Rhetorical Moves of Introduction Sections in English Linguistics Research Articles From Two Non-Scopus and Two Scopus Journals

Hui Geng

English Department, Faculty of Modern Languages and Communication, Universiti Putra Malaysia, Selangor, Malaysia

Geok Imm Lee

English Department, Faculty of Modern Languages and Communication, Universiti Putra Malaysia, Selangor, Malaysia

Ilyana Jalaluddin

English Department, Faculty of Modern Languages and Communication, Universiti Putra Malaysia, Selangor, Malaysia

Helen Tan

English Department, Faculty of Modern Languages and Communication, Universiti Putra Malaysia, Selangor, Malaysia

Abstract—As the leading section in a research article (RA), the introduction typically leaves a lasting impression on the reader. It is thus necessary to make a well-crafted and organized introduction in the writing of successful RAs. However, a lack of studies has paid attention to the rhetorical moves in the non-Scopus and Scopus RA introductions in the linguistics area. Therefore, the present study first investigated the realization and essentiality of moves and steps of introductions from both corpora, and then it delved into the relationships of distributions of moves and steps of these two sources. A total of 100 English linguistics RA introductions were selected in this study. The non-Scopus and Scopus corpus each included 50 RA introductions taken from two journals. Based on the adapted Swales' (1990) Create-A-Research-Space (CARS) model and Rasmeenin's (2006) rationale, the analysis of the identification and essentiality of moves was conducted. The findings revealed that Move 3 Step 5 was a novel step used in both corpora. Besides, though there were no statistically significant relationships in the essentiality rate of moves and steps between the two corpora, divergence did exist in the essentiality categorization of Move 1, Move 3, Move 1 Step 3, Move 2 Step 1B and Move 3 Step 1A. The results of this study highlight the rhetorical convention and the essentiality of moves and steps in the common non-Scopus journals and the prestigious Scopus journals, providing a template for writers in constructing crafted introductions and getting them published in Scopus journals.

Index Terms—rhetorical moves, introduction section, linguistics research articles, Scopus-indexed journals, non-Scopus-indexed journals

I. INTRODUCTION

In the academic community, the publication of research articles in high-impact journals has always been essential. Launched in November 2004, Scopus maintains a trustful database of abstracts and citations for peer-reviewed literature. It has a wider scope than the Web of Science and a higher level of accuracy than Google Scholar (Falagas et al., 2008). In the field of linguistics and language, 997 journals were covered in the list of 2021, and 221 journals were displayed with open access. 209 journals were included in the list of Q1, Q2, Q3 and Q4. On the contrary, non-Scopus refers to the journals that are not included in Scopus's index and are frequently disregarded when evaluating researchers' performance at the international level. Logically, to gain wide acceptance from a particular research field, academic writers including experts, scholars, lecturers and even postgraduate students are pursuing publication of their findings in Scopus-indexed journals of high prestige and social recognition. Such mental engagements not only create a record of original contributions to knowledge but also lead to more opportunities for attaining excellence in their future careers (Lindahl, 2018). As a result, it is pivotal to construct a well-structured RA.

Given that a typical RA is in a highly codified rhetorical form, the rhetorical structure of each section in RA should not be underestimated. Following the hourglass IMRD (Introduction, Method, Results, Discussion) diagram (Hill et al., 1982), the introduction section is regarded as the first section that frequently affects whether readers will keep reading the RA (Grant & Pollack, 2011). This section usually provides a map to editors, reviewers and readers, and serves to situate the research regarding what the RA covers and why it matters. Besides, this opening section is required to provide crucial motivation and show the study's contribution to readers. In writing the introduction, writers have "an unnerving wealth of options" and they need to decide "the amount and type of background knowledge to be included" (Swales, 1990, p. 138). In terms of this, the proper use of rhetorical moves is of great significance. Moves are defined as

the schematic, discoursal, and the rhetorical units, performing the communicative or social functions of a particular genre (Bhatia, 2006; Swales & Feak, 2000). However, due to the introduction of RAs from different indexed sources, it has rarely been studied whether these introduction sections follow the same standard of move structure and meet the requirement of Scopus-indexed journals with high impact, particularly in the discipline of linguistics and language. Hence, this study aims to fill the gap by investigating the patterns of rhetorical moves and steps of RA introductions from non-Scopus and Scopus journals and exploring the distribution relationships in using moves between the two corpora. The findings of this study facilitated academic writers to use moves effectively and craft a well-organized linguistics RA introduction that reaches a high-ranking Scopus level.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

The introduction section, although it is typically the shortest section of an article, it always plays a decisive role in the continuation of the reading (Grant & Pollack, 2011). This section usually accounts for about 5-7 paragraphs (first 2-3 pages) of the research and reflects the originality or novelty of the work to show how the RA at hand differs from others and convince readers to continue reading (Ahlstrom, 2017). Therefore, writing a strong and well-organized introduction is of great significance. However, it remains a tough and burdensome task for both novice and expert writers. For novice writers, the pressure of reporting their research in English has widely increased. After interviewing editors from eleven English language teaching journals worldwide, Flowerdew (2001) noticed that the most problematic area for them is not the errors they made at the surface level of the English language such as the use of the article or the subject-verb agreement but the writing of inappropriate structure of the introduction section in a RA. For expert writers, they may encounter difficulties in the writing process, for instance, the amount of background information, the authoritative tone versus the sincere tone, the attractiveness to readers, and the directness of the approach they intend to incorporate (Swales & Feak, 1994). Meanwhile, researchers in social sciences are mostly well-trained in research design, methods and statistical analysis yet they have less experience in situating and arranging manuscripts, notably in the crucial RA introduction section (Ahlstrom, 2017). Furthermore, what makes this section challenging to read and far more likely to be rejected by the editorial team are framing and organizational issues (Ahlstrom, 2010). The issues include the writers' vague understanding of creating a foundation or describing a scenario for their research at the starting point, and their inability to articulate topic-related ideas in a correct sequence. For instance, when to introduce the essential terms, the background knowledge and the interest among previous researchers; where to find the proper phrases and sentences when mentioning the research gaps; and how to balance the length of the literature review that is available on the subject in the first section, etc. As a result, a detailed analysis of the introduction sections in RA is essential, and the use of the building blocks - rhetorical moves is worth to be further explored. In a way, the logical flow of the rhetorical moves in the introduction is in itself the genre of an Introduction of an RA and aspiring academic writers should emulate to achieve successful writing of RA.

