

Analysis of Rhetorical Structures in Writing Introduction Section of Research Article Written by Native English

Nadya Ramadhanty¹

¹English Education Program, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, University of Bengkulu, 38371, Indonesia

Article Info

Article history:

Received: July, 2025

Revised: July, 2025

Accepted: July, 2025

Keywords:

Rhetorical moves, linguistic, research article, introduction, native English, CARS Model

ABSTRACT

This research was purposely conducted to describe the Rhetorical Structures of Native English in the writing introduction section of research articles. The data was chosen from the research article published by two disciplines of journal which is *Journal of Pragmatics (JOP)* and *Journal of English for Academic Purposes (JEAP)*. This present study was conducted to find out whether the introduction section of the selected introduction in both journals follows the fundamental CARS Model by Swales (2004). Ten introductions of research articles from both journals were annotated in this research. Five research publications were deliberately selected from each discipline. The findings indicate that the introduction sections of research articles from two journal disciplines authored by native English speakers predominantly encompass the moves and steps outlined in Swales' (2004) CARS model, with Move 1 and Move 3 regarded as a mandatory move. Meanwhile, Move 2 is regarded as arbitrary. In conclusion, it can be inferred that the utilization of rhetorical patterns is not contingent upon the authors' proficiency in written language; rather, authors must implement rhetorical realizations in composing their introductions.

Corresponding Author:

Nadya Ramadhanty

Email: nadyarmdhnty@unib.ac.id

1. INTRODUCTION

Recently, research articles in the academic world have increasingly shown the significance of large amounts of innovations and knowledge being transferred. Research is described as a planned inquiry employing scientific techniques (quantitative, qualitative, observational, and experimental) to address important issues and generate extra or new information. It is also known as a methodological approach to addressing unanswered questions or examining the nature of current issues (Salari, Wardak & Shafiq, 2025). In addition, Noorzan & Page (2012) claimed that a collection of paper, scientific journal, a conference paper or an academic monograph is known as a research article. A research article comprises three primary sections such as Introduction, Procedure (Methods & Results), and Discussion.

In this research, the main focus is only on the introduction section. Introduction section of Research Article (RA) is the first section to be read by readers. This section is important because if readers are not impressed in reading the Introduction section, they will not continue to read the whole article. It must be written in the most appealing and captivating manner possible since it is the opening section of a research study (Wannaruk & Amnuai, 2016). Swales and Feak (1994) asserted

that the primary objectives of the introduction are to furnish a compelling rationale to captivate readers' interest. Moreover, Tavakol and O'Brien (2023) argue that providing a clear comprehension of the research article is the primary goal in composing an introduction, as it will guide the readers to evaluate and interpret the research. Bisri (2016) has claimed his perspective about introduction, which has several aspects such as a logical reason regarding the worth of conducting based on the data, fact and analysis from prior research. Then, the introduction should enclose the problem that is not easy to solve. It also needs to provide a brief summary of the problem that will be examined in relation to the researcher's scope. Last, it provides a concise overview of the research problem's domain. The introduction section encompasses several essential elements of the research piece. Readers may choose to ascertain whether it is their original finding or a continuation of prior research.

Successful publication in the global realm necessitates that scholars recognize the significant diversity in text construction. It is a systematic arrangement employed to organize content in a written work to persuade and influence readers regarding the text's significance. Despite the fact that Rhetorical Moves play a crucial role in writing, most academic writers overlook Rhetorical Patterns. Numerous studies have been carried out regarding the rhetorical patterns in research articles across diverse contexts. Many experts have focused their emphasis in recent decades on the study of introduction parts.

Moreover, numerous studies have been conducted examining the rhetorical tendencies of non-native speakers in formulating the Introduction portion of research articles (refer to Arsyad, 2013; Adika, 2014; Arsyad & Wardhana, 2014; Suryani et al., 2014; Abdullah, 2016; Parnawati et al., 2017; Samad et al., 2017; Muangsamai, 2018; Pujiyanti, 2018). Furthermore, various studies have been performed to focus on the differences in rhetorical structure in the RA introduction section for Native Speaker and Non-Native Speaker writers (see Khany & Tazik, 2010; Sheldon, 2011; GEÇİKLİ, 2013; Agrawal 2015; Wannaruk & Amnuai, 2016; Farnia & Barati, 2017; Samanhudi, 2017). Not unexpectedly, study focuses on RAs written in English, with occasional attention paid to RAs published in other languages, particularly in terms of contrastive rhetoric. At the moment, the introduction section of the research article is the major focus of attention since it is seen as an essential component that authors use in order to captivate readers and spark their interest in the research subject that is presented throughout the article (Lim, 2012).

