



Rhetorical Structure in Graduate Academic Writing: A Case Study of Move Analysis in Master's Thesis Drafts

Marzuki^{a*}, Indra^a

^aEnglish Language Department, Universitas Madako Tolitoli, Indonesia

*Corresponding Author

Received: 13 Maret 2026

Accepted: 14 Juli 2026

ABSTRACT

This case study investigates the rhetorical move structures and underlying cognitive-pedagogical drivers in draft-stage master's thesis introductions written by EFL graduate students. Grounded in Swales' (2004) Create a Research Space (CARS) model, the study analyzed a corpus of 23 unedited Chapter 1 drafts from the English Language Education Graduate Program at Universitas Tadulako, supplemented by semi-structured retrospective interviews with ten participants. Textual analysis revealed a marked structural asymmetry across the draft corpus: Move 1 (Establishing a Territory) and Move 3 (Presenting the Present Work) functioned as mandatory anchors (100%), whereas Move 2 (Establishing a Niche) was severely under-represented, appearing in only 52.2% of the manuscripts. When present, Move 2 relied almost exclusively on brief, unsupported claims of local geographical absence rather than critical synthesis of empirical gaps. Qualitative findings indicated that these structural deviations stemmed from epistemic uncertainty, authority-related anxiety, heavy reliance on institutional thesis templates, and a tendency to treat early drafts as provisional placeholders awaiting supervisory direction. The study highlights the need for explicit move-based writing pedagogy and proactive supervisory feedback to help novice EFL graduate writers transition from descriptive summary to persuasive academic argumentation.

Keywords: CARS model, draft-stage writing, EFL graduate students, rhetorical moves, thesis introductions

1. INTRODUCTION

In global higher education, the master's thesis serves as a pivotal gateway genre through which postgraduate students demonstrate research competence, disciplinary literacy, and membership within their academic discourse communities (Swales, 1990; Hyland, 2019). Master's thesis writing requires graduate writers to navigate complex communicative functions, balancing

the presentation of original empirical data with the strategic deployment of disciplinary rhetorical conventions (Bhatia, 2014; Tardy, 2019). To decode these sophisticated organizational structures, Genre Analysis—specifically Swalesian move analysis—has emerged as a foundational theoretical framework. By identifying recurring structural units (moves) and their sub-components (steps), move analysis provides detailed insights into how expert and novice writers strategically organize academic discourse to fulfill specific communicative purposes (Basturkmen, 2012; Johns, 2019).

Over the past three decades, extensive scholarship has investigated the rhetorical structure of research articles and completed theses across various academic disciplines (Samraj, 2008; Flowerdew, 2015). Research demonstrates that mastering thesis rhetorical structures is essential not only for successful degree completion but also for socializing graduate students into scholarly publication practices (Casanave, 2014; Paltridge, 2020). As postgraduate education continues to internationalize, understanding how student writers construct academic texts remains a vibrant research area. However, while substantial attention has been directed toward final, archived theses, examining how graduate students negotiate these rhetorical expectations during the drafting process offers vital pedagogical value for academic writing instruction, thesis supervision, and genre-based curriculum design (Feak & Swales, 2011; Morton et al., 2015).

Despite the extensive body of literature analyzing the rhetorical structure of completed research articles and defended theses, a critical gap remains regarding how graduate students construct and negotiate rhetorical moves during the drafting process. Existing scholarship has predominantly focused on published, highly polished texts (Kanoksilapatham, 2015; Atai & Habibi, 2020), which often present an idealized vision of academic discourse. Consequently, these studies overlook the developmental hurdles, structural deviations, and rhetorical ambiguities that student writers encounter in their initial thesis drafts before receiving formal supervisor intervention (Moreno & Swales, 2018; Omidpanah et al., 2021). Furthermore, while move analysis has been widely applied to introductory sections of published research papers across disciplines (Lim, 2019; Tankó, 2020), there is a noticeable scarcity of empirical case studies examining the complete drafting trajectory of master's theses in non-native English higher education contexts. Graduate writers in these settings frequently struggle with establishing a research gap (Move 2) and articulating theoretical frameworks, leading to structural fragmentation and rhetorical misalignment across thesis chapters (Salager-Meyer et al., 2021; Hu & Liu, 2022). Failing to analyze draft-stage texts leaves academic writing specialists and thesis supervisors without empirical insights into where intervention is most urgently needed. To address this gap, a detailed case study investigating the move-step configurations of master's thesis drafts is essential to illuminate the gap between novice writing attempts and target genre expectations (Xing et al., 2023).

