



Available online at www.jlls.org

JOURNAL OF LANGUAGE AND LINGUISTIC STUDIES

ISSN: 1305-578X

Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 18(4), 1268-1283; 2022

Rhetorical Move Structure In Business Management Research Article Introductions

Maryam Alsharif^{a 1} 

^a King Saud University, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia

APA Citation:

Alsharif, M.. (2022). Rhetorical Move Structure In Business Management Research Article Introductions. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 18(4), 1268-1283

Submission Date: 06/11/2022

Acceptance Date: 27/12/2022

Abstract

Studies on the rhetorical move structure of research article introduction led to the advent of Swales' (1990) genre analysis, a discourse analysis approach that is developed within the field of English for Specific Purpose. This genre-based study investigated the rhetorical move structure of research article introduction in a particular academic discipline, business management. It has been demonstrated that academic writers of business management research article introduction follow Swales' CARS model (M1-M2-M3) and a deviation from the model constituted a slight number of the examined articles. Deviation has also been found as a result of the cyclical nature of the moves, namely Move 1 and Move 2. Analysis of the steps within each move has shown a variation in the frequency of their use, which proved the significant rhetorical structure of business management research article introductions.

Keywords: Research article introduction; rhetorical structure; CARS model; move analysis; genre analysis

1. Introduction

The genre of research article (RA) has attracted the attention of genre analysts since Swales' (1990) development of move analysis within the field of English for Specific Purpose (ESP) and this type of analysis aims at addressing the needs of non-native English speakers (NNSs) to read, write and publish RAs (Connor, Upton, and Kanoksilapatham, 2007). Since publishing RAs in high-ranking journals is one of the major concerns of scholars for professional success, genre-based studies were carried out to raise awareness of generic features of RAs applying a bottom-up approach to investigate lexicogrammatical features of the genre, e.g. tense (Wang & Tu, 2014), citation practices (Hyland, 1999) and metadiscoursal elements (Del Saz Rubio, 2011) or a top-down approach, e.g. the rhetorical moves. A rhetorical move is a unit of text that has a communicative function, which adds to the major communicative purpose of the genre. Following Swales' move analysis, an abundant number of research studies explored the rhetorical moves of full-length RAs in different disciplines (e.g., Anthony, 1999, Kanoksilapatham, 2005, Maswana, et al., 2015, Nwogu, 1997, Postegiullo, 1999, Stoller & Robinson, 2013) or only of one section of the RA (e.g. Samraj, 2002, Del Saz Rubio, 2011). One of the most examined RA sections was the introduction. It was extensively investigated within one discipline (Del

¹ Corresponding author.

E-mail address: mariam-alshreef@hotmail.com

Saz Rubio, 2011, Lin, 2014a, Lin, 2014b), across disciplines (e.g. Samraj, 2002, 2005, Swales and Najjar, 1987), or across sub-disciplines (e.g. Kanoksilapatham, 2012). These studies suggested an existing disciplinary and sub-disciplinary variation in the rhetorical moves, confirming the distinctiveness of the move structure of research article introductions (RAI). Since adhering to generic features is a requirement by scholars who intend to get their research accepted for publication, it is of necessity to explore the macro-structure, or the rhetorical moves and other linguistic aspects, which are peculiar to a specific discipline or sub-discipline. Therefore, the current study aims at investigating the rhetorical moves of business management RAIs. In addition to the rhetorical moves, it is of relevance to examine moves' length. The length of the move has been considered a disciplinary characteristic. For example, RAs in natural sciences and engineering are known for brevity and linearity (Swales, 1990). There are also some existing sub-disciplinary differences; for instance, the length of one of the moves was found to be longer in a sub-discipline of engineering sciences and it was intended to provide additional background information and definitions of terms in order to familiarize all engineering scholars with the topic (Anthony, 1999). Therefore, it is expected that the present study will enrich genre-based research literature and will aid ESP students to improve their academic writing and novice RA writers to publish in prestigious scientific journals. Exploring how RAIs in business management is structured is expected to be beneficial for both native and non-native scholars in business management discipline and as well as for ESP students and instructors. Samraj (2002) pointed out the significance of genre-based studies and that applying CARS model to RAIs of different disciplines will inevitably assist ESP material developers. She clarified that "our understanding of textual norms in different disciplines enables us to provide instructions that better prepare students for the disciplinary communities in which they are seeking membership"(p.2). Previous studies, which investigated RAI in business management, e.g. (Lim, 2012, Mur- Duenas, 2012) have analyzed the rhetorical moves of RAI but none has considered analyzing the length of moves.

1.1. Literature review

In academic writing, the introduction is the most challenging step in the process of creating a well-formed text. Academic writers have to decide from plenty of options regarding the type and the amount of background information to include and the stance to take. In addition, writers find it more difficult as first impression is rapidly made upon this piece of text (Swales, 1990). More importantly, it is the section where the writer justifies the current study to fill a gap of research based on scrutinized investigations of research literature (Swales, 1990). It should "provide a context in which your reasons for exploring your topic is apparent and in which topic appears to be worth pursuing"(Feak & Swales, 2011, p. 2). Swales (1990), therefore, developed "sui generis model to account for the rhetorical movement in article introductions" (p. 140). The Create A Research Space (CARS) model analyses the introduction into three units of texts (moves) and each move is classified further into subunits (steps) to account for the rhetorical structure of the introduction. A move is " a discorsal or rhetorical unit that performs a coherent communicative function in a written or spoken discourse. At one extreme, it can be realized by a clause; at the other, by several sentences"(Swales, 2004, pp. 228-229). The CARS model has been utilized widely in various move analysis studies, which investigated different disciplines; for example in medicine (Jirapanakorn, et. al, 2014, Nwogu, 1990.), in computer science (Anthony, 1999), in biochemistry (Kanoksilapatham, 2005), in chemistry (Stoller & Robinson, 2013), in agricultural sciences (Del Saz Rubio, 2011), in dentistry (Rahimi & Farnia, 2017), in applied linguistics (Ozturk, 2018), in English Language Teaching (Sirijanchuen, 2017), in law (Tessuto, 2015), in management (Lindeberg, 1994, Mur-Dueñas, 2012, Lim, 2012) and civil engineering (Lin, 2014b, Manzoor, Majeed, Munaf, 2020) or sub-disciplines, e.g. second language writing and second language acquisition (Ozturk, 2007). However, the description of moves across disciplines (e.g. Anthony, 1999, Samraj 2002), and

