



Rhetorical Move Structure In Marketing Research Article Introductions

Maryam Alsharif^{a 1}

^a *Jubail Industrial College, Jubail Industrial City, Saudi Arabia*

APA Citation:

Alsharif, M.(2025). Rhetorical move structure in marketing research article introductions. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 21(2), 1-12; 2025

Submission Date: 20/06/2025

Acceptance Date: 25/08/2025

Abstract

Swales' (1990,2004) genre analysis has insightful effects on the descriptions of research article introductions (RAIs). Researchers have analyzed the rhetorical structures, in particular to find out how far RAIs comply with Swales' Create A Research Space CARS model (1990,2004). Their studies confirmed some deviations, which are attributed to the disciplines that RAIs belong to. Therefore, this study has focused on the description of RAIs of marketing, an under-researched discipline to investigate the rhetorical structures and to describe compliance or deviations to CARS model. The results confirmed that marketing RAIs follow the common pattern of Move 1- Move 2- Move 3. In addition to its consistent pattern, marketing RAIs are remarkably with clear and simple rhetorical structures.

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

1. Introduction

English for Specific Purposes (ESP) approach to genre has contributed immensely to research writing and among the most analyzed genres is the research article (RA). Since Swales' (1990) publication of *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*, numerous genre-based studies have been written to analyze the rhetorical moves of the RA. Rhetorical moves are units, which perform "a coherent communicative function in a written or spoken discourse" (Swales, 2004, pp.228-229). These genre-based studies have been triggered by the need to offer novice scholars and researchers guidance on how to write RAs that enable them to fit the generic move structures of their academic discourse community. Analyses of the rhetorical moves of RA and RAIs, in particular, confirmed that there are specific patterns of moves for each discipline and sub-discipline (e.g., Anthony, 1999; Del Saz Rubio, 2011; Kanoksilapatham, 2005, 2012; Maswana, et al., 2015; Nwogu, 1997; Postegiullo, 1999; Samraj, 2002; Stoller & Robinson, 2013). Writers construct a sentence or sentences with a specific communicative function that represents one move. Move variations or the macro-structures across disciplines and sub-disciplines necessitate that scholars need to adhere to the macro-structure and linguistic aspects of RAI in order to be identified as members of the discourse community. In addition, generic inappropriateness may prevent scholars from publishing their RAs in reputable journals. Therefore, Swales' (1990,2004) Create A Research Space CARS model has suggested common functional moves in the RAI of some disciplines; however, there have been variations in the steps within each move across disciplines e.g.,

¹ Corresponding author.

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

(Del Saz Rubio, 2011; Lin, 2014a; Lin, 2014b, Samraj, 2002, 2005; Swales and Najjar, 1987) and sub-disciplines (Kanoksilapatham, 2012).

In these genre-based studies, it was found that there are differences in the way research article introductions (RAIs) are structured within different academic disciplines and sub-disciplines. Adhering to the specific features of each discipline is important for scholars seeking to publish their research. Therefore, it is essential to investigate the overall structure, rhetorical moves, and linguistic elements that are unique to each discipline or sub-discipline. Therefore, the purpose of this current research is to explore the rhetorical moves employed in a business sub-discipline that has not been extensively explored before. The study aims to examine how marketing RAI follows certain rhetorical move patterns and also examines the length of these move, which is a distinguishing generic feature. For example, research articles in natural sciences and engineering are brief and linear (Swales, 1990). Additionally, differences in length have been noted within specific sub-disciplines, such as engineering sciences, where one move was observed to be longer in order to provide more background information and define terms for engineering scholars (Anthony, 1999). Consequently, this study is expected to contribute to genre-based research literature and assist novice researchers to get their work published in respected scientific journals. It aims to offer guidance on constructing appropriate structural moves and lengthen a specific move.

1.1. Literature review

Previous genre-based studies

The RAI has been one of the challenging sections for research writers, as it requires decisions on the amount of background information to include, the stance writers have to choose and how to create appealing impressions for the readers while complying with the practices of their discourse community. Some writers may even choose to postpone this section until later in the writing process (Feak & Swales, 2011). The introduction also serves to justify the current study by identifying a gap in research through a rigorous examination of existing 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 the *Create A Research Space (CARS)* model, which analyses the introduction into three units of texts (moves) and each move is classified further into steps to account for the rhetorical structure of the introduction. 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 et al., 2020). However, the results of move analyses across disciplines (e.g., Anthony, 1999; Samraj, 2002), and cultures (Ahmad, 1997) have led to significantly various descriptions which the CARS model does not address. As a result, the model has been revised (Swales, 2004). Swales’ (2004) revised CARS model is illustrated in *Table 1.1*.