Rhetorical moves are schematic units that mark textual regularities of RA introductions (Ding, 2007). They are socially recognized and have a formal structure in fulfilling the coherent communicative function in a written discourse (Swales, 2004). A move can be realized by a clause or several sentences, and their length may vary from one paragraph to multiple paragraphs. At least one proposition needs to be contained in a move (Adel & Moghadam, 2015). Moves can further be subdivided into smaller textual segments, which are sometimes called sub-moves (Nwogu, 1991), or steps/strategies (Swales, 1990; Bhatia, 1993), and these constituents also conceive communicative functions that can help writers convey their ideas. Regarding the analytical frameworks of moves, the CARS model has been put forward by Swales in the years 1981, 1990, and 2004 respectively, and the one proposed in 1990 remains the most popular and suitable. Although some studies have applied Swales' framework of move analysis and identified the rhetorical structure of academic texts and professional discourse, their focuses were on other academic fields and other academic genres, for example, the CARS model has been applied to the fields of medicine (Muangsamai, 2018), computer science (Posteguillo, 1999), biology (Samraj, 2002), biochemistry (Kanoksilapatham, 2005), engineering (Maswana et al., 2015) and forestry (Zahra et al., 2022). It has also been applied to academic texts including the traditional and article-based theses (Abdolmalaki et al., 2019), textbooks (Nwogu, 1991), and grant proposals (Connor & Mauranen, 1999). Consequently, there is a need to look into the introductions of English RAs in the field of linguistics and language. Moreover, few studies made a comparison between the application of rhetorical moves in a specific genre published in non-Scopus and Scopus citations. By knowing the rhetorical regularity of the introductions from different citation databases, the writers can have an awareness of the well-structured articles that meet the standards to publish in Scopus-indexed journals and go a step further in discerning the advantages of Scopus papers. However, the results of the investigation into non-Scopus and Scopus RAs are not enough so far. Previous studies related to the Scopus database mostly focused on its comparison of indexing speed, title coverage and duplicate citation counts with other databases such PubMed, Google Scholar and Web of Science (Barnett & Lascar, 2012; Falagas et al., 2008; Moed et al., 2016). Currently, although there was a study providing insights into the rhetorical organization and linguistic realizations of the applied linguistics RAs from the Scopus-indexed journals, the emphasis of it was on the sub-genre abstract (Kurniawan et al., 2019). It investigated the rhetorical differences from the quartile lens and found that the quartile of Scopus journals does not constantly influence the manifestation of all moves and steps. There is a lack of research from the comparative non-Scopus and Scopus perspective on the RA introductions. In this sense, the present study is relevant

and it aims to fill this gap by identifying the rhetorical moves in English linguistics RA introductions from two non-Scopus and two Scopus journals. The second objective is to investigate the essentiality categorizations and the essentiality relationships in the use of rhetorical moves in English linguistics RA introductions between the non-Scopus-indexed and Scopus-indexed journals.

III. METHODS

A. Corpus Construction

In the corpora, 50 linguistics RAs were randomly selected from two non-Scopus-indexed journals (*International Journal of English Linguistics* and *Journal of Applied Language Studies*) and another 50 linguistics RAs were from two Scopus-indexed journals (*Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics* and *3L: Language, Linguistics, Literature*) from recent issues published between 2019 and 2021. The four journals are all peer-reviewed international Open Access journals with steady quality and indexed rates. All the introduction sections were written in English to reflect current writing practices. The 100 introductions were then extracted and converted into a word file for manual text analysis, with the title, the information of author and the keywords removed.

B. Analytical Framework

The rhetorical moves were identified following the adaptation of Swales' (1990) CARS model (See Table 1), and a new step Move 3 Step 5 which was discovered in the pilot study. For inter-rater reliability, two inter-coders (one professor, and one lecturer) in applied linguistics were engaged in the study, and an agreement was reached (Cohen's Kappa = 0.814) with the researcher on the identification of the rhetorical moves. The moves and steps of the adapted Swales' (1990) Create A Research Space (CARS) Model are shown below.

TABLE 1
THE ADAPTED SWALES' (1990) CREATE A RESEARCH SPACE (CARS) MODEL

Moves	Steps	Examples
Move 1 Establishing a territory	Step 1 Claiming centrality and/or	*a large body of data, important aspect of, a central issue, wide interest in*
	Step 2 Making topic generalization(s) and/or	*is known to, are believed to be, tend to consist of, are often criticized for*
	Step 3 Reviewing items of previous research	*Smith found that, in the literature, Peterson argued that…*
Move 2 Establishing a niche	Step 1A Counter-claiming or	*is challenged by, become increasingly unreliable*
	Step 1B Indicating a gap or	*but little research, a limited range of, were restricted to*
	Step 1C Question-raising or	*it is not clear whether, the question remains, has remained unclear*
	Step 1D Continuing a tradition	*need to be analyzed, it is of interest to, it is desirable to*
Move 3 Occupying the niche	Step 1A Outlining purposes or	*the aim of this paper is, our purpose was*
	Step 1B Announcing present research	*this paper evaluates the effect on, this research presents, this study focuses on*
	Step 2 Announcing principal findings	*this approach provides, our results indicate*
	Step 3 Indicating research article structure	*we have organized, this paper is structured as follows*
	Step 4 Evaluation of findings	*close to the optimum achievable bound*
	Step 5 Expectation from findings	*it is hoped that*

C. Data Analysis

In both the non-Scopus and Scopus journals, the moves and steps were operationally identified and manually coded by tagging chunks of texts and underlining the typical parts which indicated the move and step elements. Chunks of texts were marked as No. 1, 2, 3 according to the moves proposed in Swales' (1990) model, and the moves and steps identified were recorded by using a Table template (See Table 2). According to Zhang and Wannaruk (2016), a move was characterized as a chunk of text that contained at least one complete sentence and served a specific communicative function. This meant that whenever a sentence or combination of sentences fit the description of any move or step in the coding system, it was regarded to be an instance of a move or step regardless of its length.