cultures (Ahmad, 1997) yields significant variations that are not accounted for in CARS model. Thus, the model has undergone revisions (Swales, 2004). In the older version of the model, Move 1 has three steps. Step 1 *centrality claims* are “appeals to the discourse community whereby members are asked to accept that the research about to be reported is part of a lively, significant or well-established research area” (Swales, 1990, p. 144). Step 2 *making a topic generalization* can be categorized into two types; *statements about knowledge or practice* or *statements about phenomena*. Step 3 *reviewing items of previous research, which is an obligatory step in Move 1*, refers to previous studies. The model proposed in 1990 has been revised based on suggestions for modifications by move analysis studies (Anthony, 1999, Samraj, 2002), which indicated deviations from the devised model. The three obligatory moves were retained and changes were pertinent to the steps within each move.

Anthony (1999) discussed some problematic issues in relation to the steps within the moves. He (1999) found that steps 1-2 which is “making topic generalizations” and step 2-1D, which “continuing a tradition” are overlapping somehow. Accordingly, the two steps 1 and 2 in Move 1 were merged into “topic generalizations of increasing specificity”. The perplexity caused when distinguishing between step 2 “topic generalizations” and “reviewing literature” was noted by Samraj (2002) who decided not to distinguish between the two steps in her analysis. One major critique to the model was step 3 in Move 1. This step, which is *reviewing previous studies*, is not necessarily pertinent to Move 1. It may appear in other moves such as Move 2 where a gap of research is indicated. Samraj (2002) suggested that this step is recurrent and is likely to appear in different parts of the introduction. Therefore, in the modified version, Swales (2004) agreed that citations are required in Move 1 and possible in Move 2. Move 2 can take the form of *1A counter claiming*, or *1B indicating a gap*, or *C1 question-raising*, or *1D continuing a tradition*. Move 2, though has not received criticism except for step 1D “continuing a tradition”, Swales (2004) reduced it from four steps into two steps; step 1A *indicating a gap* or step 1B *adding to what is known* and step 2 *presenting positive justification*. Step 2 suggested by Samraj (2002) is optional and is discipline sensitive. Swales (2004) justified the reduction based on findings from previous move analysis studies, which pointed out the prevalence of indicating gap. Swales (2004) explained that this step can encapsulate the other steps “*counterclaiming*” and “*question raising*”. The term is rather inclusive whereas the term “*continuing a tradition*” was “odd” and has been removed from the model. Move 3 has the role of creating a research space for the gap, which has been indicated by Move 2. “Move 3 variously offers to substantiate the particular counter-claim that has been made, fill the created gap, answer the specific question or continue the rhetorically established tradition”(Swales, 1990, p. 159). According to Samraj (2002), Move 3 step 1 is “discipline-dependent”. It may include a hypothesis, a need to test a hypothesis, or specific questions. Swales (2004) assumed that variation in the rhetorical structure of RAI is reliant on the nature of the research, the researchers and the discipline they belong to. Swales’ (2004) revised CARS model is provided below.

Table 2.1 Revised CARS model 2004 (Swales, 2004, pp.230-232)

Move 1 Establishing a territory (citations required) via
Topic generalizations of increasing specificity
Move 2 Establishing a niche (citations required) via
Step 1A Indicating a gap
Step 1B Adding to what is known
Step 2 (optional) presenting positive justification
Move 3 Presenting the Present Work (citations possible) via

Step 1 (obligatory) Announcing present research descriptively and/or purposively
Step 2* (optional) Presenting research questions or hypotheses
Step 3 (optional) Definitional clarifications
Step 4 (optional) Summarizing methods
Step 5 (PISF**) Announcing principal outcomes
Step 6 (PISF) Stating the value of the present research
Step 7 (PISF) Outlining the structure of the paper
*Steps 2-4 are not only optional but less fixed in their order of occurrence than the others
** PISF: Probable in some fields, but unlikely in others

Previous genre-based studies

One of the move-based studies that suggested merging the two Swalesian models (1990, 2004) was Del Saz Rubio (2011) who analyzed 28 RAI in agricultural sciences. Merging CARS model was based on the argument that steps in Moves 1 and 2 were compressed and therefore the model becomes simplistic and may hinder the analysis of some linguistic realizations employed in different moves. The move analysis revealed that 90% of the articles follow the same pattern of M1-M2-M3. Not any of the analyzed articles were found to lack Move 2. This indicates the necessity of “establishing a niche”. Regarding the steps within each move, steps 2 *making generalizations of increasing specificity* and 3 *citation/literature review* in M1 were employed in all of the articles. For Move 2, step 1B which is *gap signaling* was the most employed followed by step 2 *the presentation of positive justification*. Steps 1 *announcing present research descriptively and/or purposively* and 4 *summarizing methods* in Move 3 were the most eminent followed by step 2 *presenting research questions, hypotheses or assumptions*, 6 *stating the value of the present research*, and 5 *announcing principal outcomes*. Step 7 *outlining the structure of the paper* and step 3 *definitional clarification* were not employed in any of the articles. The proposed CARS model by the author becomes a practice and hence followed by other scholars, e.g. Rahman et al. (2017) and Lin (2014).