Table 1.1 *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

Lim (2012), who argued for the efficiency of the new CARS model, found that the second move “establishing a niche” is the most prominent move in the management discipline and assumed that this move is liable to disciplinary variation. Therefore, his study revolved around analyzing how expert researchers *establish a niche* and particularly in the management discipline. His findings revealed that management is a discipline where *niche establishment* is essential and it is distinct from other disciplines such as educational psychology (Loi, 2010), second language writing (Ozturk, 2007), and biochemistry (Kanoksilapatham, 2005). The data of the study consisted of 30 RAs. The analysis showed that in management RAI, the niches are established through two steps; indicating a gap and adding to what is known. The first step was used in 96% of RAI whereas the second step was only employed in 20% of the analyzed RAI. 60% of the RAI were also observed to follow a complete cycle of M1-M2-M3. He also concluded 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).

Dujcik & Zhu (2016) analyzed the rhetorical moves of RAs in Marketing. Their analysis revealed that M1 and M3 are obligatory in the introduction section of the RA and M2 which appeared in only 90% of the analyzed data, is conventional. M2 appeared in two steps; “indicating a gap” and “raising a question”. The pattern of M1-M2-M3 was the most common, which complied with Swales’ model (2004). Furthermore, Dujcik & Zhu (2016) observed two patterns of RA structure: IMRD and Introduction-Study-Discussion (ISD) and argued that the pattern is determined by the audience and suggested an existing sub-discourse communities in the field.

Previous genre-based studies have proved the existence of macro-structural variations revealed through various interdisciplinary explorations. This study, hence, intends to explore further the macro-structure of marketing RAI. This discipline has not been represented enough in the literature. In addition, since variations in the length of some moves are evidently reported in earlier studies, the researcher aims to describe the length of moves. It has been shown in an earlier study by Mur- Duenas (2012) that M2 is longer in business management RAI. Previous studies have also indicated that M1 is likely to be longer in disciplines that have been recently established or rather being described as emerging fields. Moreover, writers in these fields tend to repeat some moves, which resulted in a cyclical pattern. Likewise, finding whether there are particular moves to appear repeatedly forming a cyclical pattern is another goal of this study.

1.2. Research questions

1. What are the common move structures found in the introductions of marketing research article?
2. Is there a variation in the length of moves in marketing 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 study consisted of 30 research articles randomly selected from reputable marketing journals with a high impact factor, published between 2020 and 2021. Only articles with a conventional structure (Introduction-Method-Results-Discussion) were chosen to ensure consistent analysis results. The length of the research articles varied from 400 to 1700 words, and *Table 3.1* presents data on the journals, the number of research articles from each journal, and the word count for each journal.

Table 3.1 Research Data

Journal Count	Impact factor	Number	Word
Journal of International Marketing	4.57	10	11500
Journal of Marketing	5.26	10	8713
Journal of Marketing Research	4.62	10	13033

3.3 Data analysis

3.3.1 Move Analysis

The identification of rhetorical moves was manual. One challenging aspect of move analysis arises when a sentence contains more than one move. Different researchers have dealt with this in various ways. Some have analyzed moves in a single sentence by identifying the most prominent move, (e.g. Crookes 1986, Del Saz Rubio, 2011, Holmes 1997, Ozturk, 2007, Sheldon, 2011) while others, for example, Lu, Yoon, and Kisselev (2021) and Cotos et al. (2017) have assigned primary and secondary move codes to

segments of the same sentence. In this study, the coding process followed the approach of earlier researchers to prevent confusion. Furthermore, it is a common practice in studies which analyzed moves manually. Moves were categorized as obligatory, conventional, or optional based on their frequency of occurrence, using a cut-off of 60%. This classification was based on the suggestion of Kanoksilapatham (2005), and then revised by Alyousef (2023). Moves were further classified based on their frequencies, with obligatory moves covering 100-90% of the occurrence, conventional moves covering 60-89%, and optional moves covering 59% and below. Frequencies were used as a statistical tool to count the moves and steps in the data.