TABLE 2
EXAMPLE OF IDENTIFYING THE OCCURRENCE OF MOVES

1	This paper is an attempt to fill this research gap and thus aims to address the following question.	Move 3	Step 1A

In this example for the identification of moves, Move 3 Step 1A was used in the chunk of text. The writer introduces the solution to the problem by stating the main purpose or aim of the study with the underlined typical parts.

Regarding the essentiality of moves, researchers have set the essentiality rate or the inclusion rate to represent the percentage of texts that include the move at least once (Lu et al., 2021). Kanoksilapatham (2005) proposed the cut-off rates in the essentiality of moves as 60%, i.e., a move is considered obligatory if it occurs at 60% or above. A move is optional if it occurs less often than 60%. Rasmeenin (2006) argued that a move would be viewed as obligatory if it

existed in 100% of the corpus, conventional if in between 66% and 99% of the corpus, and optional if in less than 66% of the corpus. This cut-off standard was set in a more specific way and it had a range of percentages to measure the move stability. Therefore, the current study followed Rasmeenin's (2006) and Lu et al.'s (2021) rationale in examining the proportion or the percentage of RA introductions that contains each rhetorical move at least once to make the decision. Moreover, the constituent steps in each move were also measured in the same way. For example, if a certain move or step was found in all the 50 RA introductions in a corpus, its essentiality rate would be 50 out of 50 (100%). If this move or step was found in 49 RA introductions, its essentiality rate would be 49 out of 50 (98%).

Besides, to make the comparison of the use of moves between the two corpora, descriptive statistics were used by the auxiliary software SPSS (version 26). According to the results in SPSS, the essentiality rate of rhetorical moves in each corpus was generated. Through the method of inferential statistics, Chi-square was utilized to further explore the correlation in the essentiality rates of rhetorical moves between the non-Scopus and Scopus journals.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Rhetorical Moves and Steps and Their Essentiality Rates

The RAI (research article introduction) leads readers by Move 1 (establishing a territory), Move 2 (establishing a niche) and Move 3 (occupying the niche). The purpose of Move 1 is to describe the general landscape of the research. Move 2 presents the niche on the topic, asserting the need for new research by emphasizing existing gaps. Move 3 then reveals the solutions, demonstrating how they help to address a given gap.

To answer the first part of the research objective, Table 3 presents the number of RAs that contain each move, the essentiality rates, and the essentiality categorization. The essentiality rate refers to the percentage of research articles (N=50 in each corpus) that include each move (or step). Thus, it is also called the inclusion rate, representing the texts' covering range for each move (or step). Through the essentiality rate, the essentiality level can be known, and this indicates how necessary a move or step is in RA introductions from different corpora.

TABLE 3
THE ESSENTIALITY OF MOVES IN ENGLISH LINGUISTICS RAIS FROM THE NON-SCOPUS-INDEXED AND SCOPUS-INDEXED JOURNALS

Non-Scopus Corpus (N=50 introductions)	Moves	No. of RAIs	Essentiality Rates	Essentiality
	Move 1	49	98%	Conventional
	Move 2	41	82%	Conventional
	Move 3	50	100%	Obligatory
Scopus Corpus (N=50 introductions)	Moves	No. of RAIs	Essentiality Rates	Essentiality
	Move 1	50	100%	Obligatory
	Move 2	48	96%	Conventional
	Move 3	48	98%	Conventional

From the results in Table 3, Move 1 was categorized as a conventional move in the non-Scopus corpus but an obligatory one in the Scopus corpus. Move 2 was viewed as conventional in both corpora. Besides, Move 3 was decided as obligatory in the non-Scopus corpus but conventional in the Scopus corpus. Then the essentiality of the 13 steps in the three moves would be discussed in detail (See Table 4).

TABLE 4
THE ESSENTIALITY OF STEPS IN MOVE 1

Non-Scopus Corpus (N=50 introductions)	Moves and Steps	No. of RAIs	Essentiality Rates	Essentiality
	Move 1	**49**	**98%**	**Conventional**
	Move 1 Step 1	20	40%	Optional
	Move 1 Step 2	46	92%	Conventional
	Move 1 Step 3	45	90%	Conventional
Scopus Corpus (N=50 introductions)	Moves and Steps	No. of RAIs	Essentiality Rates	Essentiality
	Move 1	**50**	**100%**	**Obligatory**
	Move 1 Step 1	14	28%	Optional
	Move 1 Step 2	49	98%	Conventional
	Move 1 Step 3	50	100%	Obligatory

Move 1 Step 1 (Claiming Centrality)

Move 1 Step 1 was considered as an optional step in both types of corpora as the essentiality rate was less than 66% when following Rasmeenin's (2006) rationale. In the non-Scopus corpus, the findings varied from journal to journal in the field of linguistics. For example, Taheri and Salehi (2020) found that Move 1 Step 1 was presented in 100% of the RA introductions from the non-Scopus journals in the field of ELT (English Language Teaching), while Alharbi (2021) found that this step (claiming centrality) was realized by two branches - claiming importance in the research and claiming importance in the real world and it was included in about 67% of linguistics RA introductions. Hence, there is a high fluctuation in the essentiality of this step and it could be optional, conventional, or obligatory in the non-Scopus corpus. In the Scopus corpus, most of the previous studies discovered that this step was conventional. For instance, Rahman and Amir (2017) proposed that 85% of Scopus linguistics RA introductions had this step, and Chinaprayoon (2016) discovered the inclusion rates of this step among three different Scopus journals were 94.74%, 81.82%, and

70.00% respectively. However, in the current study, the essentiality of this step was optional. The difference is mainly due to the writers' priority to the use of Move 1 Step 2 and Step 3. They are more likely to choose topic generalizations and literature reviews to justify why the territory is important, rather than purely mentioning the increased interest in a research area.