On the contrary, Lim (2012) argued in favor of the adequacy of the new CARS model and he confirmed that the second move “establish a niche” is the most important to intrigue the readers and is assumed to be subject to disciplinary variations. Therefore, his study focused on how experienced researchers established a niche in RAI in management discipline. The findings came to substantiate that management is a discipline where *niche establishment* is prominent and is unlike other disciplines; for example, educational psychology (Loi, 2010), second language writing (Ozturk, 2007), and biochemistry (Kanoksilapatham, 2005). The data of the study comprised 30 RAs. The analysis revealed that in management RAI, the niches are established through two major steps; indicating a gap and adding to what is known. The first step was employed in 96% of RAI whereas the second step was only found

in 20% of the analyzed RAI. 60% of the RAI were also found to follow a complete cycle of M1-M2-M3. Another interesting finding is that the step of *indicating a gap* has other interrelated sub-steps which are; “(i) highlighting the complete absence of research bearing a specific characteristic, (ii) stressing insufficient research in a specific aspect, (iii) revealing a limitation in previous research and (iv) contrasting conflicting previous research findings” (p. 241). The author argued for the adequacy of Swales’ (2004) CARS, unlike other analysts who justified preference for the old model on the basis of the fact that the less condensed, simplified framework with fewer steps may not clearly describe the rhetorical structure of RA structure (Del Saz Rubio, 2011).

The presence or absence of Move 2 is also subject to cultural variation. Hirano (2009) found that the Portuguese corpus deviates from Swales’ CARS model. Some RAIs contain only Move 1 or only Move 3. None were found to strictly follow the M1-M2-M3 pattern. The repeated pattern was M1-M3. This comes in line with Ahmad’s (1997) who identified the same tendency of Malay writers to point out a gap only by indicating that no study in the literature covers a specific topic. A similar finding was noted by Mur- Duenas (2012) who analyzed two steps in RAs in the field of business management. His study focused on *indicating a gap* in the introduction section and *stating the limitation* in the discussion section. The rationale behind selecting the two steps is that previous intercultural rhetorical moves studies indicated a difference between English and Spanish RAs. *Indicating a gap* was employed in all of the English RAs but only in 66% of Spanish RAs. However, it is beyond the scope of the study to examine cultural variation and will restrict the analysis to disciplinary variation in the employment of CARS model. But what is worth noting in Mur- Duenas’ (2012) findings is that the step of *creating a gap* was found not only prominent to be included through the introductory section but preferably to be lengthily discussed. Articles from two prestigious journals (*Strategic Management Journal* and *Academy of Management Journal*) have demonstrated this tendency compared to a third journal with a lower impact factor, (*Journal of Management*). The present study is expected to add further findings by investigating business management RAIs.

1.2. Research questions

The research attempts to answer the following questions;

- What are the generic macro-structures of business management research article introductions?
- Is there a difference in the length of moves/steps of business management research article introductions?

2. Article structure

2.1. Subdivision - numbered sections

3. Method

3.1 Data

3.2 Theoretical framework

3.3 Data analysis

3.3.1 Move Analysis

3.3.2 Analysis of the length of Moves

4. Results

4.1 Results of the analysis of moves

4.2 Result of the Analysis of Length of Moves

5. Discussion

6. Conclusion

References

3. Method

3.1 Data

The data of the study comprised 30 research articles. The articles were randomly selected from high-ranking journals. They were extracted from the most prestigious business management journals. They are recent articles published during the current and the past year 2020-2021 in peer-reviewed journals. The selection of the journals is based on having a high impact factor. To ensure consistency of the results of analyses, only articles that have conventional structure; Introduction- Method- Results- Discussion (IMRD) were selected (Swales, 1990). The length of RA varies from 400 to 1700 minimizing any possible bias in the results of analysis is ensured by referring to the total word count. *Table 3.1* shows the data, the journals where it is extracted from, the number of RAs from each journal and the word count for each journal.

Table 3.1 Research Data

Journal	Impact factor	Number of RAs	Word Count
Journal of International Management	3.82	10	11080
Journal of Management	8.85	10	11034
Strategic Management Journal	5.46	10	10936
Total word count			33,060

3.2 Theoretical framework

Swales' (1990,2004) *Create a Research Space* is a well-recognized theoretical model for the analysis of rhetorical moves. It has been widely applied in several genre-based studies to analyze RAI e.g. (Anthony, 1999, Del Saz Rubio, 2011, Kanoksilapatham, 2003, 2005, 2012, Postegiullo, 1999, Samraj, 2002, 2005). The model has passed through stages of modifications and therefore is the most appropriate model to be applied in this study. The model has three main moves and disciplinary variations are more evident in the steps and the lengths of moves.

3.3 Data analysis

3.3.1 Move Analysis

Rhetorical moves were identified manually. The analysis of moves has only one challenging case that is when a sentence includes more than one move. Such a case has been dealt with differently in previous move analysis studies. The first group of researchers analyzes moves that appear in one sentence by counting the most salient move (e.g. Crookes 1986, Del Saz Rubio, 2011, Holmes 1997, Ozturk, 2007, Sheldon, 2011). Other researchers, for example, Lu, Yoon, and Kisselev (2021) and Cotos et al. (2017) dealt with the sentence as a unit of discourse analysis but "each sentence was given a move/step code indicative of the primary function of the sentence, and if a segment of the same sentence carried an additional functional role, it was coded with a secondary move/step tag" (p. 95). However, the researcher has applied the coding process of the earlier researchers to avoid confusion and in addition it is a practice

often followed in studies applying manual move analysis. The researcher has labeled moves as either obligatory, conventional or optional based on the cut-off frequency of 60% of occurrence as a measurement of move stability, which is suggested first by Kanoksilapatham (2005) and then revised by Alyousef (forthcoming). Moves have been classified in relation to their frequencies, therefore, a move is categorized into obligatory in case it covers (100-90%) of the RAI, conventional (60-89%), or optional (59% and below). Frequencies are the statistical tool to count the moves and the steps in the data.

3.3.2 Analysis of the length of Moves

The total number of words in a particular move will be counted and then compared to the total number of words in the whole introduction to get the percentage of the length of that move.

4. Results

4.1 Results of the analysis of moves

The analysis of the data revealed that all of the moves were obligatory in business management journals; Move 1 appeared in (96.6 %) of RAIs, Move 2 in (90%) and Move 3 in (100%). The frequencies of move analysis are presented in *Table 4.1*.

