Eastern Journal of Languages, Linguistics and Literatures (EJLLL)
ISSN: 2710-3412 (Online)
https://www.qabasjournals.com/index.php/ejlll

Rhetorical Moves in Applied Language Research Article Introductions of Moroccan L2 writers of English: A Generic Move Analysis

Benraiss Khalid[1], Bani koumachi[2]
[1] *Faculty of Languages, Letters, and Arts, English Department, Ibn Tofail University, Kenitra, Morocco*
[2] *Associate Professor Faculty of Languages, Lettres, and Arts, Kenitra, Morocco.*

Corresponding Author: Benraiss Khalid E-mail: Benraiss.khalid@uit.ac.ma

ARTICLE INFO

Received: June 10, 2023
Accepted: July 17, 2023
Volume: 4
Issue: 3

KEYWORDS

Create-a-Research-Space-Model, Move Analysis, Morocco, Research Article Introductions

ABSTRACT

The current study addresses the under-explored area of rhetorical move analysis in research article introductions authored by Moroccan L2 English writers, using Swales' Create-a-Research-Space (CARS) model as a framework. As such, corpus of 27 research article introductions was collected from three open-access journals and analysed according to Swales' (2004) CARS model. The results indicated substantial discrepancies between the observed move structures and Swales' CARS model. This was characterised by unusual findings such as the omission of Move 2, the presence introductions with Move 1 only, and stretches of text not explained by Swales' model. The study highlights the need for further research so as to unravel the reasons behind these deviations. It recommends that future research should explore the potential reasons behind the, subjectively speaking, unique rhetorical moves employed by Moroccan L2 writers of English in their research article introductions.

1. Introduction

Broadly speaking, the ultimate aim of move analysis studies is the devising of adequate discourse patterns that academics can rely on to read and to write different academic genres predictably and effectively (Moreno & Swales, 2018). A large body of international research has been dedicated to reaching this very aim (e.g., Bruce, 2009; Chang & Schleppegrell, 2011; Cotos, 2018; Del Saz-Rubio, 2011; Kanoksilapatham, 2005; Ozturk, 2007; Samraj, 2002, 2004, 2008). Yet, to this date, their methodology of doing so remains varied and inconsistent. This is partly because and a) researchers rarely disclose their methodology (Moreno & Swales, 2018) b) move analysis studies are subjective in nature (Biber et al., 2007). This led Swales and Moreno (2018) to not only call for a unified move analysis procedure but also propose a potential universal methodology for doing so.

To define what a move analysis is, it is an approach to text analysis whose aim is to uncover the generic and rhetorical patterns of various discourses structures (Moreno & Swales, 2018). Under this approach, a text "is described as a sequence of 'moves', where each move represents a stretch of text serving a particular communicative function" (Biber et al., 2007, p. 15). Swales first introduced this kind of analysis in 1981 and further developed it in 1990 and 2004, respectively. It was initially based on the assumption that research article introductions (Henceforth, RAIs) are underlined by a general structure composed of three moves made concrete by a set of steps. These were bundled under the Create-a-Research-Space Model (Henceforth, CARS).

Figure 1 and Figure 2 below illustrate the 1990 and 2004 iterations of the model, with the latter being the one adopted in the current study. The difference between the two can be spotted at the level of steps. The four steps of Move 1, Claiming Centrality, are discarded in favour of a broader move marking. Move 2 witness the deletion of Step 1C and step 1A from the 1990 model in favour of the new step, Providing Positive Justification whose conceptualisation can be credited to Samraj (2002). Move 3 involved the addition and deletion of a number of steps as shown in the two figures.

