his neutrality for each proposition.

In relating to higher occurrence of *hypotaxis* in NS's text, and to find out what make it so, it is helpful to consider Hinkel's (2007) argument. He points out that Anglo discourse convention require rational Aristotelian argumentation, objectivity in the writer's position and views, and factuality in justification and proof (p. 107). This reveals that the linguistics and academic culture of English community encourage writers to argue certain points in their texts. It is true that in an academic text which is a formal form of writing that reports research findings, the writer is required to have a strong argumentative ability in order for their findings to be accepted by readers. In doing this, the writer can make certain information become salient, and in making this information stand out, the less prominent information is needed to function, for example as additional information, organizer and introduction. The NS's text under analysis shows that its main goal is to facilitate (Framing) understanding as this relation is found in the highest hierarchical level of the text. It is expected that before arriving at the prominent information, the authors provide peripheral background information which aims at making the text more comprehensible for audiences so that the communicative purpose is attained.

An argumentative essay is supposed to employ significant amount of hypotactic relation. One of hypotactic relation functions in a persuasive text is to emphasize one proposition over another. Nevertheless, the lower number of hypotactic relation in the EFL suggests that even though writing a persuasive text requires rhetorical relation to convey an argument, the writer tends to put himself in a neutral position by using more parataxis that shows subject-matter relation. In this relation, the writer is seen to be neutral between two propositions and seem to be unwilling to

impose readers to believe in one certain proposition of what he conveys. It is up to the audience to capture what is stand out in the text and let whatever they believe. Therefore, it can be expected that this text shows that native linguistics culture of the EFL learner overrides the academic requirement of argumentative essays.

Socioculturally, this also can be related to *reader-responsible* theory and politeness strategy. As Golebiowski (2006) points out, Non-Anglo writers tend to assume that readers themselves will be able to identify what is perceived as important information and what is not. They leave audience to select the information based on their resources. Historically, this indirectness in writing tradition can be traced to Confucian tradition. This tradition has huge influence in non-Anglo communities. Malcom and Pan (1989, as cited in Liao & Chen, 2009) point out that in order to avoid aggressiveness, Chinese writing convention requires writers not to give their view straightforwardly. It adopts social harmony in communication strategies (Decapua & Wintergerst, 2004). Similarly, Shokouhi and Baghsiahi (2009) and Clyne (1987, as cited in Golebiowski, 1998) report that politeness is the reason why indirectness is encouraged in Persian and German writing conventions. For these traditions, it is not polite to treat readers as those who need to be deliberately guided in following the text as they are assumed as intelligent beings.

Furthermore, in terms of the explicitness of the texts, the higher degree of unmarked relation employed in the EFL text implies that the writer tends to heavily relies on cohesive devices (conjunctions) in making his text to be coherent. Also, in using these conjunctions, the writer relies on *unmarkedness* of its employment. On the other hand, the NS's text is able to make the text to be coherent without necessarily rely on cohesive devices. This can be related to the language competencies of the two different texts' authors. The EFL text, which is written by a language learner, is expectedly to have less knowledge on writing coherent text. He has no many options to make the text becomes coherent other than using linguistics cohesive devices. It is assumed that without using cohesive devices, the writer will have difficulty in making his text coherent. Meanwhile, the NS's, which is authored by experts in academic studies, shows strong rhetorical knowledge in composing the text. They are able to produce a coherent text without being solely attached to the employment of cohesive devices.

Lastly, by looking at hierarchical structure, the NS's and EFL text are found to have different communicative purposes. As has been indicated, the NS's text is formed by hypotactic-Framing relation that reflects its general communicative purpose. This text is built by facilitating readers to whom background information is provided before going into the main part of the text. This pattern is frequently found in an introduction of research article produced in Anglo discourse community. Meanwhile, the ESL text is organized around paratactic Causal-Evidence communicative goal. This organization is usually found in persuasive text. Evidence which is presented by the writer is a decisive factor for his text to have a strong influence.

On FARS and CARS analysis procedures

FARS and CARS are two models in discourse analysis which deal with the analysis of structure of the academic texts. They have a similar purpose, which is to capture defining characteristics of various genres of texts, and identify the communicative purpose of writers. CARS is intended to identify the regularities of moves in the introduction of research articles. It looks closely at how a realization of a particular move is found in a chunk of sentences. Furthermore, the analysis is carried to identify if those moves are explicitly or implicitly indicated by writers. FARS, in one hand also deals with the identification of the explicitness and implicitness of writers in presenting the rhetorical relations in their text. Additionally, it deals with hierarchical structure and taxis. Unlike CARS which analyzes introductory section, FARS is applicable for all part of the sections in text. The two models are also purposed to analyze text produced in non-Anglo communities to see if those texts follow the moves outlined in CARS schema and functional relations in FARS. The ultimate goal of analysis in these models is to find out how cultural values are embedded in the convention of writing.