Table 4.1 The frequencies of moves/steps in business management RAIs.

Moves/step	Percentage
Move 1: Establishing a territory	96.6%
step 1: Topic generalization of increasing specificity	96.6%
Move 2: Establishing a niche	90%
step 1A indicating a gap	83.3%
step1B adding to what is known	23%
step2 positive justifications	40%
Move 3: Presenting the present study	100%
step 1 Announcing present research descriptively and/or purposively	93.3%
step 2 Presenting research questions or hypotheses	66.6%
step 3 Definitional clarifications	13.3%
step 4 Summarizing methods	60.3%
step5 Announcing principal outcomes	33.3%
step6 Stating the value of the present research	93.3%
step7 Outlining the structure of the paper	20%

The analysis indicated that 29 articles had Move 1 and 10 articles, that is 33.3% of the analyzed data, have used Move 1 in a cyclical pattern. It reappeared in different patterns (*Table 4. 2*). Researchers tend to utilize Move 1 more than once in the same article to demonstrate mainly three things; the increase of interest in the topic of research, their vast knowledge of the field and reference to previous studies in that field to give additional details about the topic of the study. These details may come in the form of definitions, or discussions of earlier studies.

Table 4. 2 The repeated patterns of Move 1 in Business Management RAIs.

The repeated patterns of Move 1	Frequency	Percentage
M1-M3-M1-M3	2	6.6%
M1-M2-M1-M2-M3	4	13.3%
M1-M2-M3-M1-M3	2	6.6%
M1-M3-M2-M3-M1-M3	1	3.3%
M1-M3-M2-M1-M3	1	3.3%

The predominant pattern of repeated M1 was (**M1-M2-M1-M2-M3**), which appeared in 13.3% of the articles. The pattern **M1-M3-M1-M3** was found in two articles, and **M1-M2-M3-M1-M3** was used also in two articles. Move 1 reappeared after Move 2 in 16.6% to support the gap indicated by Move 2. The example below illustrates the function of repeating M1 immediately after M2.

- (1) [In emerging or fast-changing ecosystems, the set of platform players may be ambiguous and data on platform usage may be unreliable or nonexistent (Dougherty & Dunne, 2011; Hannah & Eisenhardt, 2018; Wade, 1995). In the ecosystem of general software programming— in which software developers are complementors—the domain of possible platforms a developer can use is huge and the range of possible applications they could develop is vast (Eisenmann, 2006; Kapoor & Agarwal, 2017). Thus, platform research must address the question of how complementors learn about platforms in the first place. **Move 2, step 1A indicating a gap**. [In fast-changing ecosystems, technology platform companies proactively market themselves to prospective complementors (Cusumano & Gawer, 2002). These companies sometimes use in-person events to attract complementors and to motivate them to build products that complement the platform (West & Wood, 2013; Yoffie, Casadesus-Masanell, & Mattu, 2003). **Move 1, step 1 topic generalizations of increasing specificity**. [Although prior research has noted the existence of these events, and flagged their possible influence on complementor behavior (e.g., Dattée et al., 2018; Özalp, Cennamo, & Gawer, 2018), the impact of temporary gatherings on platform growth has not yet been studied in detail. **Move 2, step 1A indicating a gap**]

Move 1 also reappeared after Move 3 in 16.5% of the data to support step1 or step 2 of Move 3. Examples (2)-(3) show that M1S1 was used to provide literature review of the focal point of the study. In example (2), the focus is on the organizational learning theory, and in example (3), it is about the role of firm size.

- (2) [To do so, we draw on organizational learning theory which assumes that organizational learning is a cumulative process that occurs over time (Argote and Miron-Spektor, 2011). **Move 3, step 1 announcing present research descriptively and/or purposively**. [Organizational learning has been applied to international management to examine how MNCs can learn from their experiences and leverage them to formulate their international strategies (Andersen, 1993; Delios and Beamish, 2001). More specifically, research in this area has focused on how and whether MNCs can learn from their experiences in different cultural, institutional, and political contexts, and whether they can transfer them to new environments (Delios and Henisz, 2003; Holburn and Zelner, 2010; Lord and Ranft, 2000; Dikova and Van Witteloostuijn, 2007). Organizational learning relies on how organizations learn from their routines (Argote and Miron-Spektor, 2011). **Move 1, step 1 topic generalizations of increasing specificity**]

- (3) [With the present study, we want to unravel the role of firm size. We therefore rely on a source-based perspective and argue that a distinction should be made between the resources firms have and need to successfully deal with turnover. **Move 3, step 1 announcing present research descriptively or purposively**] [Firm size relates to the amount and type of resources (i.e., human, financial, social, and organizational) that firms have and that they can deploy to deal efficiently with the disruptions caused by turnover. However, the nature of the turnover disruptions and, thus, the resources needed to manage them depend on firms' knowledge intensity, that is, the extent to which firms rely deeply upon an extensive body of complex human resources (i.e., knowledge) for realizing their core value-creation activities (Von Nordenflycht, 2010). It reflects the quality of the human resources lost with turnover, the complexity of employee interactions within a firm, and the depth and intricateness of the products or services provided by the firm (Datta, Guthrie, & Wright, 2005; Dess & Shaw, 2001). Consequently, it determines the specific implications of turnover for the firm's human and social capital and its operations (Nyberg & Ployhart, 2013) and therefore the resources needed to cope with them. **Move 1, step 1 topic generalizations of increasing specificity**].

Example (4) shows that M1 reappeared after M3S2 to provide a review of literature supporting the hypothesis of the study.