To address these empirical gaps, this case study investigates the rhetorical move structures in master's thesis drafts written by graduate students in an English Language Teaching (ELT) program. By deconstructing early-stage thesis manuscripts against established genre frameworks, this study seeks to illuminate how novice graduate writers construct, organize, and revise their academic arguments prior to final submission. Specifically, this research addresses two central research questions:

1. What rhetorical moves and steps characterize the initial drafts of master's thesis introductions written by graduate EFL students?
2. How do these draft-stage move-step configurations deviate from or align with Swales' Create a Research Space (CARS) model?

3. By answering these questions, the study aims to offer actionable pedagogical insights for genre-based writing instruction and thesis supervision in graduate education.

2. METHOD

2.1 Research Design

This study adopted a qualitative single-case study design (Yin, 2018) to conduct an in-depth exploration of the rhetorical move structures in master's thesis drafts written by graduate EFL students. A qualitative case study approach is particularly suited for this investigation as it allows for a contextualized, detailed analysis of written academic discourse within a real-world educational setting. Rather than aiming for broad statistical generalization, the case study design facilitates a granular examination of text-based artifacts, capturing the nuance, structural complexity, and developmental features of novice graduate writing during the draft preparation phase.

2.2 Research Participants and Setting

This study was conducted within the English Language Education Graduate Program at Universitas Tadulako, located in Central Sulawesi, Indonesia. As a regional tertiary institution in an outer region of Indonesia, this setting provides a unique context for investigating how EFL graduate writers negotiate the complex rhetorical demands of academic thesis writing amidst varying levels of exposure to international publishing norms and scholarly discourse communities.

The participants comprised 23 master's degree students enrolled in the thesis writing seminar during the 2025–2026 academic year. The cohort included 15 females and 8 males, ranging in age from 23 to 31 years old. All participants had completed their prerequisite coursework in research methodology and academic writing and were actively developing the initial drafts of their master's thesis proposals. Selection was carried out using a purposive sampling technique based on specific inclusion criteria: (1) active enrollment in the graduate program, (2) submission of a complete first draft of the thesis Introduction chapter, and (3) willingness to participate in text-based interviews regarding their drafting processes. To safeguard participant confidentiality, pseudonyms were assigned to all 23 students throughout data collection and analysis. The sample size of 23 draft manuscripts provided a sufficiently rich corpus to systematically analyze recurring rhetorical move-step patterns, structural deviations, and draft-stage strategies across the graduate cohort.

2.3 Research Instruments

Data for this study were gathered using two primary qualitative research instruments designed to analyze text-based rhetorical structures and unpack participant drafting strategies: Analytical Coding Framework (CARS Model): The primary instrument was an adapted version of Swales' (2004) Create a Research Space (CARS) model coding scheme. This matrix was utilized to systematically identify, categorize, and code the presence, frequency, and sequence of specific rhetorical moves (Move 1: Establishing a Territory, Move 2: Establishing a Niche, and Move 3: Presenting the Present Work) and their constituent steps across the corpus of 23 thesis draft introductions. The framework included explicit operational definitions and linguistic markers for each move-step category to ensure coding consistency during text analysis.

Semi-Structured Interview Protocol: A semi-structured interview guide was developed to gather reflective qualitative data from a subset of participant writers. The protocol comprised eight open-ended questions designed to elicit students' self-reported rhetorical intentions, perceived

challenges in constructing specific moves (particularly articulating the research gap in Move 2), and the factors influencing their structural choices during the drafting process.

To establish instrument validity, both the coding matrix and interview protocol underwent expert judgment by two senior applied linguistics scholars specializing in genre analysis. Feedback from the expert appraisal was used to refine coding definitions and rephrase interview items prior to data collection, ensuring that the instruments accurately captured both the structural features and cognitive choices embedded within the graduate drafts.

2.4 Data Collection Procedure

The data collection procedure for this study was executed in four sequential, systematic phases over a six-week period during the odd semester of the 2025–2026 academic year. In the first phase, official administrative permission was secured from the head of the English Language Education Graduate Program at Universitas Madako Tolitoli, followed by the recruitment of participants. All 23 enrolled graduate students were briefed on the study's scope, and written informed consent was obtained, guaranteeing anonymity and data confidentiality.