Move 1 Step 2 (Making Topic Generalization)

Move 1 Step 2 was conventional in both types of corpora in the current study. This finding agrees with Alharbi's (2021) findings which showed this step was conventional and it has been found in 87% of RA introductions in the non-Scopus-indexed *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ)* and 93% of RA introductions in the Scopus-indexed *English for Specific Purposes (ESP)* journal in the area of linguistics. The writers from both corpora were used to providing statements about the existing condition and the well-accepted evidence for a worth-investigating topic. This finding implies that Move 1 Step 2 functions as a tool to pave the way for maintaining the validity of a phenomenon.

Move 1 Step 3 (Reviewing Items of Previous Research)

Move 1 Step 3 was included in 90% of linguistics RA introductions in the non-Scopus journals and 100% of linguistics RA introductions in the Scopus journals. As for the non-Scopus corpus, the present result is slightly different from Taheri and Salehi's (2020) study, in which Move 1 Step 3 was contained in 68% of the RA introductions from the non-Scopus journals in the sub-field of applied linguistics. Though the inclusion rate in their finding was 22% lower than the current finding, the essentiality of this step was the same. It was considered conventional in the non-Scopus corpus. While in the Scopus corpus, this step marked its presence throughout the entire corpus and was taken as obligatory. This finding suggests that from the more experienced writers' view, this step can not only assist in extending readers' knowledge on a particular topic but also make the current study fit into the research literature. By applying this step in the RA introductions, the commonly acknowledged facts, and the current state of the topic of research can be highlighted, and the evolution of knowledge within the field can be illuminated.

TABLE 5
THE ESSENTIALITY OF STEPS IN MOVE 2

Non-Scopus Corpus (N=50 introductions)	Moves and Steps	No. of RAIs	Essentiality Rates	Essentiality
	Move 2	**41**	**82%**	**Conventional**
	Move 2 Step 1A	10	20%	Optional
	Move 2 Step 1B	27	54%	Optional
	Move 2 Step 1C	5	10%	Optional
	Move 2 Step 1D	9	18%	Optional
Scopus Corpus (N=50 introductions)	Moves and Steps	No. of RAIs	Essentiality Rates	Essentiality
	Move 2	**48**	**96%**	**Conventional**
	Move 2 Step 1A	11	22%	Optional
	Move 2 Step 1B	33	66%	Conventional
	Move 2 Step 1C	2	4%	Optional
	Move 2 Step 1D	17	34%	Optional

Move 2 Step 1A (Counter-Claiming)

As shown in Table 5, Move 2 Step 1A was optional in both corpora. Findings from this study supported earlier works on a large scale. It agrees with Taheri and Salehi's (2020) results, which demonstrated that only 4% of linguistics RA introductions contained this step in the non-Scopus corpus. The finding also accords with Chinaprayoon's (2016) earlier observations, which showed that this step was optional and had an inclusion rate of less than 55% in the linguistics RA introductions from all three Scopus journals. Therefore, in the linguistics field, whether the journals are non-Scopus or Scopus, this step is optional. This suggests that most writers prefer not to put forward a set of conflicting or contradictory evidence to show their understanding of "the state of the art", and their hesitation in making such a negative evaluation of previous research may lie in the "face culture" and the lack of spirit in challenging the authority.

Move 2 Step 1B (Indicating a Gap)

Move 2 Step 1B was included in 54% of RA introductions in the non-Scopus-indexed journals and 66% of RA introductions in the Scopus-indexed journals. It could be considered optional in the non-Scopus corpus but conventional in the Scopus corpus. As for the non-Scopus corpus, this finding is similar to what Alharbi (2021) has found. There were merely 40% of linguistics RA introductions covering this step and its essentiality of it was optional. Regarding the Scopus corpus, there were similarities and differences in the essentiality rate among different linguistics journals. The current finding is consistent with those of Rahman et al. (2017) who confirmed that this step was conventional and was used in 80% of RA introductions. The present result is also congruent with the essentiality of step analysis in the *Journal of Second Language Writing*, in which 76.67% of RA introductions have covered this step. However, in the *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, this step was considered optional because only 63.64% of RA introductions contained it (Chinaprayoon, 2016). Though this inconsistency may be due to the difference in corpora size of the Scopus-indexed journals, Move 2 Step 1B comparatively exists in a higher percentage of RA introductions than Move 2 Step 1A in both corpora.

Move 2 Step 1C (Raising a Question)

Move 2 Step 1C was considered optional in both types of corpora. According to previous studies, this step was seldom covered in RA introductions in the field of linguistics. For example, in Taheri and Salehi's (2020) research, this

step was detected in 8% of RA introductions from non-Scopus-indexed journals. In Rahman and Amir's (2017) work, their adapted framework in move analysis of Scopus-indexed corpus did not mention this step. In Chinaprayoon's (2016) work, this step was merely discovered in 18.42%, 9.09%, and 23.33% of three Scopus journals respectively. Consequently, it could be extrapolated that the vague or unclear parts of previous studies were seldom pointed out in a question form by emerging writers in the linguistics published articles.