CONCLUSION

The analysis has shown that in term of frequency of segment relation, the NS's text shows the dominant use elaborative relation. On the other hand, EFL text predominantly employs List relation which is slightly higher from Causal relation which comes in the second place. The NS text also reveals lower degree of explicitness which is indicated by low occurrence of conjunction realized in unmarked way.

Hypotaxis in the NS's text is almost equal in number as *parataxis*, and by comparison it has higher number of hypotactic relation compared with the EFL text. On the other hand, EFL text shows higher degree of explicitness, which is identified by higher number of conjunctions employment which is mostly realized in unmarked way.

All of these features of text can be linked to the types of texts and linguistic and cultural background of the writers. The NS's text which predominantly uses elaborative relation can be linked to the writer-responsible theory. This is where the writers have responsibility to make their text become as comprehensible as possible. Elaborative relation is purposed to advance the flow of understanding of the text by readers by providing clarification and other relevant information. Higher number of hypotactic relations can be influenced by Aristotelian argumentation which encourages writers to argue their point of view. Low explicitness in NS's text reflects the higher English proficiency of the writers in making the text become coherent without heavily relying on conjunction. On the other hand, EFL text uses larger number of List and Causal relations which is expectedly found in an argumentative text. Its higher number of unmarked conjunction indicates the writer's heavy reliance on conjunction in making the text coherent. The lower degree of hypotactic relation is linked to politeness strategy and keeping harmony following the Confucianism tradition of writing. Consequently, paratactic relation is tended to be used to avoid aggressiveness in presenting a point of view.

FARS and CARS are believed to have pedagogical applicability. The models have captured the different characteristic in different types of texts in terms of moves and rhetorical structure. CARS has provided a basis to the establishment of Genre-Based approach in schools, and FARS can be part of it. Genre-Based approach enables learners to learn various types of texts in English which are characterized by different features. It introduces the central features of different texts and how they can use that features to achieve different communicative purposes. As parts of text analysis, the two models will develop students' awareness in terms of types of genres and their characteristic features so that they are aware of purpose that different genres serve in society and culture, and can learn to gain control of these genres (Gee, 1997, as cited in Paltridge, 2006). FARS allows ESL students to understand that a

text can be coherent without necessarily being cohesive. They will recognize the different coherent relations which can be used for different communicative purposes. Additionally, CARS enables learners to recognize various academic genres especially in teaching English for academic purpose (EAP). Students will be informed how texts from different discipline in English employ different moves. Also, two models allow language teachers to understand that ESL students can be influenced by writing tradition of their native culture and thus they can develop their awareness in cross-culturally different convention of writing.

REFERENCES

- Adams, T. (2003). Becoming cultured: Your exploration of intercultural communication can help you realize dramatic influence of culture on patient communication, *RDH*, 23(8), August, 40-48. Retrieved from http://www.rdhmag.com/display_article/184780/56/none/none/Feat/Becoming-Cultured.
- Dahl, T. (2004). Textual metadiscourse in research article: A marker of national culture or of academic discipline? *Journal of Pragmatics*, 36(10), 1807-1825.
- DeCapua, A., & Wintergerst, A. C. (2004), *Crossing cultures in the language classroom*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Golebiowsky, Z. (1998). Rhetorical approaches to scientific writing: An English-Polish contrastive study. *Text*, 18(1), 67-102.
- Golebiowski, Z. (2004). *Description of FARS relational clusters and definitions of relations*. Deakin University.
- Golebiowski, Z. (2006). The distribution of discursial salience in research papers: relational hypotaxis and parataxis. *Discourse Studies*, 8(2), 259-78, retrieved 12 June 2016, Sage Premiere database.
- Golebiowski, Z., & Liddicoat, A. J. (2002). The interaction of discipline and culture in academic writing. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistic*, 25(2), 59-71.
- Hinkel, E. (Ed.) (2009). *Culture in second language teaching and learning*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kaplan, R. B. (1988). Contrastive rhetoric and second language learning: notes towards theory of contrastive rhetoric. In A. C. Purves (Ed.), *Writing across language and cultures: issue in contrastive rhetoric*, (pp. 275-304). Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Liao, M. T. & Chen, C. H. (2009). Rhetorical strategies in Chinese and English: a comparison of L1 composition textbooks. *Foreign Language Annals*, 42(4), 695-720.

- Mann, W. C., Matthiessen, C. M. I. M., & Thompson, S. A. (1992). Rhetorical structure theory and text analysis. In W. C. Mann & S. A. Thompson (Eds.), *Discourse Description: Diverse Linguistic Analyses of a Fund-raising Text* (pp. ix-ixx, 39-78). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Paltridge, B. (2006). *Discourse Analysis*. London: Continuum
- Shokouhi, H. & Baghsiahi, A. T. (2009). Metadiscourse function in English and Persian sociology article: a study in contrastive rhetoric. *Poznań Studies in Contemporary Linguistics*, 45(4), 549-568.
- Swales, J. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.