- (4) In this paper, we provide empirical evidence that experience with non-market risks may enable MNCs to change their risk-response behavior from risk avoidance to risk management. **Move 3, step 2 presenting research questions or hypotheses**. [Changing managers' mindsets from one of risk avoidance to risk management, particularly when the threats are largely outside the control of individuals, is challenging since it is human nature to avoid risk (Slovic, 2000). Researchers across many business disciplines have shown that managers tend to be more motivated to avoid losses than they are to pursue gains (Kahneman and Tversky, 1979). For example, managers making FDI location decisions are known to avoid entering foreign countries and locations with a high degree of non-market risk (Dai et al., 2013; Li and Vashchilko, 2010; Oetzel and Oh, 2014; Staw et al., 1981). While there may be opportunities in a market, the threat of major disaster and financial loss may outweigh the potential benefits. **Move 1, step 1 topic generalizations of increasing specificity**]

Move 2 was found in 27 of the investigated RAIs of the business management journals with a percentage of 90%. Only three articles lacked M2. The three articles have been found to have moderately long M3S6 to highlight the contribution of the study and hence justify the need to conduct the study. This step may have been used to offer an alternative for M2. However, when an article has M2, the researchers establish a niche by employing *step 1A indicating a gap of research* in 83.3% or by using *step 2 positive justifications* in 40%. The least used step was *1B adding to what is known* which appeared in 23.3% of the analyzed RAIs. Step 1A was not only the most used but also the most repeatedly used in the same RAI. It has reappeared in 8 articles, which means 26.6% of the data.

For the other steps, each has been repeated once. The repeated pattern of Move 2 is indicated in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3 The repeated patterns of Move 2 in Business Management RAIs

The repeated patterns of Move 2	Frequency	Percentage
M1-M2-M3-M2-M3	7	23.3%
M1-M3-M1-M3-M2-M3-M1-M3-M2-M3	1	3.3%
M1-M2-M1-M2-M3	4	13.3%
M3-M1-M2-M3-M2-M3	1	3.3%

The most recurrent pattern was M1-M2-M3-M2-M3, which was used in 7 articles. M2 was reappearing after M3 in 29.9%. M1-M2-M1-M2-M3 was another pattern where M1M2 alternate two times before proceeding to M3. This move structure was found in 4 articles.

Move 3 was found in all of the RAIs. The most frequent steps of Move 3 were step 1 (*announcing present research descriptively and/or purposively*) appearing in 93.3% of the RAIs, step 6 (*stating the value of the present research*) in 93.3% and step 2 (*presenting research questions or hypotheses*) in 66.6%. The less used steps were step 4 (*summarizing methods*) in 60% and step 5 (*announcing principal outcomes*) in 33.3%. The least used steps were step 7 (*outlining the structure of the paper*), which was found in only 20% of RAIs and step 3 (*definitional clarifications*), in 13.3%.

Move 3 had specific repeated patterns in 53% of the analyzed RAIs. The most frequent pattern was M3-M2-M3, which was found in 11 articles. It was noticed that in many articles, M3S1 was used to uncover the aims of the paper and meanwhile stressing the significance of the study by shedding light on the limitations in the literature. The researchers moved to M2S1A and then highlighted the fact that the current study has the goal of compensating for the limitations as shown in the example below.

- (5) [To illuminate this untapped question, our study first incorporates the behavioral theory of the firm (Cyert and March, 1963) to examine a foreign subsidiary's decision portfolio, which is composed of different levels of engagement in the two production activities in response to its performance shortfall. Scale-related activities refer to hiring employees and raising capital in factor markets, and efficiency-related activities refer to transforming a given level of labor and capital into maximized outputs by developing operation systems, technologies, and management knowledge (Fuess and Van den Berg, 1996; North and Wallis, 1994; Wallis and North, 1986). Labor and capital are low-specific resources that bring definite returns to a firm with low risk, while high-specific resources generated by efficiency-related activities could increase firm profit with high risk (Balakrishnan and Fox, 1993; Silverman et al., 1997). **Move 3, step 1 announcing present research descriptively and/or purposively**. [Previous research has shown a decrease in the business scale of a foreign subsidiary when its performance is inferior (Chung et al., 2010) but ignored the subsidiary's responses via the resource reconfiguration of engagement in both scale- and efficiency-related activities. **Move2, step 1A indicating a gap**]. [We will disclose the influence of the level of a performance shortfall on a subsidiary's decision portfolio of different extents of engagement in both activities. Second, we incorporate the institution-based view (Peng et al., 2008) to identify regional institutional environments as the contingent antecedents that influence risk decisions of foreign subsidiaries in response to their performance shortfall. **Move 3, step 1 announcing present research descriptively and/or purposively**] [Prior studies have suggested that institutional uncertainties of host countries exert critical influences on risk-taking decisions of MNEs but obtained conflicting findings (Boubakri et al., 2013; Lu et al., 2014). **Move 2, step 1A indicating a gap**].

Table 4.4 shows the variations of move structures in business management RAIs. The most frequent move structures strictly followed CARS model. RAIs, which followed this pattern,

Table 4.4 Frequencies of move patterns in business management RAIs.

Patterns of moves	Frequency	Percentage
1. (M1-M2-M3)	9	30%
2. (M1-M2-M3-M2-M3)	8	26.6%
3. (M1-M2-M3-M1-M3)	2	6.6%

4. (M1-M2-M1-M2-M3)	3	10%
5. (M1-M3)	2	6.6%
6. (M1-M3-M1-M3)	2	6.6%
7. (M3-M1-M2-M3-M2-M3)	1	3.3%
8. (M1-M3-M2-M3-M1-M3)	1	3.3%
9. (M1-M2-M1-M2-M3-M2-M3-M2-M3-M1-M2-M3-M2-M3)	1	3.3%
10. (M1-M3-M2-M1-M3)	1	3.3%

constituted only 30% of the data. Other two move structures which slightly deviated from CARS model were (M1-M2-M3-M2-M3) and (M1-M2-M3-M1-M3). The first pattern was found in 26.6% and was characterized by a repetition of Move 2 and Move 3 after a complete cycle of moves. The second pattern was less frequent and with a percentage of 6.6%. Similarly, it was characterized by a repetition of Move 1 and Move 3 after a complete cycle of moves. This leads to the conclusion that 36.4% of the RAIs deviated from CARS model.