Move 2 Step 1D (Continuing a Tradition)

Move 2 Step 1D was detected in 18% of RA introductions in the non-Scopus-indexed journals and 34% of RA introductions in the Scopus-indexed journals. It could be considered optional in both types of corpora but the inclusion rate was doubled in the Scopus corpus compared with the non-Scopus corpus. This result is consistent with earlier observations in which none of the linguistics RA introductions contained this step in the non-Scopus corpus (Taheri & Salehi, 2020). While in the Scopus corpus, this finding agrees with Rahman et al.'s (2017) findings which showed that 30% of linguistics RA introductions used this step. In their research, Move 2 Step 1D is mentioned as "add to what is known", and functions as pursuing a research direction or continuing a research tradition that has already been undertaken. This step is used quite rarely in the linguistics RA introductions in both types of corpora.

TABLE 6
THE ESSENTIALITY OF STEPS IN MOVE 3

Non-Scopus Corpus (N=50 introductions)	Moves and Steps	No. of RAIs	Essentiality Rates	Essentiality
	Move 3	**50**	**100%**	**Obligatory**
	Move 3 Step 1A	32	64%	Optional
	Move 3 Step 1B	40	80%	Conventional
	Move 3 Step 2	0	0%	Optional
	Move 3 Step 3	11	22%	Optional
	Move 3 Step 4	7	14%	Optional
	Move 3 Step 5	7	14%	Optional
Scopus Corpus (N=50 introductions)	**Moves and Steps**	**No. of RAIs**	**Essentiality Rates**	**Essentiality**
	Move 3	**48**	**98%**	**Conventional**
	Move 3 Step 1A	34	68%	Conventional
	Move 3 Step 1B	34	68%	Conventional
	Move 3 Step 2	2	4%	Optional
	Move 3 Step 3	6	12%	Optional
	Move 3 Step 4	7	14%	Optional
	Move 3 Step 5	11	22%	Optional

Move 3 Step 1A (Outlining the Purposes)

As shown in Table 6, Move 3 Step 1A was included in 64% of RA introductions in the non-Scopus-indexed journals and 68% of RA introductions in the Scopus-indexed journals. It was optional in the non-Scopus yet conventional in the Scopus corpus. In the previous studies, this step was not extracted independently for move analysis in linguistics RA introductions. Move 3 Step 1A and Move 3 Step 1B were usually categorized into a broader step, which was "announcing present research descriptively or purposively" (Alharbi, 2021; Amnuai & Wannaruk, 2013; Chinaprayoon, 2016; Rahman et al., 2017). While in the current study, this finding related to Step 1A was new because this step put more emphasis on stating the aim or purpose of solving the research question. Consequently, writers would use certain infinitive phrases such as "is to, tends to, attempts to" or noun phrases such as "the objective of, the purpose of, the aim of" to show the authors' desire in introducing how the paper would occupy the niche.

Move 3 Step 1B (Announcing Present Research)

Move 3 Step 1B was conventional in both corpora. As mentioned earlier, this step was usually analyzed together with Move 3 Step 1A in previous studies in the linguistics area (Alharbi, 2021; Amnuai & Wannaruk, 2013; Chinaprayoon, 2016; Rahman et al., 2017). These researchers considered Move 3 Step 1A (outlining purposes) and Move 3 Step 1B (announcing present research) together as one step, which was Move 3 Step 1 (announcing present research descriptively or purposively). It suggested that either Step 1A or Step 1B appear, a researcher would report Step 1 as an inclusion. Due to their broader categorization, the previous results were different from the current one. For example, Alharbi (2021) found that Move 3 Step 1 was covered in 93% and 100% of linguistics RA introductions from the non-Scopus and Scopus corpus respectively. Rahman et al. (2017) also found that Move 3 Step 1 was obligatory and was available in all the applied linguistics RA introductions in the Scopus corpus. Therefore, the finding in the current study was novel because it had a more specific division of Move 3 Step 1.

Move 3 Step 2 (Announcing Main Findings)

Move 3 Step 2 was contained in none of the RA introductions in the non-Scopus-indexed journals and 4% of RA introductions in the Scopus-indexed journals. This step was optional in both corpora. Regarding the non-Scopus corpus, another two studies also confirmed its absence in all the linguistics RA introductions from Arab and Thai journals (Alharbi, 2021; Amnuai & Wannaruk, 2013). As for the Scopus corpus, Rahman et al. (2017) observed that there were no linguistics RA introductions containing the step of announcing principal outcomes, while Chinaprayoon (2016) discovered that linguistics RA introductions from different Scopus-indexed journals had different inclusion rates for this step. There were 28.95%, 18.18%, and 10% of linguistics RA introductions covered this step in *English for Specific Purposes*, *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, and *Journal of Second Language Writing* respectively. Since the

inclusion rates were obviously less than 66%, they shared the same essentiality of this step. Alharbi (2021) found that this step was optional and it was used in 6% of RA introductions. These results suggest that the inclusion rate and the essentiality of Move 3 Step 2 were kept consistent and optional in both non-Scopus and Scopus journals in the field of linguistics.

Move 3 Step 3 (Indicating the Structure of the Paper)

Move 3 Step 3 was used in 22% of RA introductions in the non-Scopus-indexed journals and 12% of RA introductions in the Scopus-indexed journals. It could be treated as an optional step in both corpora. Concerning the non-Scopus corpus, Alharbi (2021) reported a 13% inclusion rate of this step in linguistics RA introductions from Arab journals, and Amnuai and Wannaruk (2013) put forward a 5% inclusion rate of this step in linguistics RA introductions from Thai journals. In the Scopus corpus, Chinaprayoon (2016) found that 39.47%, 31.82%, and 53.33% of linguistics RA introductions contained this step in three various journals. While Alharbi (2021) mentioned that none of the linguistics RA introductions covered this step in the Scopus corpus. Together with the current study, there was a range of inclusion rates from 5% to 30% in the non-Scopus corpus and a range of 0% to 60% inclusion rates in the Scopus corpus. However, no matter how many introductions covered this step, it would be always optional in both corpora.