Figure 1

Swales (1990) Create-a-Research-Space Model

Move 1	**Establishing a territory**	
	Step 1	Claiming centrality ***and/or***
	Step 2	Making topic generalizations ***and/or***
	Step 3	Reviewing items of previous research
Move 2	**Establishing a niche**	
	Step 1A	Counter-claiming ***or***
	Step 1B	Indicating a gap ***or***
	Step 1C	Question raising ***or***
	Step 1D	Continuing a tradition
Move 3	**Occupying the niche**	
	Step 1A	Outlining purposes ***or***
	Step 1B	Announcing present research
	Step 2	Announcing principal findings
	Step 3	Indicating RA structure

Note: Adapted from *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings* (1st ed., p 141), by J. Swales, 1990, Cambridge.

Figure 2

Swales (2004) modified Create-a-Research-Space

Move 1	**Establishing a territory (citation required) via Topic generalizations of increasing specificity**	
Move 2	**Establishing a niche (citations possible) via:**	
	Step 1A	Indicating a gap ***or***
	Step 1B	Adding to what is known
	Step 2	Presenting positive justification ***(optional)***
Move 3	**Presenting the present work via:**	
	Step 1A	***(obligatory)*** Announcing present research descriptively and/or purposively
	Step 2*	***(optional)*** Presenting research questions or hypothesis
		(optional) Definitional clarifications
	Step 3	***(optional)*** Summarizing methods
	Step 4	***(PISF**)*** Announcing principal outcomes
	Step 5	***(PISF)*** Stating the value of the present research
	Step 6	***(PISF)*** Outlining the structure of the paper

Move 1	**Establishing a territory (citation required) via Topic generalizations of increasing specificity**	
	Step 7	

* Step 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

Note: Adapted from *Research Genres: Explorations and Applications* (1st ed., p 230, 232), by J. Swales, 2004, Cambridge.

I began this article with the above line of argumentation to demonstrate that, despite their worldwide popularity and evolving nature, move analysis studies using the CARS model are rarely, if not never, carried out in the Moroccan academic writing context. This is arguably an odd oversight since such studies can greatly inform academic writing pedagogies. The lack of move analysis studies in Morocco using Swales' (2004) model highlights an opportunity to contribute to the understanding of academic writing practices within the country. Such an investigation would undoubtedly and hopefully introduce more research of this kind to the Moroccan context, given its significance. Its potential lies in encouraging further exploration and improvement of academic writing courses, ultimately leading to better academic writing outcomes for Moroccan researchers.

Further solidifying the gap above is the wide appeal the model garnered over the years. It has been used as the analytical tool in many research papers investigating the rhetorical patterns of RAIs from different disciplines. To name a few, Anthony (1999) studied 12 Software Engineering RAIs using Swales'(1990) CARS model. He reported that the execution of the CARS model deviated from the prescribed three-move structure in terms of move count and move order per introduction. Nevertheless, all three moves were present in each of the 12 RAIs. The most notable finding in Smaraj's (2002) study is the invention of the step of Positive Justification, which was also reported to be in Del Saz Rubio's study in (2011). This step is usually paired with the step of indicating a gap. Kanoksilapatham (2005) studied 60 Biochemistry RAIs and revealed that 20 of the selected authors did not establish a niche, Move 2. Contrastingly, both Move 1 and Move 3 had an occurrence frequency of 100%. Ozturk (2007) analysed the rhetorical variability within the field of Applied Linguistics, specifically in Second Language Acquisition (SLA) and Second Language Writing (SLW). His study showed that the two sub-disciplines are unrelated in their realisation of the CARS model as no underlying move structure was found. In his SLW corpus, instances were found where Move 2, Establishing a Niche, did not occur. Del Saz Rubio (2011) examined 28 RAIs from the field of Agricultural Sciences to show that the original three-move patterns constituted more than 93% of her overall findings. The remaining 7% exhibited similar variation to the studies mentioned above. Bruce (2014) examined the extent to which 15 RAIs from Applied Linguistics and Psychology deviated from Swales' CARS model. His results showed that (a) Move 1 was present in all 30 introductions, and (b) there was a great deal of variation in the manifestation of the model. In (2019), Kashiha and Marandi compared two sets of 20 RAIs from Applied Linguistics and Chemistry and found that Move 1 and Move 3 appeared in every RAI, regardless of the discipline. Move 2 was absent from one Applied Linguistics RAI and one Chemistry RAI.