Several studies have been conducted to investigate rhetorical moves among Indonesian writers across various disciplines (Adnan, 2009; Arsyad, 2013, Parnawati, 2017, Ramadhanty, 2020). Most of the studies conducted proposed similar results that most Indonesian authors do not completely employ rhetorical patterns in writing Introduction section, especially the existence of indicating a gap is quietly low. However, the rhetorical patterns of native English in writing introductions are rarely found. This present research aims to examine the rhetorical structure in the introduction sections in Journal of Sciences and English Specific Purposes Journal written by native English writers.

2. METHOD

This research employed a mixed methods approach, integrating quantitative and descriptive analyses of the data. This study employed content analysis to examine the data. The quantitative analysis comprised a straightforward descriptive statistic of frequency counts regarding moves and steps in the introduction sections. The qualitative analysis identified the language realizations in the moves and steps according to their communicative aim. The collection of research publications was deliberately chosen from the Journal of Pragmatics (JOP) and the Journal of English for Academic Purposes (JEAP) available on SCIEDIRECT. The researcher purposefully picked two separate disciplines of the journal to determine whether there were any notable variations between these two disciplines of the journal. The writer intentionally selected the research written by native English speakers based on their institutional affiliations. The articles set included a total of 10 Research Article (Ras) written by native speakers of English. The sample size was limited as this constituted

a preliminary investigation aimed at identifying rhetorical moves and steps. This study's tool is text analysis, which involves using a checklist of moves and steps in the introductions to research articles. The researcher analyzed the whole part of the Introduction section using Creating a Research Space (CARS) model proposed by Swales (2004). The researcher used numerous approaches to identify each of the motions and phases from the introductory portion of research papers, including gathering research articles from journal sources. Read the whole introductory parts. Identifying the hint that represents each move and stage of the CARS Model. Finally, categorize the research.. Each of the articles was given a code to make research easier for researchers to identify and present it. Finally, the result was presented in the table.

3. RESULT(S) AND DISCUSSION

This section presents and analyzes the findings in relation to Swales' (2004) CARS model and other published studies. The findings of the study are presented below..

Table 1. Occurrences of Move 1 in RA introduction

MOVE	STEP	JOP (N=5)	JEAP (N=5)	TOTAL (N=10)
Move 1: Establishing a research territory (M1)	Step 1: Claiming Centrality (S1)	5	5	10
	Step 2: Making Topic Generalization (S2)	5	5	10
	Step 3: Reviewing Previous Research (S3)	5	5	10

Table 1 illustrates the occurrence of Move 1 and the components from the introductions of research articles across both data. M1 comprises three components: claiming centrality, generalizing the topic, and evaluating prior research. The data revealed that three phases were identified in both the JOP and the JEAP. M1S1 aims to articulate the research issue and provide justifications for the importance of investigating the topic. This is an illustration from the study.

Extract 1: “A gap between theory and practice has been repeatedly observed in EAP. On the one hand, some EAP research has been criticized for fad[ing] away before offering well-articulated pedagogical applications” (B5)

The raised sample is derived from the JOP. The sample one above pertains to M1S1 because "had been repeatedly observed" implies that the issue or phenomenon is important to address. In favor of M1S1, both journals discipline each step. Thus, they are essentially the same.

M1S2 aims to elucidate the current state of knowledge and offer a consent description of phenomena.. Here is the Extract of the study:

Extract 2: “ADM is a systematic approach to the mental process used by aircraft pilots to consistently determine the best course of action in response to a given set of circumstances. A key part of ADM, situation awareness is the perception of the elements” (A4)

The aforementioned extract was sourced from the *JOP*. The observation in extract 2 relates to M1S2, as it concerns the description of the researcher's domain. In M1S2, both journals regulate each step. Consequently, a clear differentiation between them does not exist.