3.3.2 Analysis of the length of Moves

The number of words in a specific move will be tallied and then compared with the total number of words in the entire introduction to determine the percentage of the length of that particular move.

4. Results

4.1 Results of the analysis of moves

The RAI section was extracted for analysis from three marketing journals. Excluding the tables and the figures, the total number of words in this particular set of data is 33,278. The analysis of three moves in the data revealed that all of the three moves were obligatory in marketing journals. Move 1 appeared in (100%), Move 2 in (93%) and Move 3 in (100%). The results of frequency analysis are presented in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1 Frequencies of moves/steps in marketing RAIs

Moves/step	Percentage
Move 1: Establishing a territory	100%
step 1: Topic generalization of increasing specificity	100%
Move 2: Establishing a niche	93.3%
step 1A indicating a gap	76.6%
step1B adding to what is known	0%
step2 positive justifications	30%
Move 3: Presenting the present study	100%
step 1 Announcing present research descriptively and/or purposively	83.3%
step 2 Presenting research questions or hypotheses	53.3%
step 3 Definitional clarifications	26.6%
step 4 Summarizing methods	43.3%
step5 Announcing principal outcomes	50%
step6 Stating the value of the present research	80%
step7 Outlining the structure of the paper	46.6%

From the table above, it is clear that all articles had Move 1 and 9 articles that is 30% of the analyzed data have used Move 1 repeatedly. It reappeared in different patterns and the most frequent was reappearing as the first move of a second cycle of moves. The consistency of patterns is evident in marketing RAIs. 12 RAIs had the typical pattern of moves, which was M1-M2-M3 or M1-M2-M3-M1-M2-M3 where the cycle reappeared in the same order. The latter repeated pattern was found in 4 articles. Then the total number of RAIs following this move pattern was 16, which presented 53% of the data. The second pattern of repetition was **M1-M3-M1-M2-M3**. It was found in two RAIs. The three other

RAIs where M1 had different sequences of moves are **M1-M2-M1-M3-M2-M3-M1-M2-M3** and **M1-M3-M1-M3-M2-M3** and **M1-M2-M3-M2-M3-M1-M3**. Table 4.2 shows the patterns of M1.

Table 4.2 The repeated patterns of Move 1 in marketing RAIs

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

Move 2 was found in 28 of the RAIs of marketing journals with a percentage of 93.3%. Two articles lacked M2. The most recurrent steps of these two articles were M3S2, M3S5 and M3S6. The researchers moved from *establishing a territory* with Move 1 to introducing the study using M3S1 and then presenting the hypothesis with M3S2. Later M3S5 and M3S6 were lengthily discussed. When M2 was used, the researchers established a niche mostly by using *step 1A indicating a gap of research* in 76.6%, or by using *step 2 positive justifications* in 30%. Step 1B *adding to what is known* was not utilized in any of the analyzed RAIs. Step1A was the only repeatedly used step. It has been used repeatedly in 7 articles. The repeated patterns of Move 2 are indicated in Table 4.3. The most common pattern of repeated Move 2 was **M1-M2-M3-M1-M2-M3**.

Table 4.3 The repeated patterns of Move 2 in marketing RAIs.

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

Move 3 was found in all of the RAIs. The most frequently used steps of Move 3 were step 1 *announcing present research descriptively and/or purposively* appearing in 83.3% of the RAIs, step 6 *stating the value of the present research* in 80%, and step 2 *presenting research questions or hypotheses* in 53.3%. The less recurrent steps were step 5 *announcing principal outcomes* in 50%, step 7 *outlining the structure of the paper* which was found in 46.6% of RAIs and step 4 *summarizing methods* in 43.3%. Another indication of the simplicity and clarity of the moves in marketing journals is the use of step 7 by researchers. The readers are easily led through the paper from one move to another and finally ending with short instructions of the sections they are about to read next. Examples (1)-(5) illustrate how most researchers end their RAIs.

1. The remainder of our article is organized as follows. First, relevant literature on professional branding is reviewed to highlight both the differences between person and product brands and to identify potentially relevant insights from prior research. Next.... We then provide details on the context of our study, high fashion, wherein individuals may be enrolled in prestigious posts as creative directors, and describe the qualitative methodology used to develop theory inductively.