Still, there exist very few studies of varying similarity to the ones above that are geologically relevant to the Moroccan context. Their mentioning here is intended as a potential contextually sensitive comparison benchmark for the results to come. In (2021), Alaa Eldin analysed 20 unedited first draft English RAIs written by Egyptian STM majors using the CARS model. The analysis showed that 90% of the RAIs did not follow the three-move sequence as prescribed. Additionally, Move 2 was absent from 55% of the RAIs. Considering first drafts only leaves the question whether the writers in question could have made revisions to their drafts in later iterations. Benraiss (2023) investigated the manner of niche established (i.e., Move 2) in 30 master thesis introductions written by Moroccan L2 Applied Linguistics and English Language Teaching majors, using Swales' (2004) CARS model. He reported that a research niche was established in 93% of the introductions, mainly by pairing the two steps of Providing a Research Gap and Providing a Positive Justification. Furthermore, the niches found primarily concerned the Moroccan EFL context. Although it utilised a different analytical model, Mliless (2017) study could potentially be the first published move analysis study conducted in Morocco. The study examined master thesis abstracts written by Moroccan graduate students from the Faculty of Arts and Humanities at the University of Moulay Ismail in Meknes using Hyland's (2000) IPMRcR model.

To this end, the study being presented fills in the gap reported above by investigating 27 RAIs written in English by Moroccan L2 writers majoring in Applied Language studies. The corpus was compiled from three open-source journals. The research questions this paper aims to address are:

1. To what extent is Swales' CARS model present in the studied corpus?
2. Are there any deviations in the execution of the CARS model?
3. If so, what are these deviations?

2. Methodology

2.1. Corpus Collection

For this study's purposes, a total of 27 research article introductions were selected from three open-source journals: a) *The International Arab Journal of English for Specific Purposes*, b) *The International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation*, and c) *The Journal of Applied Language and Culture Studies*. The process of corpus compilation followed these steps. First, an initial search was conducted to identify research articles written by Moroccan writers published between 2018 and 2023. Second, the identified articles were downloaded forming an unprocessed corpus of 52 RAIs. Third, these were screened against the following checklist:

a) discard RAs written by university professors,
b) discard RAs written by Moroccan authors originating from universities outside of Morocco,
c) discard RAs not falling under the category of Applied Language studies,
d) select only one RAs per author,
e) discard RAs lacking an explicit introduction section.

The outcome is 27 RAIs detailed in Table 1 below.

Table 1

Selected RAIs per Journal

Journal	Number of Selected RAIs
The International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation	9
International Arab Journal of English for Specific Purposes	7
Journal of Applied Language and Culture Studies	11
Total	27

2.1. Corpus Treatment

The 27 RAIs were analysed using MAXQDA 2020 (VERBI Software, 2020), using its dedicated coding suit. First, the 27 RAIs were added to the software following the naming scheme visible in Table 2. Second, a coding list imported to MAXQDA corresponds to the 2004 CARS model (see Table 3). Each of the 27 introductions was then subjected to a move analysis, the results of which are reported in the next section.