Move 3 Step 4 (Evaluation of Findings)

Move 3 Step 4 was included in 14% of RA introductions in both the non-Scopus-indexed and the Scopus-indexed journals. This step was optional in both corpora. However, this step was seldom discussed in the field of linguistics in previous studies. According to Swales (1990), this step was most often found in research that aimed to develop new methods, such as chemistry and engineering and it was mostly left until the discussion section rather than the opening introduction section. As a result, the current finding is meaningful. Though writers would not always propose new methods for applied linguistics or other social science subjects, they also had the option to use this step to show that their findings could hold water and attract the readers' attention at the beginning of their papers.

Move 3 Step 5 (Expectation from Findings)

Move 3 Step 5 was detected in 14% of RA introductions in the non-Scopus-indexed journals and 22% of RA introductions in the Scopus-indexed journals. This step could be considered optional in both corpora. Similar to the previous step, the prior studies have not delved much into the inclusion rate or essentiality of this step as it was only discovered in the pilot study in the current study. The writers used it as an option because they would show their strong beliefs or how helpful their papers were. As the first section followed by the abstract, a good introduction should be captivating to persuade readers to go through.

In conclusion, findings from this research have revealed three conventional steps and ten optional steps from the RA introductions in the non-Scopus-indexed journals, and one obligatory step, four conventional steps, and eight optional steps from the RA introductions in the Scopus-indexed journals. Therefore, for writers who are pursuing to publish RAs in Scopus-indexed journals, it is better to follow the essentiality regularity in the Scopus corpus, using Move 1 Step 3 as compulsory and using Move 1 Step 2, Move 2 Step 1B, Move 3 Step 1A and 1B as frequent as possible.

B. The Relationships in Essentiality Rate of Moves and Steps Between the Two Corpora

Table 7 shows the relationships in the essentiality rate of each move in English linguistics RA introductions between the non-Scopus-indexed and Scopus-indexed journals.

TABLE 7
CHI-SQUARE ANALYSIS INDICATING RELATIONSHIPS IN THE ESSENTIALITY RATE OF EACH MOVE IN ENGLISH LINGUISTICS RA INTRODUCTIONS BETWEEN THE NON-SCOPUS-INDEXED AND SCOPUS-INDEXED JOURNALS

Moves	N=100 (Each Scopus N=50)		Chi-Square Value	df	Asymp. Sig.
	Non-Scopus	Scopus			
Move 1	49	50	.010[a]	1	.920
Move 2	41	48	.551[a]	1	.458
Move 3	50	48	.041[a]	1	.840

Based on the results of the Chi-Square goodness of fit test in Table 7, as the significant values (p) all exceeded alpha (α= .05), there was no sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis. That is, the distribution of each move in the RA introductions is independent of the indexing of journals. From a macro point of view, this result confirmed that writers from both corpora had an awareness of using Move 1, Move 2 and Move 3 in a large percentage of their introductions. The lack of associations in the essentiality rate of each move in the two datasets may be attributed to the basic norms and fundamental standards in academic publishing, whether in non-Scopus or Scopus journals. According to Kallestinova (2011), moves are like traffic indicators that guide the readers down the route of writers' ideas. Each move should be used with thought and care as its function is significant in constructing RA introductions. Therefore, from a broader sense, the writers from both the non-Scopus and Scopus corpora may have a notification of the obvious traffic lights (such as red, green, and yellow), however, for the detailed information of an indicator (such as how many minutes the red light will last when crossing a road), writers from the non-Scopus corpus may have fewer ideas. In the current study, it is the subtle nuances in the essentiality rate that caused the divergences in the essentiality categorization of moves between the two corpora. For example, the most essential move in the Scopus corpus was Move 1, but writers in the non-Scopus gave particular prominence to Move 3. Thus, it can be concluded that no matter how slight the

statistical dependence appeared in the essentiality rate, writers need to follow the essentiality category convention of moves and steps in the Scopus corpus if they manage to get their papers published in Scopus-indexed journals.

Table 8 demonstrates the relationships in the essentiality rate of each step in English linguistics RA introductions between the non-Scopus-indexed and Scopus-indexed journals.

TABLE 8
CHI-SQUARE ANALYSIS INDICATING RELATIONSHIPS IN THE ESSENTIALITY RATE OF EACH STEP IN ENGLISH LINGUISTICS RA INTRODUCTIONS
BETWEEN THE NON-SCOPUS-INDEXED AND SCOPUS-INDEXED JOURNALS

Moves and Steps	N=100 (Each Scopus N=50)		Chi-Square Value	df	Asymp. Sig.
	Non-Scopus	Scopus			
Move 1 Step 1	20	14	1.059[a]	1	.303
Move 1 Step 2	46	49	.095[a]	1	.758
Move 1 Step 3	45	50	.263[a]	1	.608
Move 2 Step 1A	10	11	.048[a]	1	.827
Move 2 Step 1B	27	33	.600[a]	1	.439
Move 2 Step 1C	5	2	1.286[a]	1	.257
Move 2 Step 1D	9	17	2.462[a]	1	.117
Move 3 Step 1A	32	34	.061[a]	1	.806
Move 3 Step 1B	40	34	.486[a]	1	.485
Move 3 Step 2	0	2	/	/	/
Move 3 Step 3	11	6	1.471[a]	1	.225
Move 3 Step 4	7	7	.000[a]	1	1.000
Move 3 Step 5	7	11	.889[a]	1	.346

Based on the results of the Chi-Square goodness of fit test in Table 8, as the significant values (p) all exceeded alpha (α= .05), each step was found to be significantly independent on the indexing of journals. The lack of significant associations in the essentiality rates of each step (from Move 1 Step 1 to Move 3 Step 5) may be due to the small corpora sizes of RA introductions. For instance, Move 1 Step 3 was conventional in the non-Scopus but obligatory in the Scopus corpus. The subtle differences in the essentiality rate led to the divergent categorization of this step's essentiality between the two corpora.