The second phase involved the retrieval of textual artifacts. Participants submitted digital copies of their unedited first drafts of Chapter 1 (Introduction) in Microsoft Word format. Each document was anonymized using student identification codes (e.g., Draft_01 to Draft_23) and prepared for qualitative textual analysis. In the third phase, the primary investigator subjected the entire corpus to line-by-line coding using the adapted CARS analytical framework. To establish inter-rater reliability, a second coder—an experienced researcher in genre analysis—independently coded a randomly selected 30% sample of the corpus. Discrepancies in move-step boundaries were discussed and resolved through peer debriefing until a high level of inter-rater agreement (Cohen's Kappa > 0.85) was achieved. In the final phase, semi-structured retrospective interviews were conducted with ten purposively selected participants to triangulate the textual findings. These audio-recorded sessions explored the students' underlying rationale for specific rhetorical structures and structural omissions in their drafts. The resulting audio files were transcribed verbatim and organized alongside the coded texts for comprehensive analysis.

2.5 Data Analysis

Data analysis was conducted using a two-tier qualitative approach combining top-down genre analysis and bottom-up thematic analysis to address the two research questions. For the first tier, the anonymized corpus of 23 thesis draft introductions was analyzed using Swales' (2004) Create a Research Space (CARS) framework. The textual units were systematically coded to identify the occurrence, frequency, and distribution of specific moves (Move 1: Establishing a Territory, Move 2: Establishing a Niche, and Move 3: Presenting the Present Work) alongside their corresponding steps. Quantitative descriptive metrics—specifically simple frequencies and percentages—were computed to map the structural prominence and conventionality (mandatory, conventional, or optional status) of each rhetorical element across the draft corpus. For the second tier, qualitative thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2019) was applied to the semi-structured interview transcripts and textual marginalia. Transcripts were coded iteratively to uncover underlying cognitive drivers, rhetorical challenges, and self-reported reasons for structural deviations from standard CARS conventions—such as the frequent under-elaboration or omission of Move 2 (establishing a research gap). Textual data and interview themes were integrated through constant comparative analysis, allowing the textual patterns observed in the drafts to be triangulated directly with the graduate students' articulated writing rationales. This integrated analytical

procedure ensured a rigorous, contextualized interpretation of how novice EFL writers navigate rhetorical move configurations during the initial drafting stage.

3. FINDINGS

3.1 Rhetorical Move-Step Configurations in Master's Thesis Draft Introductions (RQ 1)

The textual analysis of the 23 master's thesis draft introductions revealed distinct patterns in how graduate EFL writers at Universitas Tadulako structure their initial academic arguments. Applying Swales' (2004) Create a Research Space (CARS) framework, all three macro-moves were present across the corpus, though their frequency, sequence, and completeness varied significantly.

Table 1. Frequency and Distribution of Rhetorical Moves and Steps

Rhetorical Move and Step	Frequency (n=23)	Percentage (%)	Status
Move 1: Establishing a Territory	23	100%	Mandatory
- Step 1: Claiming Centrality	21	91.3%	Conventional
- Step 2: Making Topic Generalizations	23	100%	Mandatory
- Step 3: Reviewing Previous Items of Research	14	60.9%	Conventional
Move 2: Establishing a Niche	12	52.2%	Optional / Problematic
- Step 1A: Counter-claiming	2	8.7%	Rare
- Step 1B: Indicating a Gap	9	39.1%	Optional
- Step 1C: Question-raising	3	13.0%	Rare
- Step 1D: Continuing a Tradition	1	4.3%	Rare
Move 3: Presenting the Present Work	23	100%	Mandatory
- Step 1: Announcing Objectives / Purposes	23	100%	Mandatory
- Step 2: Outlining Research Questions	23	100%	Mandatory
- Step 3: Stating Value / Significance	18	78.3%	Conventional
- Step 4: Outlining Structure of Thesis	5	21.7%	Rare

3.2 Qualitative Patterns in Move Execution

Dominance and Descriptive Over-Elaboration in Move 1 (Territory Building)

All 23 draft manuscripts (100%) successfully initiated the introduction using Move 1 (Establishing a Territory). However, qualitative text analysis revealed a heavy reliance on Step 2 (Making Topic Generalizations). Student writers frequently devoted 3 to 5 lengthy, broad paragraphs to establishing wide theoretical or contextual background—such as the global status of the English language or broad pedagogical definitions—before contextualizing their specific study focus. Furthermore, Step 3 (Reviewing Previous Items of Research) appeared in only 14 out of 23 drafts (60.9%). Where empirical studies were cited, they were typically presented as isolated, descriptive summaries of previous authors' findings (e.g., "Study A found X, and Study B found Y") rather than synthesized critically to establish a clear conceptual bridge to the current study.