Table 2

RAI Naming Scheme

Source Journal	Corresponding Name
The International Arab Journal of English for Specific Purposes	JALCS RAI (X)
The International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation	IJLTT RAI (X)
The Journal of Applied Language and Culture Studies.	IAJSEP RAI (X)

*X stands for the number of RAI

Table 3

Coding Scheme

Step	Corresponding code
Move 1	M1
Move 2 – Step 1A	M2-S1A
Move 2 – Step 1B	M2-S1B
Move 2 – Step 2	M2-S2
Move 3 – Step 1	M3-S1
Move 3 – Step 2	M3-S2
Move 3 – Step 3	M3-S3
Move 3 – Step 4	M3-S4
Move 3 – Step 5	M3-S5
Move 3 – Step 6	M3-S6
Move 3 – Step 7	M3-S7

3. Results

3.1 Move Frequency

Move 1 and Move 3 were two most established moves in the corpus respectively. The first was found in all 27 RAIs while the second was found in 23 RAIs. Contrastingly, Move 2 was the least frequent of the bunch occurring in 13 RAIs. This trend was not specific to any one journal, as it was absent in over 50% of the RAIs in each of the three journals (see Table 4).

Table 4

Move Frequency

	Move Occurrence frequency		
	M1	M2	M3
IJLTT RAI (1)	1	0	1
IJLTT RAI (2)	1	1	2
IJLTT RAI (3)	1	1	1
IJLTT RAI (4)	2	1	3
IJLTT RAI (5)	1	0	1
IJLTT RAI (6)	1	1	0
IJLTT RAI (7)	1	0	0
IJLTT RAI (8)	1	0	2
IJLTT RAI (9)	1	0	1
JALCS RAI (1)	1	1	1
JALCS RAI (2)	1	0	1
JALCS RAI (3)	1	0	1
JALCS RAI (4)	1	1	3
JALCS RAI (5)	1	0	2
JALCS RAI (6)	1	0	1
JALCS RAI (7)	1	1	1
JALCS RAI (8)	1	1	1
JALCS RAI (9)	1	0	1
JALCS RAI (10)	1	1	1
JALCS RAI (11)	1	1	2
IAJSEP RAI (1)	1	0	1
IAJSEP RAI (2)	1	1	0
IAJSEP RAI (3)	1	0	0
IAJSEP RAI (4)	1	0	2
IAJSEP RAI (5)	1	1	1
IAJSEP RAI (6)	1	1	2
IAJSEP RAI (7)	1	0	1
Totals	28	13	33

3.1 Move Pattern Frequency

Table 5 and Table 6 display the frequency of move patterns both per introduction and across the entire corpus. The study uncovered three key findings. First, the CARS model was realised in nine different move configurations. Second, the most frequent sequence of moves across the three journals was Move 1 – Move 3, occurring in 13 out of 27 cases, followed by the pattern of Move 1 – Move 2 – Move 3, appearing in 7 cases. The remaining patterns were not as consistent, occurring only once or twice throughout the whole corpus. Third, two introductions, IJLTT RAI (7) and IAJSEP RAI (3), lacked any instance of Move 2 and Move 3, indicating that a research niche was not established, and the paper's work was not announced. Examining the pattern frequency in each journal separately showed that Move 1 – Move 3 was the most commonly used move construction by the authors, but the three-move pattern was not as frequent except in JALCS RAIs.

Table 5

Move Pattern Frequency

RAI	Move Pattern
IJLTT RAI (1)	Move 1 - Move 3
IJLTT RAI (2)	Move 1 - Move 3 - Move 2 - Move 3
IJLTT RAI (3)	Move 1 - Move 2 - Move 3
IJLTT RAI (4)	Move 1 - Move 3 - Move 2 - Move 1 - Move 3
IJLTT RAI (5)	Move 1 - Move 3
IJLTT RAI (6)	Move 1- Move 2
IJLTT RAI (7)	Move 1
IJLTT RAI (8)	Move 1- Move 3
IJLTT RAI (9)	Move 1 - Move 3
JALCS RAI (1)	Move 1 - Move 2 - Move 3
JALCS RAI (2)	Move 1 - Move 3
JALCS RAI (3)	Move 1 - Move 3
JALCS RAI (4)	Move 1 - Move 3 - Move 2- Move 3
JALCS RAI (5)	Move 1 - Move 3
JALCS RAI (6)	Move 1 - Move 3
JALCS RAI (7)	Move 1 - Move 2 - Move 3
JALCS RAI (8)	Move 1 - Move 2 - Move 3
JALCS RAI (9)	Move 1 - Move 3
JALCS RAI (10)	Move 1 - Move 2 - Move 3
JALCS RAI (11)	Move 1 - Move 2 - Move 3
IAJSEP RAI (1)	Move 1 - Move 3
IAJSEP RAI (2)	Move 1 - Move 2
IAJSEP RAI (3)	Move 1
IAJSEP RAI (4)	Move 1 - Move 3
IAJSEP RAI (5)	Move 1 - Move 2 - Move 3
IAJSEP RAI (6)	Move 1 - Move 3 - Move 2 - Move 3
IAJSEP RAI (7)	Move 1 - Move 3