The current result suggested that most writers may have a general sense of covering the steps in the construction of their RA introductions when they are seeking publication. However, they may not be clear about the targeted essential order of which steps should be used in the striking place in the different corpora. In other words, they are unsure about how necessary the moves and steps are used in the non-Scopus-indexed journals and Scopus-indexed journals (Can et al., 2016), and as mentioned before, this leads to the instability of categorizing the essentiality of certain moves and steps between the two corpora. If the corpora were enlarged, there would be more evident relationships showing in the essentiality rates.

V. CONCLUSION

This paper investigated the use of rhetorical moves and their essentiality features in English linguistics RA introductions between two non-Scopus-indexed and two Scopus-indexed journals. According to the results of the identification of moves and steps, Move 3 Step 5 (expectation from findings) was the new step found in the present study and it contributed to the theoretical Swales' (1990) CARS framework. As it was a novel rhetorical strategy detected in the English linguistics RA introductions, previous studies had not focused on this step and no results had been mentioned. Different from Step 4 (evaluation of findings), this step mostly shows the prediction of future studies or aspirations based on the findings. The results suggested that the more experienced writers from the Scopus corpus preferred to look into the future with confidence. Meanwhile, though there were no significant associations regarding the essentiality rates of the three moves and thirteen steps by inferential statistics, there was a divergence in the categorization of essentiality based on the subtle nuances from Rasmeenin's (2006) rationale. The essentiality categorization differences were reflected in Move 1 (establishing a territory), Move 3 (occupying the niche), Move 1 Step 3 (reviewing items of previous research), Move 2 Step 1B (indicating a gap) and Move 3 Step 1A (outlining purposes). At the move level, in addition to the conventional Move 2 in both corpora, Move 1 was conventional in the non-Scopus corpus but obligatory in the Scopus corpus. Move 3 was obligatory in the non-Scopus corpus but conventional in the Scopus corpus. Therefore, the most essential move in the Scopus corpus is Move 1. At the step level, Move 1 Step 3 was considered conventional in the non-Scopus corpus but obligatory in the Scopus corpus. As this step marked its presence throughout the entire RA introductions from the Scopus corpus, it is necessary for the writers to follow this rhetoric convention if they are eager to get their research published in Scopus journals. Move 2 Step 1B and Move 3 Step 1A were considered optional in the non-Scopus corpus but conventional in the Scopus corpus, thus, it is suggested that gap indication and purpose outlining of research are comparatively important in Scopus journals' publication. Hence, the most necessary steps in the Scopus corpus were Move 1 Step 3 (100%), followed by Move 1 Step 2 (98%), Move 3 Step 1A (68%), Move 3 Step 1B (68%) and Move 2 Step 1B (66%). The findings obtained in this study are meaningful as they shed light on the construction of RA introduction by noticing the patterns and the essentiality of rhetorical moves in those renowned Scopus-indexed journals. It is better for novice writers to follow the

essentiality order and keep the stability of using moves and steps that are always covered in the Scopus journals with high reputations.

The limitation of this research lies in the relatively small size of the corpora. This study was confined to analyzing rhetorical moves from 50 introductions from each corpus. In the future, the corpora could be enlarged. Meanwhile, since only the RA introductions in the linguistics subject were investigated, the findings of this study would not be generalized to other disciplines, other sections, and other academic genres. For further research, it would be possible to conduct interdisciplinary studies to make a comparison of the rhetorical structure across other sections, other disciplines, and other academic genres, especially those texts in high-impact Scopus journals from the academic community.

REFERENCES

[1] Abdolmalaki, S. G., Tan, H., Abdullah, A. N. B., Sharmini, S., & Lee, G. I., (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.

[2] Adel, S. M. R., & Ghorbani Moghadam, R. (2015). A comparison of moves in conclusion sections of research articles in psychology, Persian literature and applied linguistics. *Teaching English Language, 9*(2), 167-191.

[3] Ahlstrom, D. (2010). Clearing the first hurdle at the Asia Pacific Journal of Management. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management, 27*(2), 171-177.

[4] Ahlstrom, D. (2017). How to publish in academic journals: Writing a strong and organized introduction section. *Journal of Eastern European and Central Asian Research, 4*(2), 1-9.

[5] Alharbi, S. H. (2021). A Comparative Genre-Based Analysis of Move-Step Structure of RAIs in Two Different Publication Contexts. *English Language Teaching, 14*(3), 12-24.

[6] Amnuai, W., & Wannaruk, A. (2013). Investigating Move Structure of English Applied Linguistics Research Article Discussions Published in International and Thai Journals. *English Language Teaching, 6*(2), 1-13.

[7] Barnett, P., & Lascar, C. (2012). Comparing Unique Title Coverage of Web of Science and Scopus in Earth and Atmospheric Sciences. *Issues in Science and Technology Librarianship, n70* (Sum 2012). http://doi.org/DOI:10.5062/F4W37T8C

[8] Bhatia, A. (2006). Critical discourse analysis of political press conferences. *Discourse & Society, 17*(2), 173-203.

[9] Bhatia, V. K. (1997). Genre-mixing in academic introductions. *English for specific purposes, 16*(3), 181-195.

[10] Can, S., Karabacak, E., & Qin, J. (2016). Structure of moves in research article abstracts in applied linguistics. *Publications, 4*(3), 1-16.

[11] Chinaprayoon, W. (2016). Move Analysis of Introduction Section in Applied Linguistics Research Articles (Doctoral dissertation, Burapha University).