2. In the following section, we review the relevant literature and derive our hypotheses for the mechanism by which price promotions can influence consumers' donation behavior. Finally, we articulate implications of our findings in the "General Discussion" section.
3. In the next section, we develop a conceptual framework to investigate the impact of NPIs on disease incidence and mortality. Subsequently, we discuss the research methodology, model results, public policy implications, and the limitations and suggestions for future research.
4. To establish these implications for the prior literature, the next section details the theoretical foundation for our study using institutional and cultural frameworks as well as the COO research that serves as a basis for our conceptual model. After detailing the method, we present the results. The final section outlines some theoretical and managerial implications along with guidelines for further research.
5. The remainder of the article is structured as follows. First, the theoretical background and hypotheses are developed. Next, the research methods are described, and the analysis and results are demonstrated. We conclude with a discussion and implications of our research.

The least used step in the data was step 3 *definitional clarifications*, which appeared in 26.6% of the analyzed data. Move 3 has been found repeatedly used about 15 times. The two most common patterns were M1-M2-M3-M1-M2-M3 and M1-M2-M3-M2-M3, which were found in 4 articles or 13.3% of the analyzed RAIs. The two less common move structures were M1-M3-M2-M3 and M1-M3-M1-M2-M3, which were found two times or in 6.6%. M1-M2-M1-M3-M2-M3-M1-M2-M3, M1-M3-M1-M3-M2-M3 and M1-M2-M3-M2-M3-M1-M3 were patterns of repeated M3, which occurred only once.

Table 4.4 Frequencies of move patterns in marketing RAIs

Patterns of moves	Frequency	Percentage
(M1-M2-M3)	12	40%
(M1-M2-M3-M1-M2-M3)	4	13.3 %
(M1-M3)	3	10%
(M1-M3-M1-M2-M3)	2	6.6%
(M1-M2-M3-M2-M3)	4	13.3%
(M1-M3-M2-M3)	2	6.6%
(M1-M2-M1-M3-M2-M3-M1-M2-M3)	1	3.3%
(M1-M3-M1-M3-M2-M3)	1	3.3%
(M1-M2-M3-M2-M3-M1-M3)	1	3.3%

Table 4.4 illustrates the rhetorical move structures in marketing RAIs. It is clear that the majority of the RAIs did not deviate from CARSS model. The most predominant pattern was M1-M2-M3 and 40% of the RAIs strictly followed the model. In addition, other articles had the same sequence of moves but with a second repeated sequence. These articles constituted 13.3% of the data. A third common pattern of moves was M1-M2-M3-M2-M3, which slightly deviated from CARSS model as the last two moves; Move 2 and Move 3 had been repeated for a second time. This pattern was found in 13.3% of the data. 33.3% of the RAIs deviated from the ordinary pattern of moves, M1-M2-M3.

4.2 Result of the Analysis of Length of Moves

Table 4.5 The length of moves in marketing RAI

Move 1		Move 2		Move 3	
Raw No.	percentage	Raw No.	percentage	Raw No.	percentage

8193	24.6%	5599	16.8%	19486	58.6%
------	-------	------	-------	-------	-------

Table 4.5 demonstrates the clear contrast between the length of Move 2 and Move 3 in marketing RAIs. Move 2 is the shortest of all. In relation to the length of the steps, step1A was the longest of all with a high percentage of (73%) compared to step 2 which was used with a lower percentage of (27%), and step 1B was never used. Researchers in marketing RAIs have used the steps of Move 3 more equally. They used M3S1 83%, M3S6 80%, M3S5 50% and M3S2 53%. In addition, steps 6 and 5 are typically discussed lengthily. These two reasons may contribute to the length of Move 3 in marketing RAIs. Marketing researchers discussed M3S1 with a lower percentage of (13%) compared to M3S5 (18%) and M3S4 (18%). They elaborated more often on summarizing the methods of the study M3S4 and presenting the findings M3S5 than on the objectives of the study, that is, M3S1.

5. Discussion

According to the analysis of the results, Move 1 where researchers have to establish a territory by claiming the significance of research topic has been used with a high percentage. It is also noticed previously that Move 1 is cyclical. This repetition contributes to the length of the move as it has been observed by Anthony (1990) that the more cyclical the move is, the longer it is in a specific field.