Table 6

Overall Move Pattern frequency

Move Pattern	Count of Research Article introduction
Move 1 - Move 3	11
Move 1 - Move 2 - Move 3	7
Move 1	2
Move 1 - Move 3 - Move 2 - Move 3	2
Move 1 - Move 3	1
Move 1 - Move 2	1
Move 1 - Move 3 - Move 2 - Move 1 - Move 3	1
Move 1 - Move 2	1
Move 1 - Move 3 - Move 2- Move 3	1

3.3 Step Occurrence Frequency

Table 7 reveals several key observations. Firstly, Move 2 – Step 1A, pointing out a gap in the literature, was found to be the primary mechanism for establishing a research niche. IAJESP (6) was the sole instance where a positive justification was given alongside a research gap. Secondly, a great deal of variation was observed in the manifestation of Move 3. Except for Move 3 – Step 1 and Move 3 – Step 5, no other step was consistently realised in any of the three corpus sets. In fact, no observable trend could be identified at the level of Move 3 and its steps.

Table 7

Step Occurrence Frequency

	M1	M2-S1A	M2-S1B	M2-S2	M3-S1	M3-S2	M3-S3	M3-S4	M3-S5	M3-S6	M3-S7
IJLTT RAI (1)	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0
IJLTT RAI (2)	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0
IJLTT RAI (3)	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
IJLTT RAI (4)	2	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
IJLTT RAI (5)	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0
IJLTT RAI (6)	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
IJLTT RAI (7)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
IJLTT RAI (8)	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	0
IJLTT RAI (9)	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
JALCS RAI (1)	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1
JALCS RAI (2)	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1
JALCS RAI (3)	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1
JALCS RAI (4)	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0
JALCS RAI (5)	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	1
JALCS RAI (6)	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
JALCS RAI (7)	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
JALCS RAI (8)	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
JALCS RAI (9)	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
JALCS RAI (10)	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
JALCS RAI (11)	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
IAJSEP RAI (1)	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
IAJSEP RAI (2)	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
IAJSEP RAI (3)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
IAJSEP RAI (4)	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
IAJSEP RAI (5)	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
IAJSEP RAI (6)	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
IAJSEP RAI (7)	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Totals	28	13	0	1	27	10	1	8	0	4	7

3.3 Qualitative Move Analysis Results

Apart from frequencies, inspecting the actual construction of the three moves unveiled some rather interesting findings. Firstly, it was possible to mistake a research niche as being present in some introductions. However, upon closer inspection, the supposed niche was, in fact, a group of general statements falling under Move 1. In other words, authors alluded to the availability of a gap in practice or literature, but their phrasing of that niche was arguably so general that their intended niche became an instance of Move 1 (see Example 1).