[12] Connor, U., & Mauranen, A. (1999). Linguistic analysis of grant proposals: European Union research grants. *English for specific purposes, 18*(1), 47-62.

[13] Ding, H. (2007). Genre analysis of personal statements: Analysis of moves in application essays to medical and dental schools. *English for specific purposes, 26*(3), 368-392.

[14] Falagas, M. E., Pitsouni, E. I., Malietzis, G. A., & Pappas, G. (2008). Comparison of PubMed, Scopus, web of science, and Google scholar: strengths and weaknesses. *The FASEB journal, 22*(2), 338-342.

[15] Flowerdew, J. (2001). Attitudes of journal editors to nonnative speaker contributions. *TESOL quarterly, 35*(1), 121-150.

[16] Gabillon, Z. (2005). L2 learner's beliefs: An overview. *Journal of Language and learning, 3*(2), 233-260.

[17] Grant, A. M., & Pollock, T. G. (2011). Publishing in AMJ—Part 3: Setting the hook. *Academy of management journal, 54*(5), 873-879.

[18] Hill, S. S., Soppelsa, B. F., & West, G. K. (1982). Teaching ESL students to read and write experimental-research papers. *TESOL quarterly, 16*(3), 333-347.

[19] Housen, A., De Clercq, B., Kuiken, F., & Vedder, I. (2019). Multiple approaches to complexity in second language research. *Second language research, 35*(1), 3-21.

[20] Kallestinova, E. D. (2011). How to write your first research paper. *The Yale journal of biology and medicine, 84*(3), 181-190.

[21] Kanoksilapatham, B. (2005). Rhetorical structure of biochemistry research articles. *English for specific purposes, 24*(3), 269-292.

[22] Kurniawan, E., Lubis, A. H., Suherdi, D., & Danuwijaya, A. A. (2019). Rhetorical Organization of Applied Linguistics Abstracts: Does Scopus Journal Quartile Matter? *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies, 19*(4), 184-202.

[23] Lindahl, J. (2018). Predicting research excellence at the individual level: The importance of publication rate, top journal publications, and top 10% publications in the case of early career mathematicians. *Journal of Informetrics, 12*(2), 518-533.

[24] Lu, X., Casal, J. E., Liu, Y., Kisselev, O., & Yoon, J. (2021). The relationship between syntactic complexity and rhetorical move-steps in research article introductions: Variation among four social science and engineering disciplines. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 54*, 1-13. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2021.101006.

[25] 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.

[26] Moed, H. F., Bar-Ilan, J., & Halevi, G. (2016). A new methodology for comparing Google Scholar and Scopus. *Journal of informetrics, 10*(2), 533-551.

[27] Muangsamai, P. (2018). Analysis of moves, rhetorical patterns and linguistic features in New Scientist articles. *kasetsart Journal of social sciences, 39*(2), 236-243.

[28] Nasirizadeh, Z., Paramasivam, S., Nimehchisalem, V., & Omar N. (2022). Rhetorical Structures and Cyclical Patterns in Forestry Research Articles. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies, 22*(2), 288-311.

[29] Nwogu, K. N. (1991). Structure of science popularizations: A genre-analysis approach to the schema of popularized medical texts. *English for specific purposes, 10*(2), 111-123.

[30] Pintrich, P. R. (2003). A motivational science perspective on the role of student motivation in learning and teaching contexts. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 95*(4), 667-686.

[31] Posteguillo, S. (1999). The schematic structure of computer science research articles. *English for specific purposes, 18*(2), 139-160.

[32] Rahman, M., Darus, S., & Amir, Z. (2017). Rhetorical structure of introduction in applied linguistics research articles. *Educare, 9*(2), 69-83.

[33] Rasmeenin, C. (2006). *A structural move analysis of MA thesis discussion sections in applied linguistics*. Mahidol University.

[34] Samraj, B. (2002). Introductions in research articles: Variations across disciplines. *English for specific purposes, 21*(1), 1-17.

[35] Swales, J. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings.* Cambridge University Press.

[36] Swales, J. M. (2000). *English in today's research world: A writing guide (No. 428 S71).* University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI (EUA).

[37] Swales, J. M. (2004). *Research genres: Explorations and applications.* Cambridge University Press.

[38] Swales, J. M., & Feak, C. B. (1994). *Academic writing for graduate students (pp. 155-6).* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

[39] Taheri, R., & Salehi, H. (2020). *Genre Analysis of ELT and Psychological Academic Written Discourse Through Introduction*, 5th National Conference on Language, Literature and Peace Discourse 2019, Qazvin, Iran. https://en.civilica.com/doc/1021532/

[40] Zhang, B., & Wannaruk, A. (2016). Rhetorical Structure of Education Research Article Methods Sections. *PASAA: Journal of Language Teaching and Learning in Thailand, 51*, 155-184.

Hui Geng is a Ph.D. candidate at the Department of English, Faculty of Modern Languages and Communication, Universiti Putra Malaysia. Her research interests are in the areas of corpus linguistics, academic writing, EAP, ESP, second language acquisition, literature and translation. Email: huiyuqiankun@gmail.com

Geok Imm Lee is a senior lecturer at the Department of English, Faculty of Modern Languages and Communication, Universiti Putra Malaysia. Her research interest is in applied linguistics, specifically focusing on the skill and practice of writing. Email: gilee@upm.edu.my

Ilyana Jalaluddin is a senior lecturer at UPM. She has researched and published books and articles related to TESL, teaching of writing skills, ESL writing skills and self-efficacy development. Her current research focuses on the use of technology in teaching and learning of writing skills. Email: ilyana@upm.edu.my

Helen Tan is a retired associate professor from the Department of English, Faculty of Modern Languages and Communication, Universiti Putra Malaysia. She has over 30 years of teaching experience both in the school and in the university. To date, she has published over 80 articles, books and proceedings that mainly focus on writing practices. Email: htanlopez07@gmail.com