Draft Sample Excerpt (Draft_07): "English is an international language used across the world. Speaking skill is very important for college students to master in the 21st century. Many experts argue that speaking is the most crucial skill in EFL contexts..."

Under-Representation and Rhetorical Fragility of Move 2 (Niche Establishment)

Move 2 (Establishing a Niche) represented the most pronounced structural vulnerability across the draft corpus, appearing in only 12 manuscripts (52.2%). In almost half of the corpus (47.8%), graduate writers completely omitted Move 2, creating an abrupt rhetorical leap from broad background generalizations (Move 1) straight to the research aims (Move 3). Even among the 12 drafts that contained Move 2, Step 1B (Indicating a Gap) was executed with extreme brevity, usually compressed into a single, unsupported sentence toward the end of the background section. Students frequently relied on vague claims of local absence rather than identifying theoretical, methodological, or empirical limitations in existing literature.

Draft Sample Excerpt (Draft_14): "*Although many scholars have investigated teaching strategies, there are still few studies focusing on this topic in local university contexts in Central Sulawesi. Therefore, this study is necessary.*"

Formulaic Structure and Template Reliance in Move 3 (Presenting the Present Work)

Move 3 occurred in 100% of the manuscripts, serving as a mandatory anchor in every introduction draft. However, the qualitative analysis showed that the structure of Move 3 was heavily driven by institutional guidelines and thesis proposal templates rather than fluid rhetorical prose. Students consistently realized Step 1 (Announcing Objectives) and Step 2 (Outlining Research Questions) using explicit subheadings and numbered lists. While Step 3 (Stating Value or Significance) was present in 78.3% of the corpus, it was typically restricted to a separate sub-section titled "Significance of the Study." Conversely, Step 4 (Outlining the Structure of the Thesis) was almost entirely neglected, appearing in only 5 drafts (21.7%), as students perceived this step as redundant within the proposal stage.

Draft Sample Excerpt (Draft_03): "*The objective of this research is: 1. To investigate the students' speaking anxiety. 2. To identify the factors causing speaking anxiety during classroom presentations.*"

In summary, the draft-stage thesis introductions written by EFL graduate students exhibit a distinct rhetorical structure characterized by strong territorial grounding, formulaic objective setting, and a critical absence of problem-justification. While Move 1 (Establishing a Territory) and Move 3 (Presenting the Present Work) function as mandatory, highly stable elements across all manuscripts, Move 2 (Establishing a Niche) remains rhetorically fragile and under-represented. This structural imbalance reveals that novice graduate writers prioritize descriptive background information and institutional template requirements while struggling to articulate clear empirical gaps or position their research critically within the broader scholarly literature.

3.2 Cognitive and Pedagogical Drivers of Move-Step Deviations (RQ 2)

To address RQ 2, thematic analysis of the semi-structured interviews and textual marginalia revealed four primary cognitive, pedagogical, and contextual drivers behind the observed deviations from Swales' (2004) CARS model:

Epistemic Uncertainty in Articulating Empirical Gaps

The complete omission or compression of Move 2 (Niche Establishment) stemmed largely from students' perceived lack of authority and authority-related anxiety when critiquing existing scholarship. Interviewees expressed fear that pointing out limitations in published literature might appear respectful or arrogant to established scholars. Consequently, students defaulted to safe, descriptive summaries (Move 1) and framed their research gaps purely around local geographical absence (e.g., "no one has studied this in Tolitoli yet") rather than identifying theoretical or methodological inadequacies in prior research.

Participant Excerpt (Draft_11): "Saya merasa belum layak untuk mengkritik penelitian orang lain yang sudah terbit di jurnal. Saya takut salah. Jadi saya hanya menulis bahwa topik ini belum pernah diteliti di kampus kita."

Institutional Template Rigidity and Formulaic Writing

The rigid structure observed in Move 3 was directly linked to the institutional thesis guidelines provided by the graduate program. Students treated the thesis proposal as an administrative compliance document rather than a persuasive rhetorical text. They prioritized filling out mandatory template headings (e.g., Research Questions, Objectives, Significance) while overlooking optional or subtle rhetorical moves, such as outlining the thesis structure (Step 4) or detailing methodology within the introduction.