1. Language is a primary source of communication. It is how we communicate our ideas and thoughts to others. People of all cultures, ethnicities, and social backgrounds use English as a lingua franca worldwide … While learning English, there are skills that the learner has to master to become fluent. Those skills are listening, reading, speaking, and writing. Writing skills are always less focused on in the curriculum. Also, they are not given much time and attention in class, which results in the incompetence of students' potential to master these skills. Writing, as a skill, allows students to learn a variety of other helpful skills that will benefit them in their academics, careers, and other aspects of their lives. … writing was considered a support system for acquiring grammar and vocabulary rather than a skill on its own. (IJLTT RAI (9))

Secondly, Move 3 and its subsequent steps were realised in separate sections, which were placed under the label of *"Methods"* or *"Research Methodology"* just after the literature review section. Since only discrete and explicit introductions were considered for analysis, those steps were excluded from the study performed, contributing to the variation reported above.

Thirdly, during the analysis, some instances of stretches of text not corresponding to any of the CARS model moves and steps were found scattered throughout the corpus. These occurred between two moves or within one move (see Example 2 and Example 3).

2. **[**(M3-S1) (The present study investigates whether anxiety as a psychological factor hinders fluency in IELTS test takers. From my experience as a second/foreign language instructor and as a previous IELTS test taker, solid psychological factors affect students' performance in the IELTS speaking task). (***Considerably, as reported by one upper intermediate student motivated to take the test for immigration purposes: "I get stuck when a native speaker asks me a question. I am not confident to communicate in English with a native speaker and afraid of making mistakes sounding stupid". Remarkably, the theme of getting stuck or my mind going blank is prevalent in IELTS exam preparation classrooms, and teachers struggle daily to help students overcome such an issue***) (**uncoded**). (For the study, I would reference Horwitz's foreign language anxiety, Krashen's Affective filter hypothesis, and the comprehensible input hypothesis) (M3-S4).**]** (IJLTT RAI (8))

3. **[**(M3-S1) (In this study, I aim to shed light on the impact of covid 19 on language centers in the region of Fes. To what extent, they were able to adopt to the new shift of digital use and online teaching. What kind of strategies they followed to continue the school year?) (**One of the contributing issues is tutors' awareness and expertise with online learning) (uncoded)**. (Consequently, my purpose is also to scrutinise the efforts of resilient start-ups to get along with the horrific impacts; to what extent were they able to excel in online teaching) (M3-S1).**]** (IAJSEP RAI (4))

4. Discussion & Recommendations

4.1 Qualitative Move Analysis Results

While it is true that the CARS model is there in the corpus, its execution can be questionable. On the one hand, having RAIs following a different move configuration than the prescribed one is in line with the literature reported above. On the other hand, there are instances raising the question of whether the CARS model is actually realised or is it a stroke of luck.

For example, more than half of the RAIs analysed are missing Move 2. This could be attributed to the lack of competition within a discourse community, as Benraiss (2023a) and Fredrickson and Swales (1994) did. The first found that Moroccan graduate writers of Applied Linguistics rarely interact with readers in their abstracts, and the second reported that Swedish researchers are in less competition for publication spots in Swedish journals. However, when it comes to niche creation by Moroccan researchers, Benraiss (2023) indicated that Applied Linguistics masters' students do establish a niche in their thesis introductions. Instead of attributing and limiting this lack to one probable cause, I would like to call for more research pinpointing exactly why this is the case with Moroccan graduate writers.

Another point is the extreme variation, as one can boldly claim, associated with the CARS model execution at every level. Both move pattern frequency and step frequency cannot be said to be underlined by anything constant. Maybe it is the lack of explicit CARS model training and instruction that Moroccan English majors receive throughout their study years that is the cause of this.

As it can be deduced, the brief discussion above asks more questions than it answers. Hence, it would be a fitting end to conclude the article with recommendations for future research.

4.2 Recommendations for Future Research

Clearly, more research is needed to offer a substantiated account for and understanding of the factors contributing to the inconsistencies reported. Future studies could investigate the influence of variables such as academic literacy, genre conventions, and culture on the realisation of the CARS model and its elements. Additionally, it would be beneficial to examine the relationship between the manifestation of the CARS model and the overall quality of the introduction section. Finally, the scope of the study could be expanded to compare the execution of the CARS model in introductions written in other languages by Moroccan researchers. It should be noted that conducting such studies requires teams of well-trained researchers that can systematically and reliably carry out such research.