Regarding the patterns of repetition, the most used pattern in marketing is **M1-M2-M3-M1-M2-M3**. The findings confirm that RAIs in marketing comply with Swales' (2004) CARS model. Cyclical pattern was also found to be common in some previous RAI studies, e.g., Maswana et al. (2015); Ozturk (2007); and Posteguillo (1999). In addition, a study by Anthony (1999) confirmed the same findings where some introductions have four cycles of Move 1 prior to the step of revealing the aim of research that is in Move 3. It was concluded that repeating M1 has served the purpose of providing definitions of terms or presenting extensive reviews of previous studies to accommodate readers from different engineering backgrounds. The present data has also revealed that Move 2, *establishing a niche*, was the least used move and hence was the shortest. With regards to the steps, step 1A, which is indicating a gap, was found to be the most prevailing. This finding is consistent 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*. Nevertheless, the findings do not totally concur with a previous study by Kanoksilapatham (2012), who examined the RAIs of biomedical engineering, and found that Move 2 was infrequent at a rate of 86% compared to Moves 1 and 3. Similarly, Tessuto (2015) and Kanoksilapatham (2003) found that Move 2 was not employed in some RAIs. Move 2 in marketing was an obligatory move and it was lacking in only two articles. Therefore, the results support Lim's (2012) findings, which confirmed that *niche establishment* is essential in management discipline and it is unlike other disciplines, e.g., educational psychology (Loi, 2010), second language writing (Ozturk, 2007), and in biochemistry (Kanoksilapatham, 2005).

The analysis has also revealed that there is no correlation between the length of Move 2 and the percentage of repetition. Step1A is the most cyclical. It has been found that the patterns of Move 2 in marketing are distinct. The commonly repeated pattern of Move 2 is M1-M2-M3-M1-M2-M3.

Move 3 was found to be the longest and it has been used in 100% of the RAIs. Move 3 Step 1 *announcing present research descriptively and/or purposively* was the most used step. This finding is in line with the findings of Samraj (2002); Del Saz Rubio (2011), and Rahman et al. (2017) who have found step 1 to be the most frequent in Move 3. Step 6 *stating the value of the present research* was the second most frequently used steps. Though step 5 *announcing principal outcomes* has ranked as the fourth most frequent step, previous studies indicated that this step may vary across disciplines. In this respect, Samraj (2002) explained that this step is infrequent in *wildlife behavior* and *conservation biology* RAIs and it was possible to have RAIs that do not report results directly and instead they may report predictions about the possible results.

Step 2 *presenting research questions or hypotheses* was used with a significantly high percentage. Similarly, this step has been found as the most used step in RAIs of applied linguistics (Rhaman et al., 2017) and the third most used in RAIs of agricultural sciences (Del Saz Rubio, 2011). Step 7 *outlining*

the structure of the paper has been found significantly frequent in marketing RAIs. This step is infrequent in some disciplines, e.g., in applied linguistics (Rahman, et al., 2017), and in some other disciplines, writers refrain from concluding their RAIs with an outline, e.g., in Chemistry (Stoller and Robinson, 2013). Researchers in marketing tended to clearly guide their readers from the introductory section of the research article and also used the simplest rhetorical structures. Hence, it is assumed that marketing research community distinctively values simplicity and clarity. One of the least used steps is step 3 *definitional clarifications*. It has been found to be infrequent. This is in line with the findings of Del Saz Rubio (2011) who found that this step did not appear in agricultural sciences RAIs.

The analysis of the length of moves revealed that Move 3 occupied most of the text space of the RAIs, followed by Move 1 and the move, which occupied the minimum text space, is Move 2. This finding is similar to Anthony's (1999) who explained that the length of Move 3 and Move 1 is probably attributed to the cyclical patterns they have and that Move 1 is characterized by an extensive use of technical terms to familiarize a vast number of readers with an engineering background who are not familiar with software engineering terms, in particular. Therefore, definitions of terms are very frequently used in Move 1. Similarly, the current data has shown that the writers of marketing RAIs often tend to include definitions of terms in Move 1 to acquaint the readers with terminology which are likely to be new but intrinsic to the study. In addition, it is possible that previewing previous studies in Move 1 has added to the length of that move. This finding is consistent with Ozturk (2007) who found that Move 1 is long 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 noticed the repetitive patterns of Move 1, which confirmed the findings of Posteguillo (1999) and Anthony (1999) as Move 2 and Move 1 have been found to have cyclical patterns in computer science RAIs and in environmental engineering RAIs by Maswana et al. (2015). They concluded that environmental engineering is sub-disciplinary and therefore writers repeat the moves to create a context for their studies. Move 3 step 6 has also been observed by Anthony (1999) to be the longest step and it occupies one-third of Move 3 and 14% of the RAIs. In the present data, step 6 has also been found to be the longest. Writers tended to emphasize the value of their study by discussing the significance and the contributions of their studies. In addition, it has been found in the current data that limitations of the study are frequently discussed in step 6 or step 1 of Move 3. Hence, it is suggested to consider the limitations of the study as an independent step in the RAIs. The other steps, which were also relatively long, were steps 1, 4 and 5. The frequency of step does not necessarily correlate with its length as step 2 in Move 3 was frequent but rather short.