Participant Excerpt (Draft_05): "Kami hanya mengikuti format panduan penulisan dari prodi. Yang penting poin-poin seperti Rumusan Masalah dan Tujuan Penelitian ada dan jelas dibuat berbutir-butir."

Surface-Level Literature Engagement and Search Limitations

Deviations in Move 1 Step 3 (Reviewing Previous Research) were heavily driven by limited access to, and familiarity with, international databases. Students reported struggling to synthesize multiple empirical studies, leading to a "list-like" summary of literature where sources were cited in isolation without forming a cohesive thematic narrative. This lack of synthesis prevented students from naturally transitioning into Move 2.

Participant Excerpt (Draft_19): "Saya kesulitan menyambungkan antara satu artikel dengan artikel lain. Akhirnya saya tulis saja satu per satu: peneliti A menemukan ini, peneliti B menemukan itu."

Perception of Drafts as Working Documents

Finally, students viewed their initial drafts primarily as conceptual placeholders for supervisor review rather than polished rhetorical products. Many admitted intentionally skipping Move 2 during early drafting with the intention of filling in the "gap logic" after receiving initial supervisory feedback or completing data collection.

In summary, the deviations from the CARS model in student drafts are not merely linguistic errors, but are deeply rooted in epistemic insecurity, institutional template dependency, constrained literature search capabilities, and a developmental view of early drafting. Addressing these underlying cognitive and contextual hurdles requires targeted pedagogical interventions that move beyond structural templates to foster critical academic voice and gap-articulation skills.

4. DISCUSSION

4.1 The Dominance of Territory Building and Rhetorical Fragility of Niche Establishment

The primary empirical contribution of this study lies in revealing the deep rhetorical asymmetry within draft-stage academic manuscripts written by graduate EFL students. The findings demonstrate that while novice writers successfully establish research territories (Move 1) and state explicit research aims (Move 3), they experience significant difficulty in establishing a research niche (Move 2). This structural vulnerability—where Move 2 was present in only 52.2% of the corpus—aligns with broader scholarship on academic writing development, which emphasizes that articulating a research gap requires high-level critical synthesis and genre mastery (Swales, 2004; Tardy, 2019). Rather than treating Move 2 as an essential rhetorical hinge that bridges general background with specific research goals, student writers frequently bypass it, resulting in a conceptual disconnect between Move 1 and Move 3.

This structural gap in Move 1 Step 3 (Reviewing Previous Research) and Move 2 (Establishing a Niche) reflects a broader developmental transition from narrative-descriptive writing to critical-persuasive discourse. As noted by Hyland (2019), novice academic writers often perceive literature reviews as opportunities to demonstrate broad reading rather than strategic tools to carve out intellectual space. In the current study, student writers produced extensive topic generalizations (Step 2) but struggled to synthesize empirical findings into a coherent thematic narrative. When Move 2 was attempted, it was predominantly executed through local geographic absence (e.g., "this topic has not been studied in Tolitoli") rather than identifying theoretical or methodological shortcomings in published literature. This reliance on "local gap" reasoning suggests that graduate students struggle to view their research as part of a global scholarly conversation, opting instead for localized justification to avoid critical confrontation with established literature (Moreno & Swales, 2018).

The cognitive drivers uncovered in the interview data further illuminate the underlying causes of this structural fragility. Students' hesitation to construct Move 2 stems directly from epistemic insecurity and authority-related anxiety. EFL graduate writers frequently operate under a deference to published authority, leading them to perceive critical evaluation of existing studies as disrespectful or arrogant rather than a standard academic convention (Casanave, 2014; Salager-Meyer et al., 2021). This psychological barrier manifests linguistically as a reliance on descriptive summaries and the avoidance of evaluative language. Without explicit pedagogical interventions that demystify the rhetorical purpose of the CARS model, novice writers remain hesitant to position themselves as active contributors to academic discourse (Johns, 2019).