6. References

Alaa Eldin, A. (2021). Rhetorical Structure Challenges Facing Egyptian Researchers in Writing English Research Articles for International Publication. هرمس, *10*(2), 9–38. https://doi.org/10.21608/herms.2021.199260

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. https://doi.org/10.1109/47.749366

Benraiss, K. (2023a). Interactional Metadiscourse in Applied Linguistics Research Article Abstracts of Moroccan L2 Writers of English: A Small Corpus Investigation. *International Journal of English Language Studies*, *5*(1), 23–31. https://doi.org/10.32996/ijels.2023.5.1.3

Benraiss, K. (2023b). Establishing a Niche in Applied Linguistics master thesis introductions of Moroccan L2 graduate writers of English. *Eastern Journal of Languages, Linguistics and Literatures*, *4*(2), 49–60.

Biber, D., Connor, U., & A. Upton, T. (2007). *Discourse on the Move: Using Corpus Analysis to Describe Discourse Structure*. John Benjamins Publishing.

Bruce, I. (2009). Results sections in sociology and organic chemistry articles: A genre analysis. *English for Specific Purposes*, *28*(2), 105–124. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2008.12.005

Bruce, I. (2014). Expressing criticality in the literature review in research article introductions in applied linguistics and psychology. *English for Specific Purposes*, *36*, 85–96. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2014.06.004

Chang, P., & Schleppegrell, M. (2011). Taking an effective authorial stance in academic writing: Making the linguistic resources explicit for L2 writers in the social sciences. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *10*(3), 140–151. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2011.05.005

Cotos, E. (2018). Move Analysis. In *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics* (pp. 1–8). American Cancer Society. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal1485

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. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2011.03.002

Fredrickson, K., & Swales, J. (1994). Competition and discourse community: Introductions from Nysvenska studier. In B. Nordberg, P. Linell, & B.-L. Gunnarsson (Eds.), *Text and Talk in Professional Contexts* (pp. 9–22). Scopus.

Hyland, K. (2000). *Disciplinary Discourses: Social Interactions in Academic Writing*. Longman.

Kanoksilapatham, B. (2005). Rhetorical structure of biochemistry research articles. *English for Specific Purposes*, *24*(3), 269–292. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2004.08.003

Kashiha, H., & Marandi, S. (2019). Rhetoric-specific features of interactive metadiscourse in introduction moves: A case of discipline awareness. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, *37*(1), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.2989/16073614.2018.1548294

Mliless, M. (2017). Master of Arts Theses' Abstracts in Applied Linguistics at the Faculty of Arts and Humanities, Meknes Morocco: A Genre Analysis. *International Journal of Academic Studies*, *3*(2), 37–57.

Moreno, A. I., & Swales, J. M. (2018). Strengthening move analysis methodology towards bridging the function-form gap. *English for Specific Purposes*, *50*, 40–63. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2017.11.006

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. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2005.12.003

Samraj, B. (2002). Introductions in research articles: Variations across disciplines. *English for Specific Purposes*, *21*(1), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(00)00023-5

Samraj, B. (2004). Discourse features of the student-produced academic research paper: Variations across disciplinary courses. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *3*(1), 5–22. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1475-1585(03)00053-5

Samraj, B. (2008). A discourse analysis of master's theses across disciplines with a focus on introductions. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *7*(1), 55–67. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2008.02.005

Swales, J. (1981). *Aspects of Article Introductions*. Birmingham AL.

Swales, J. (1990). *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings* (1st Edition). Cambridge University Press.

VERBI Software. (2020). *MAXQDA Analytics Pro 2020* (2020.4.2). VERBI Software. https://www.maxqda.com/products/maxqda-analytics-pro