M1S3 seeks to consolidate existing research that supports the need to investigate the research issue. This is an illustration of the phase derived from the analysis of research articles:

Extract 3: “Most notable in this regard is Sorjonen and Raevaara's (2014) ground-breaking study of how customers in Finnish kiosks in a systematic and orderly fashion format and time the production of their requests in close coordination with their progression towards the counter and the service provider. Sorjonen and Raevaara (2014) thus convincingly demonstrate that the spatial and temporal relationship between a customer and a service provider has a direct impact on linguistics” (A1)

The aforementioned extract was sourced from the JOP. extract 3 referenced above pertains to M1S3, as it is explicitly articulated that the investigation conducted by Sorjonen and Raevaara (2014) examines “how customers in Finnish kiosks structure and time their requests in close coordination with their approach to the counter and the service provider.” M1S3 was evident in all of the RA throughout both publications. Thus, distinction can not be found between two.

Table 2. Occurrences of Move 2 in RA introduction

MOVE	STEP	JOP (N=5)	JEAP (N=5)	TOTAL (N=10)
Move 2: Establishing a niche (M2)	Step 1A: Indicating A Gap (S1A)	3	1	4
	Step 1B: Adding to what is known (S1B)	1	1	2
	Step 2: Presenting Positive Justification (S2)	-	-	-

Table 2 presents the occurrences of Move 2 in the introductions of RA across both journal fields. Move 2 comprises three steps which are S1A, S1B, S2. The researcher's study indicates that not all stages in Move 2: Establishing a Niche were recorded in both the JOP and the JEAP. Swales (2004) enhanced the CARS model from its earlier iteration (1990). Similar to the preceding structure, Move 2 consisted of four steps: establishing a counterclaim, identifying a gap, raising a question, and maintaining tradition. Swales' (2004) modified CARS model changed these steps: counterclaiming and finding a gap were combined into a single phase called "showing a gap," while raising a query and maintaining tradition were merged into another stage called "contributing to existing knowledge. Additionally, he incorporates an optional component, Step-2 (offering a positive rationale), within Move 2. This study found a reduced number of additional steps as amended by Swales (2004).

M2S1A was discovered in three research publications in the JOP, but just one research article in the JEAP had Step 1A. This stage is designed to focus the research challenge on a gap or understudied section of the literature. Here is an extract from the analysis.

Extract 4: “Eight years since DePalma and Ringer theorized about adaptive transfer, however, transfer scholarship in composition studies and that of EAP and L2 writing still appear separate entities despite greater general attention within composition studies to the presence of multilingual students in institutions of higher education in the United States” (B2)

The sample presented was obtained from the JEAP. The extract 4 presented above is derived from M2S1A. The phrases "however" and "still appear" indicate that previous research or theories remain insufficient. In the JOP, 50% of the research articles analyzed reference a gap identified in previous studies or hypotheses. Conversely, in the publications of the JEAP, the researcher identified only one article that indicated the gap, as previously illustrated. Many articles in the JEAP employ the terms "However" or "Therefore" as transitional phrases to contrast with the preceding sentence, rather than omitting a connection. These statements fail to adequately identify the gap, as they do not specify

what remains unaddressed or the absence of prior theory or research. In M2S1A, the two journal fields exhibit notable divergence.

To finalize the statement of gap, proceed to M2S1B. This phase is meant to highlight a gap in the current region. Certainly, the gap that says require supporting comments to convey to the reader that the concerns under consideration are important to be a researcher. Here's an extract of the phase based on research article analysis:

Extract 5: "While adaptive transfer has the potential to bridge this divide, it has so far received only limited theoretical engagement (Donahue, 2018; Hendricks, 2018) and empirical examination (Alexander, DePalma, & Ringer, 2016; Baird & Dilger, 2017). Others, such as Grujicic-Alatriste (2013), have questioned if a methodology for empirically examining adaptive transfer is possible to design at all." (B2)

This step appears exclusively in a single research study published in the JEAP. The aforementioned extract, sourced from the JEAP, pertains to M2S1B. The remarkt is reinforced by an expert's citation, highlighting the gap identified in the preceding sentence. An expert's identification of a gap or understudied topic indicates the significance of the research subject warranting further investigation. This phase is identified exclusively in a single research paper across both journal fields.

No instances were identified in either the JOP or the JEAP for M2S2. M2S2 aims to address a deficiency in the existing literature to bolster the current research efforts. The amended model by SWALES (2004) viewed this step optionally occurring. This step was not acknowledged in any of the examined study publications.