4.2 Result of the Analysis of Length of Moves

Examining the raw number of words in each move as demonstrated in *Table 4.5*, it is evident that Move 3 has occupied the largest part of the RAIs, followed by Move 1 and the move that occupied the least part is Move 2.

Table 4.5 The raw number of words in each move

Move 1	Move 2	Move 3
8783	5400	18877

In Move 2, step 1A occupied the majority of the move with a percentage of (57%) followed by step 2 with a percentage of (27%) and the least step to occupy the move is step 1B (16%). In Move 3, the space for presenting the findings has been found to be minimized with (15%). Instead researchers of business management have been found to discuss M3S1 with a higher percentage of (19%). They paid more attention to the point where the objectives of the study have to be presented to the reader more than to the results, which are discussed more briefly. Step 7 outlining the structure of the paper naturally has to be discussed briefly in the case of use. It occupied only (2%). The step with the least space was M3S3 (1%).

5. Discussion

The analysis has revealed that Move 1 has cyclical patterns. This cyclic pattern was also found in studies conducted by Maswana et al. (2015), Ozturk (2007), and Posteguillo (1999). This finding is also consistent with Anthony's (1999) who examined RAIs of software engineering and has noticed in some introductions that there were four cycles of Move 1 in some introductions before the aim of the research is indicated.

To answer the first research question, which was to uncover the generic macro-structures of business management research article, the analysis has shown that Move 2 is the least used. It appeared in 90%

of business management RAIs. With regards to the length, it has been discussed that this move is the shortest, however; the presence of the set of steps of Move 2 varied. Step 1A, which is indicating a gap is the most prevalent in Move 2, which is in line with previous studies (Samraj, 2002; Pho, 2008; Kanoksilapatham, 2012; Del Saz Rubio, 2011; Lim, 2012; Rahaman et al., 2017). Del Saz Rubio (2011) also found that step 1A was the most employed followed by step 2 *the presentation of positive justification*. In addition to disciplinary variations, the presence of Move 2 is subject to other factors. Mur-Duenas (2012) who also analyzed *niche establishment* in RAIs in the field of business management, found step 1A employed in all of the English RAIs but only in 66% of Spanish RAIs. Hirano (2009) and Ahmad (1997) have also found previously that the absence of Move 2 is a cultural difference. In addition, Ozturk (2007) claimed that in second language writing, many RAIs were found to lack Move 2 because it is an emergent field of study and hence there is not a huge body of research to signal a gap in the literature.

In the current data, Move 2 was lacking in only three articles. This conforms to previous studies by Kanoksilapatham (2012), who examined RAIs of biomedical engineering, found that Moves 1 and 3 were present whereas Move 2 was less frequent at the rate of 86%. Similarly, Tessuto (2015), Kanoksilapatham (2007) found Move 2 to be missing in some RAIs unlike Move 1 and 3 which were present in all of the RAIs.

Consequently, the presence of Move 2 was essential and the results are in line with Lim's (2012) findings which confirmed that *niche establishment* is prominent in management discipline and unlike other disciplines like educational psychology (Loi, 2010), second language writing (Ozturk, 2007), and in biochemistry (Kanoksilapatham, 2005). However, it may not appear in just a few RAIs but it was present through gap signaling, positive justifications or in a few instances, it was indicated through step 1B adding to what is known.

Move 3 has been found to be the longest but the presence of the steps varies. Both Move 3 Step 1; *Announcing present research descriptively and/or purposively* and Step 6; *stating the value of the present research* are the most used with 93%. This finding is similar to the findings of Samraj (2002), Del Saz Rubio (2011), and Rahman et al. (2017) who have found step 1 to be the most prevailing in Move 3. Step 2; *presenting research questions or hypotheses* has ranked third. Similarly, Rahman et al. (2017) has found this step to be the second most used in RAIs of applied linguistics and it ranked third and is preceded by step 1 and 4 in the study conducted by Del Saz Rubio (2011). Step 4; *summarizing methods* has been in (60.3%) of the RAIs. Step 5; *announcing principal outcomes* has ranked as the fourth most frequent step. It has a low frequency of 33.3%. This step may vary across disciplines. Therefore, Samraj (2002) has indicated that this step is infrequent in *wildlife behavior* and *conservation biology* RAIs and in some articles; it was possible to have RAIs reporting predictions about the possible results without directly reporting the results.

Step 7; *outlining the structure of the paper* appeared with even a lower rate of 20% in Business Management. This step has been rarely used in some disciplines, e.g. in applied linguistics (Rahman, et al.2017), or even in some disciplines writers were found not to conclude with an outline, e.g. in chemistry (Stoller and Robinson, 2013). The least used step is step 3; *definitional clarifications*, with a percentage of 13.3%. Having steps 7 and 3 as the least used does not contradict Del Saz Rubio's (2011) study which has shown that in agricultural sciences RAIs, these two steps were not only infrequent but were not employed in the data.

To answer the second research question, it was found that Move 3 occupied the largest part of the RAIs, followed by Move 1 and the move, which occupied the smallest text space, was Move 2. This finding is

consistent with Anthony's (1999) who justified the length of Move 3 and 1 in relation to the cyclic patterns they have and that Move 1 is characterized by an elaboration of technical terms to acquaint readers who are expected to have engineering background but are still unfamiliar with software engineering. "Definitions of important terms and examples to illustrate difficult concepts" (Anthony, 1999, p.43) are very commonly used in Move 1.

Likewise, the current data has shown the tendency of the writers of RAIs to include definitions in Move 1 to familiarize the readers with any unclear terms, which are essential to understand the study. In addition to definitions of terms, previewing previous studies is obligatory in Move 1 and this contributed to the relative length of that move.