6. Conclusions

Marketing RAIs have a consistent rhetorical pattern and deviations from Swales' (2004) CARS model were rarely observed in the data. Move 2 was lacking in only two RAIs and in some RAIs moves have repetitive patterns. These two conditions contributed to the slight deviation from the common rhetorical pattern of marketing RAIs that is M1-M2-M3. This pattern was observed in 40% of the examined data. However, the most predominant pattern of repeated moves was M1-M2-M3-M1-M2-M3 which was the rhetorical pattern in 13.3% of the examined RAIs. The cycle of moves reappeared in the same order, which has confirmed that marketing RAIs have a distinguished simple rhetorical pattern. For the length of moves, Move 1 and Move 3 were long compared to Move 2 as they appeared in all of the examined RAIs. Additionally, these two moves reappeared in many RAIs and they have numerous steps. Move 3 was remarkably long with its various steps and some steps tend to be long such as step 5 *Announcing principal outcomes*, step 6 *Stating the value of the present research* and step 7 *Outlining the structure of the paper*.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Dr. Hesham Alyousef, a professor of linguistics at College of Language Sciences, English Department, King Saud University, for his feedback and continuous support to conduct this study.

References

1. Ahmad, Ummul. (1997). Scientific research articles in Malay: a situated discourse

- analysis. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
2. Alyousef, H. S. (2023). "A multidimensional analysis of linguistic realizations and rhetorical move structure in geography research article abstracts: A corpus-based study." *Atlantis*, 45(1).
 3. 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
 4. 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
 5. Crookes, G. (1986). Towards a validated analysis of scientific text structure. *Applied Linguistics*, 7, 57-70. doi: 10.1093/applin/7.1.57
 6. 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
 7. Dujsik, 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
 8. Feak, C. B., Swales, J. M. (2011). *Creating contexts: Writing introductions across genres*. University of Michigan Press.
 9. 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
 10. 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.
 11. Kanoksilapatham, B. (2003). A Corpus-based investigation of scientific research articles: linking move analysis with multidimensional analysis. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Georgetown University.
 12. 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
 13. 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
 14. 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.
 15. 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
 16. 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.
 17. 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
 18. 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
19. 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
 20. 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.
 21. 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
 22. 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
 23. 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.
 24. 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
 25. 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
 26. 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.
 27. Pho, P. D. (2008). Research article abstracts in applied linguistics and educational technology: A study of linguistic realizations of rhetorical structure and authorial stance. *Discourse studies*, 10(2), 231–250. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445607087010>
 28. 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
 29. Rahman, M., Darus, S., & Amir, Z. (2017). Rhetorical structure of introduction in applied linguistics research articles. *EDUCARE*, 9(2), 69–84.
 30. Rahimi, S. Fania, M. (2017). Comparative Generic Analysis of Introductions of English and Persian Dentistry Research Articles. *RELPA*, 5(1), 27–40.
 31. 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
 32. 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).
 33. 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
 34. Swales, J., & Najjar, H. (1987). The writing of research article introductions. *Written Communication*, 4(2), 175–191. doi: 10.1177/0741088387004002004
 35. Swales, J. (1990). Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings. Cambridge University Press.
 36. Swales, J. M. (2004). Research genres: Explorations and applications. Cambridge University Press.
 37. 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
38. 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
39. 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

AUTHOR BIODATA

1. Maryam Alsharif is an assistant professor at Jubail Industrial College, teaching English language skills; Composition and Language Acquisition at the English Dept. She is interested in discourse analysis and has published the following research papers;
2. Alsharif, M. (2017). The frequently used discourse markers by Saudi EFL learners. *Arab World Journal*, 8 (2), 384-397.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. Alsharif, M. (2022). Rhetorical Move Structure In Business Management Research Article Introductions. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 18(4), 1268-1283