Table 3. Occurrences of Move 3 in RA introduction

MOVE	STEP	JOP (N=5)	JEAP (N=5)	TOTAL (N=10)
Move 3: Occupying the niche (M3)	Step 1A: Outlining Purpose (S1A)	3	5	8
	Step 1B: Announcing Present Research (S1B)	3	5	8
	Step 2: Announcing Principle Findings (S12)	3	3	6
	Step 3: Indicating RA Structure (S3)	4	3	7

Table 3 above presents the occurrences of Move 3 in the introductions of RA from both journals. The analysis indicates that most publications in the JOP and the JEAP employed the steps outlined in move 3 as proposed by Swales (2004).

The JOP' introduction for three research papers and the JEAP introduction for every research article had M3S1A. The goal of this stage is to provide a response to the "so what?" query. This is an illustration of the process used in the analysis of research articles:

Extract 6: "This paper therefore aims to illustrate and give extracts, in an impressionistic way, of this apparent divergence between EAP research and practice" (B3)

The aforementioned sample is sourced from the JEAP. The writers clearly articulated the research objective by asserting, "this paper therefore aims," thus categorizing extract 6 under M3S1A. This phase was predominantly employed in the introductions of research papers in both journals. This procedure was employed in all research publications within the JEAP that constituted the data for this study. This procedure was utilized in only 50% of the study publications in the JOP.

Then, M3A1B is the second step in Move 3. The JOP introduction for three research papers and the JEAP introduction for every research article had this step. This stage is meant to explain the

study's goal in terms of what the investigation will achieve. This is an illustration of the process used in the analysis of research articles:

Extract 7: "From this epistemic perspective, the article addresses two questions. The first is: how do persons with Alzheimer's "do remembering," or more precisely "do forgetting," in their interactions with the examining clinician? The second question is: how does "doing forgetting" morph over the progression of the disease: from interactionally troubled, but benign, in early stages to (something like) interactionally pathological in late stages?" (A2)

This extract 7 is sourced from the JOP. extract 7 above exemplifies M3S1B, as the statement "the article addresses two questions" signifies that the current research identifies two issues requiring resolution. This step was identified in the introductions of all RA from the JEAP. This step was identified in the introductions of only three articles from the JOP.

Then, M3S2 is the third stage of Move 3. The introduction of two journal disciplines in both research papers mostly contained this stage. The objective of M3S2 is to deliver an effective and comprehensive summary of the primary conclusions that have been published. This is an illustration of the process used in the analysis of research articles:

Extract 8: "The results, similarly to Cowley-Haselden and Monbec (2019), show a rather low application of theory in EAP textbooks, suggesting that learners' issues with transition markers might be reinforced by unsuitable teaching materials, as suggested by Lei (2012, p. 273)." (B5)

Extract 8 presented above is sourced from the JEAP. extract 8 above corresponds to M3S2, as the writer summarizes the result by declaring, "the result, similarly to...". The outcome is typically presented in the results and discussion section. This section includes a summary of the outcomes or findings to present a clear overview of the problem's resolution. This step was observed in a comparable manner across both disciplinary journals. The two disciplinary journals are comparable.

The final step in M3S3. This step is also frequently encountered in both the JOP and the JEAP. This phase is designed to explain how the rest of the paper will be arranged. Here's an extract of the phase based on research article analysis:

Extract 9: "The structure of the paper is as follows. After a brief discussion of data and methodology (Section 2), I turn to the history of each DDM, first by the way, by far the most frequent and richly diversified DDM (Section 3.1), then by the by(e) (3.2), incidentally (3.3), and parenthetically (3.4)" (A3)

Extract 9 presented above is sourced from the JOP. extract 8 illustrates M3S3, as the writer successfully identifies and elucidates the structure. The phrase "The structure of the paper is as follows" signifies a discussion regarding the organization of a RA. This step was noted in the introductions of four research articles published in the JOP. This step was noted solely in the introductions of three research publications in the JEAP.