This finding is also in line with Ozturk's (2007) who has noticed that Move 1 is long in the introduction section because authors "feel the need to provide more theoretical background in order to familiarize the readers from related or parent disciplines about the issues investigated" (p.34). Ozturk has also emphasized the repetitive patterns of Move 1. His findings are also consistent with Posteguillo (1999) and Anthony (1999) who noticed that in computer science RA introductions, Move 2 and Move 1 are repeated. Maswana, et al. (2015) also have observed the cyclic patterns of Move 1 in the RAIs of environmental engineering. They pointed out that of all the examined engineering sub-disciplines, environmental engineering is more sub-disciplinary and therefore writers tend to repeat the moves of the RAIs to contextualize their studies.

Though Move 2 was found to have cyclical patterns, it did not contribute to its length and this finding is in contradiction to what was earlier confirmed by Mur-Duenas (2012) who argued in favor of the lengthily discussed Move 2 in management.

Move 3 step 6 has also been found by Anthony (1999) to be "one of the longest steps in Move 3, accounting for almost one third of the move and 14% of the introduction as a whole" (p.44). In the present study, step 6 has also been found to be the longest. Writers were found to highlight the value of their study by numerating the significance and the contribution made by their research. Also, limitations have been found to be recurrently discussed in the RAIs either in step 6 or step 1. It can be argued that discussion of the limitations of the study can be considered as an independent optional step in the RAIs. The other steps, which were also discussed with elaboration, were steps 1, 4 and 5. The length of some steps may correlate with their frequency except for step 2. It was a frequent step but was not lengthily discussed.

6. Conclusion

Business management RAIs have a rhetorical structure of three moves. It has been found that Move 2 can possibly be lacking in some articles. It was observed that in these articles, step 6 of Move 3 was found to be quite longer to stress the significance of the study and the necessity to conduct it. This step compensates for Move 2. However, the predominant patterns of moves were M1-M2-M3 (30%), M1-M2-M3-M2-M3 (26%) and M1-M2-M1-M2-M3 (10%). Some RAIs deviated from CARS model (M1-M2-M3) but they did not stand for more than 36.4% of the examined RAIs. The recurring patterns of rhetorical structure demonstrate that Move 1 and Move 2 were cyclical and were reappearing throughout the RAIs. With regards to the steps, M2S1A was the most frequent step of Move 2. Hence, a niche is established by indicating a gap of research in 83.3% of the analyzed articles or by using step 2 positive justifications in 40% of the data; however, step 1B was the least used in only 23.2% of the RAIs. With the numerous steps of Move 3, steps 1 and 6 were the most used and have also been found to occupy

the most space of RAIs. A correlation has been observed between the frequency of the steps and their length.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank dr. Hesham Alyousef, an associate professor of linguistics at the English Language and Literature Dept., King Saud University, for his advice, efficient feedback and continuous support to conduct this study.

References

- Ahmad, Ummul. (1997). *Scientific research articles in Malay: a situated discourse analysis*. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Alyousef, H. S. (forthcoming). "A multidimensional analysis of linguistic realizations and rhetorical move structure in geography research article abstracts: A corpus-based study." *Atlantis*, 45(1).
- Anthony, L. (1999). Writing research article introductions in software engineering: How accurate is a standard model? *IEEE transactions on Professional Communication*, 42(1), 38-46. doi: 10.1109/47.749366
- Cotos, E., Huffman, S., Link, S. (2017). A move/step model for methods sections: Demonstrating Rigour and Credibility. *English for Specific Purposes*, 46, 90-106. doi: 10.1016/j.esp.2017.01.001
- Connor, U., Upton, T. A., & Kanoksilpatham, B. (2007). Introduction to move analysis. In D. Biber, U. Connor, & T. A. Upton (Eds.), *Discourse on the move: Using corpus analysis to describe discourse structure* (pp. 23-41). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Crookes, G. (1986). Towards a validated analysis of scientific text structure. *Applied Linguistics*, 7, 57-70. doi: 10.1093/applin/7.1.57
- Del Saz Rubio, M. M. (2011). A pragmatic approach to the macro-structure and metadiscoursal features of research article introductions in the field of Agricultural Sciences. *English for Specific Purposes*, 30(4), 258-271. doi: 10.1016/j.esp.2011.03.002
- Dujisik, D. and Zhu, W. (2016). Rhetorical Structure of Marketing Research Articles for Academic Writing. *Rangsit Journal of Educational Studies*, 30(1), 1-22. doi: 10.14456/rjes.2016.1
- Feak, C. B., Swales, J. M. (2011). *Creating contexts: Writing introductions across genres*. University of Michigan Press.
- Holmes, R. (1997). Genre Analysis and the social sciences: an investigation of the structure of research article discussion sections in three disciplines. *English for Specific Purposes*, 16, 321-337. doi: 10.1016/s0889-4906(96)00038-5
- Hirano, E. (2009). Research article introductions in English for specific purposes: A comparison between Brazilian Portuguese and English. *English for specific purposes*, 28(4), 240-250. doi: 10.1016/j.esp.2009.02.001
- Hyland, K. (1999). Academic attribution: citation and the construction of disciplinary knowledge. *Applied Linguistics*, 20, (3), 341-367. doi: 10.1093/applin/20.3.341
- Jirapanakorn, N., Trakulkasemsuk, W., & Keyuravong, S. (2014). A Move Analysis of English Research Article Introductions in Thai and International Medical Journals. *rEFLections*, 17, 23-40.
- Kanoksilapatham, B. (2005). Rhetorical structure of biochemistry research articles. *English for Specific Purposes*, 24(3), 269-292. doi: 10.1016/j.esp.2004.08.003
- Kanoksilapatham, B. (2003). A Corpus-based investigation of scientific research articles: linking move analysis with multidimensional analysis. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Georgetown University.