The extracts provided establish the steps involved in each motion of Swales' CARS model (2004). The data also reveal differing figures for the JOP and the JEAP. All phases in Move 1 were included in all of the study publications. This step might be construed as a necessary move for Native English writers. It is possible since this stage is critical for defining and articulating the seriousness of the topic, which has become the first step in doing research. This has also occurred in prior studies by numerous scholars (Adnan, 2009; Arsyad, 2013; Parnawati, 2017). These studies examined rhetorical patterns in the introduction sections produced by Indonesian speakers. Both Indonesian speakers and Native English speakers regard Move 1 as an essential component. Swales (2004) identified this step as crucial and examined the potential for cyclical patterns in the introduction. Conversely, fewer than half of the research paper introductions from the JOP and the JEAP contained all stages of Move 2. M2S2 was absent from the introductions of all study publications in both journals.

This step may be regarded as an optional action by native English writers. The occurrence may be attributed to the writers of RA addressing the need to avoid gaps or underexplored topics within the study domain. Instead of stating the knowledge gap, the majority of writers just utilize research

challenges to support their research. Finally, Move 3 appeared in the introductions of the majority of research publications from the *JOP* and the *JEAP*. Move 3 might be considered as a compulsory move for Native English writers.

It is possible since this move is used to describe the current study that will be conducted, and the writers strive to entice the reader with the substance of the RA, since the introduction is the first section to be read. There is no substantial variation in the rhetorical patterns described by Swales (2004) in his CARS model across both of the journal fields examined by researchers. The writers only differ slightly in how they sequence the actions and stages. In the *JOP*, writers frequently begin their introduction with move 1, particularly step 1, which claims primacy. On the contrary, in the *JEAP*, the writer often begins the introduction by defining the goal of the current research.

4. CONCLUSION

The researcher's analysis of the rhetorical patterns in RA introduction published in native English yields several conclusions. It has been discovered that native English speakers in both journal fields believe that Move 1 is a crucial element that any introduction should include. Secondly, native English speakers in the two journal disciplines consider Move 2 to be optional, seeing that most of the writers utilize research challenges to clarify their work. It has been observed that native English speakers across both journal disciplines regard Move 3 as essential, as it allows the writer to elucidate their current research. The application of rhetorical patterns does not revolve around the writer's expertise in the written discourse of the RA; instead, writers must possess rhetorical awareness when composing their introduction. The outcomes from this research are significant for students and academics seeking to enhance their understanding of rhetorical structures in academic writing, which are essential for producing effective RA. The application of rhetorical structures in writing assists students and researchers in executing and ordering the content of their research paper introductions effectively. The introduction section serves as the initial part of the article, necessitating effective writing to engage readers and encourage further exploration of the content. This result necessitates that the lecturer provide material on rhetorical structures to students, as producing an article is now a requirement for completing their studies.

REFERENCES

- Abdolmalaki, S. G., Tan, H., Abdullah, A. N., Sharmini, S., & Geok Imm, L. (2019). Introduction Chapter of Traditional and Article-based Theses: A Comparison of Rhetorical Structures and Linguistic Realisations. *GEMA Online® Journal of Language Studies*, 19(1), 116–135. <https://doi.org/10.17576/gema-2019-1901-07>
- Adika, G. S. K. (2016). Swales' Cars Model and the Metaphor of Research Space: An illustration with an African Journal. *Legon Journal of the Humanities*, 25, 58–75. <https://doi.org/10.4314/ljh.v25i1.4>
- Adnan, Z. (2009). Some potential problems for research article written by Indonesian academics when submitted to international English language journals. *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly*, 11(1), 107-125.
- Arsyad, S. (2013a). A Genre-Based Analysis on The Introductions of Research Articles Written by Indonesian Academics. *TEFLIN Journal*, 24(2), 180–200.
- Arsyad, S. (2013b). A genre-based analysis of Indonesian research articles in the social sciences and humanities written by Indonesian speakers. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, 8(3), 234–254. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17447143.2013.849711>
- Arsyad, S., & Adila, D. (2018). Using local style when writing in English: The citing behaviour of Indonesian authors in English research article introductions. *Asian Englishes*, 20(2), 170–185. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2017.1327835>

- Arsyad, S., & Wardhana, D. E. C. (2014). Introduction in Indonesian Social Sciences and Humanities Research Articles: How Indonesian Writers Justify Their Research Projects. *Jurnal Linguistik Indonesia*, 32(2), 149–163.
- Farnia, M., & Barati, S. (2017). Writing Introduction Sections of Research Articles in Applied Linguistics: Cross-Linguistic Study of Native And Non-Native Writers. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 7(2), 486–494. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v7i2.8357>
- Faryadi, Q. (2018). PhD Thesis Writing Process: A Systematic Approach—How to Write Your Introduction. *Creative Education*, 09(15), 2534–2545. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ce.2018.915192>
- Fazilatfar, A. M., & Naseri, Z. S. (2016). The Study of Rhetorical Moves in Applied Linguistics Research-Based Articles Written by Iranian Researchers. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 8(6), 154–173. <https://doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v8i6.10468>
- Huda, T. (2016). Reflection of rhetorical pattern in the Introduction of academic research reports. *Proceeding of International Conference on Teacher Training and Education*, 1(1), 657-662.
- Husnussalam, H. (2016). The Analysis of EFL Students' Errors In Writing Skripsi. *ELTIN Journal*, 4(1), 21–27.
- Khany, D. R. (2011). Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning Year53 No. 222. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, 53(222), 71–95.
- Mirahayuni, N. K. (2002). *Investigating textual structure in native and non-native English research articles: Strategy differences between English and Indonesian writers*. University of New South Wales.
- Muangsamai, P. (2018). Analysis of moves, rhetorical patterns and linguistic features in New Scientist articles. *Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences*, 39(2), 236–243. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.kjss.2018.03.006>
- Parnawati, T. A., Basthomi, Y., & Ruslan, S. (2017). Rhetorical Moves in the Introductions of Islam-Related Research Articles. *Jurnal Pendidikan Humaniora*, 5(4), 169–174. <https://doi.org/10.17977/um030v5i42017p174>
- Pescante-Malimas, M. A., & Samson, S. C. (2018). Linguistic Error Analysis on Students' Thesis Proposals. *IAFOR Journal of Language Learning*, 3(2), 193–209. <https://doi.org/10.22492/ijll.3.2.09>
- Pujiyanti, I., Arsyad, S., & A, A., Arono. (2019). Rhetorical Structure Analysis on Introduction Chapters of English Master Theses by Indonesian Postgraduate Students. *IJEE (Indonesian Journal of English Education)*, 5(2), 143–164. <https://doi.org/10.15408/ijee.v5i2.8423>
- Rahman, M., Darus, S., & Amir, Z. (2017). Rhetorical Structure of Introduction in Applied Linguistics Research Articles. *International Journal for Educational Studies*, 9(2), 69–84.
- Ramadhanty, N. (2021). Rhetorical Patterns in the Writing of Introduction Section of Research Articles in English Academic. *e-Journal of Linguistics*, 16(1), 125-136. <https://doi.org/10.24843/e-jl.2022.v16.i01.p13>
- Salari, M. W. ., Wardak, M. S., & Shafiq, K. (2025). Research and Research Types. *Journal of Natural Sciences – Kabul University*, 6(2), 45–71. <https://doi.org/10.62810/jns.v6i2.364>
- Samad, I. A., Usman, B., Rizkanisa, N., & Fitriani, S. S. (2018). Non-Native Speakers' Rhetorical Commonalities in Writing Script Introduction Section. *Lingua Cultura*, 12(2), 141–147. <https://doi.org/10.21512/lc.v12i2.2475>
- Samanhudi, U. (2017). Introduction of Research Articles in Applied Linguistics by Indonesian and English Academics. *Indonesian Research Journal in Education*, 1(1), 58–71.

-
- Samraj, B. (2005). An exploration of a genre set: Research article abstracts and introductions in two disciplines. *English for Specific Purposes*, 24, 141-156.
- Sarkawi, D. (2017). Rhetorical Moves in Introduction Sections of Academic Journal Articles. *SMCC Higher Education Research Journal*, 4(1). <https://doi.org/10.18868/sher4j.04.00817.02>
- Suryani, I., Hashima, N., Yaacob, A., Rashid, S. A., & Desa, H. (2013). Rhetorical Structures in Academic Research Writing by Non- Native Writers. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 3(1), 29–38. <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v3n1p29>
- Swales, J., & Feak, C. (1994). *Academic writing for graduate students*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Swales, J. (2004). *Research genres: Explorations and applications*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wannaruk, A., & Amnuai, W. (2016). A Comparison of Rhetorical Move Structure of Applied Linguistics Research Articles Published in International and National Thai Journals. *RELC Journal*, 47(2), 193–211. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688215609230>