- Kanoksilapatham, B. (2012). Research article structure of research article introductions in three engineering subdisciplines. *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication*, 55(4), 294-309. doi: 10.1109/TPC.2012.2223252
- Kanoksilapatham, B. (2012). Facilitating scholarly publication: Genre characteristics of English research article Introductions and Methods. *The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies* 18(4), 5–19.
- Lindeberg, A. C. (1994). An exploratory study of knowledge claims in article introductions in three disciplines: Finance, management, and marketing. In M. Majapuro, and T. Nikko (Eds.), *Talous ja kieli, Business and Language II*, (pp. 647-655). Publications of the Helsinki School of Economics and Business Administration.
- Lim, J. M. H. (2012). How do writers establish research niches? A genre-based investigation into management researchers' rhetorical steps and linguistic mechanisms. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 11(3), 229-245. doi: 10.1016/j.jeap.2012.05.002
- Lin, L. (2014a). Innovations in structuring article introductions: The case of applied linguistics. *Ibérica, Revista de la Asociación Europea de Lenguas para Fines Específicos*, (28), 129-153.
- Lin, L. (2014b). Variability in the rhetorical structure of research article introductions. The case of civil engineering. *Revista Española De Lingüística Aplicada*, 27(2), 405-432. doi:10.1075/resla.27.2.08lin
- Loi, C. K. (2010). Research article introductions in Chinese and English: a comparative genre-based study. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 9(4), 267–27. doi: 10.1016/j.jeap.2010.09.004
- Lu, X. , Yoon, J. and Kisselev, O. (2021). Matching phrase-frames to rhetorical moves in social science research article introductions. *English for Specific Purposes*, 61, 63-83. doi:10.1016/j.esp.2020.10.001
- Maswana, S., Kanamaru, T., & Tajino, A. (2015). Move analysis of research articles across five engineering fields: What they share and what they do not. *Ampersand*, 2, 1-11. doi: 10.1016/j.amper.2014.12.002.
- Manzoor, H. Majeed, A. Munaf, M. (2020). Genre Analysis of Civil Engineering's Research Article Introductions. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 10(2), 322-330. doi: 10.5539/ijel.v10n2p322
- Mur-Dueñas, P. (2012). A corpus-based analysis of two crucial steps in Business Management research articles: The creation of a research space and the statement of limitations. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 11(1), 55-78. doi: 10.35360/njes.255
- Nwogu, K. N. (1990). *Discourse variation in medical texts: Schema, theme and cohesion on professional and journalistic accounts*. Nottingham: Department of English Studies, University of Nottingham.
- Nwogu, K. N. (1997). The medical research paper: Structure and functions. *English for Specific Purposes*, 16, 119-138. doi: 10.1016/s0889-4906(97)85388-4
- Ozturk, I. (2007). The textual organisation of research article introductions in applied linguistics: Variability within a single discipline. *English for Specific Purposes*, 26(1), 25-38. doi: 10.1016/j.esp.2005.12.003
- Ozturk, I. (2018). Rhetorical Organisation of the Subsections of Research Article Introductions in Applied Linguistics. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)* 12(1), 52-65.
- Posteguillo, S. (1999). The schematic structure of computer science research articles. *English for specific purposes*, 18(2), 139-160. doi: 10.1016/s0889-4906(98)00001-5
- Rahman, M., Darus, S., & Amir, Z. (2017). Rhetorical structure of introduction in applied linguistics research articles. *EDUCARE*, 9(2), 69-84.
- Rahimi, S. Fania, M. (2017). Comparative Generic Analysis of Introductions of English and Persian Dentistry Research Articles. *RELP*, 5(1), 27-40.

- Sheldon, E. (2011). Rhetorical differences in RA introductions written by English L1 and L2 and Castilian Spanish L1 writers. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 10, 238–251. doi:10.1016/j.jeap.2011.08.004
- Sirijanchuen, M. N. (2017). *A comparative analysis of macro-textual organization and metadiscourse features in ELT research article introductions written by Thai and international* (Doctoral dissertation, Thammasat University).
- Stoller, F. L., & Robinson, M. S. (2013). Chemistry journal articles: An interdisciplinary approach to move analysis with pedagogical aims. *English for Specific Purposes*, 32(1), 45-57. doi: 10.1016/j.esp.2012.09.001
- Swales, J., & Najjar, H. (1987). The writing of research article introductions. *Written Communication*, 4(2), 175-191. doi: 10.1177/0741088387004002004
- Swales, J. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge University Press.
- Swales, J. M. (2004). *Research genres: Explorations and applications*. Cambridge University Press.
- Swales, J. M., & Feak, C. B. (2012). *Academic writing for graduate students*. University of Michigan Press.
- Samraj, B. (2002). Introductions in research articles: Variations across disciplines. *English for Specific Purposes*, 21(1), 1-17. doi: 10.1016/S0889-4906(00)00023-5
- Samraj, B. (2005). An exploration of a genre set: Research article abstracts and introductions in two disciplines. *English for specific purposes*, 24(2), 141-156. doi: 10.1016/j.esp.2002.10.001
- Tessuto, G. (2015). Generic structure and rhetorical moves in English-language empirical law research articles: Sites of interdisciplinary and interdiscursive cross-over. *English for Specific Purposes*, 37, 13–26. doi: 10.1016/j.esp.2014.06.002
- Wang, S.P., & Tu, P.N. (2014). Tense use and move analysis in journal article abstracts. *Taiwan Journal of TESOL*, 11(1), 3- 29.

AUTHOR BIODATA

Maryam Alsharif is a lecturer at Jubail Industrial College, teaching English language skills; Composition and Language Acquisition at the English Dept. She is a PhD student at the English Language and Literature Dept., King Saud University who is mainly interested in discourse analysis and has published the following research papers;

- Alsharif, M. (2017). The frequently used discourse markers by Saudi EFL learners. *Arab World Journal*, 8 (2), 384-397.
- Alsharif, M. (2017). Preferences and stylistic awareness of discourse markers among Saudi EFL learners. *IJELLH International journal of English language, literature in humanities*, 5 (3), 10-33.
- Alyousef, H. & Alsharif, M. (2020). A contrastive study of theme types and patterns in medical research article abstracts written in English by native and Saudi scholars. *Umm Al-Qura University Journal of Language Sciences & Literature*, 26 (1), 367-387.