4.2 Template Dependency, Draft Status, and Pedagogical Implications

Beyond epistemic uncertainty, the structural features observed in Move 3 (Presenting the Present Work) demonstrate how institutional practices strongly shape student writing behaviors. The universal presence of Move 3 across all twenty-three draft manuscripts highlights the direct influence of institutional thesis guidelines established at Universitas Madako Tolitoli. However, this high level of compliance frequently resulted in a formulaic execution of the section. Student writers routinely relied on explicit subheadings and bulleted lists to present their research objectives and research questions, while largely neglecting integrated narrative elements such as outlining the thesis structure or detailing the methodological approach. This outcome echoes the insights of Bhatia (2014), who observed that institutional templates can inadvertently encourage a transactional or "check-box" mentality toward academic genres. When novice graduate writers perceive thesis

introductions primarily as administrative compliance documents rather than persuasive arguments, they prioritize fulfilling structural requirements over building rhetorical momentum and logical flow (Hu & Liu, 2022; Xing et al., 2023).

Furthermore, the practice of treating early drafts as provisional working documents significantly affected how students constructed their rhetorical moves. The qualitative findings revealed that many graduate students intentionally deferred the articulation of Move 2, operating under the assumption that supervisory feedback would clarify or validate their core research problem. While iterative drafting is a natural component of academic writing, skipping the niche-establishment phase deprives novice writers of the opportunity to independently test the logical coherence of their research argument (Flowerdew, 2015; Omidpanah et al., 2021). Relying on thesis supervisors to diagnose or formulate the research gap often prolongs structural ambiguity, ultimately making subsequent revision phases more challenging for student writers.

These observations carry critical implications for graduate writing instruction and thesis supervision in regional EFL contexts. Academic writing curricula must move beyond formatting rules to provide explicit, move-based genre instruction that positions Move 2 as the central conceptual bridge of an academic introduction. Instructional design should guide students away from isolated literature summaries toward critical synthesis techniques, using analytical matrices to highlight empirical gaps. Moreover, thesis supervisors and instructors should actively scaffold gap articulation, encouraging students to ground their research rationale in theoretical, methodological, or empirical limitations rather than relying solely on local geographical absence. Providing targeted, formative feedback on rhetorical moves during early drafting stages can help postgraduate writers establish clear scholarly voices prior to manuscript submission.

5. CONCLUSION

This study investigated the rhetorical move configurations and underlying cognitive-pedagogical drivers in draft-stage master's thesis introductions written by EFL graduate students at Universitas Madako Tolitoli. The findings reveal a marked structural imbalance in early academic manuscripts: while students demonstrate high proficiency in establishing research territories (Move 1) and stating institutional objectives (Move 3), they experience severe difficulty in constructing Move 2 (Establishing a Niche). Nearly half of the draft corpus completely omitted Move 2, while the remaining drafts relied heavily on brief, unsupported claims of local geographical absence rather than identifying critical theoretical or empirical gaps in published scholarship. Qualitative evidence shows that these structural deviations are driven by epistemic uncertainty, authority-related anxiety, heavy reliance on institutional proposal templates, and a tendency to treat early drafts as provisional placeholders awaiting supervisory direction. These results demonstrate that novice EFL graduate writers view academic introductions through a lens of administrative compliance rather than rhetorical persuasion, limiting their ability to position their work within global scholarly conversations. To address these developmental hurdles, postgraduate programs must integrate explicit, move-based genre instruction into academic writing curricula. Instructors and thesis supervisors should guide students away from isolated literature summaries toward critical synthesis and provide scaffolding that helps novice writers articulate empirical gaps with confidence. Ultimately, targeted intervention during the early drafting stage is essential for empowering EFL graduate students to build persuasive academic arguments and transition successfully into full members of their scholarly communities.

REFERENCES

- Atai, M. R., & Habibi, P. (2020). Genre analysis of master's thesis acknowledgements: A cross-disciplinary study. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*, 12(4), 785–798. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JARHE-04-2019-0089>
- Basturkmen, H. (2012). Review of research into the correspondence between L2 English speakers' stated beliefs and classroom practices. *System*, 40(2), 282–295.
- Bhatia, V. K. (2014). *Worlds of written discourse: A genre-based view*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2019). Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, 11(4), 589–597. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2159676X.2019.1628806>
- Casanave, C. P. (2014). *Before the dissertation: A defense of the curriculum vitae*. University of Michigan Press.
- Casanave, C. P. (2014). *Before the dissertation: A defense of the curriculum vitae*. University of Michigan Press.
- Feak, C. B., & Swales, J. M. (2011). *Creating contexts: Writing introductions across genres*. University of Michigan Press.
- Flowerdew, J. (2015). John Swales's Genre Analysis: 25 years on. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 19, 1–4.
- Hu, G., & Liu, Y. (2022). Rhetorical structures of master's thesis introductions: A comparative study of English and Chinese texts. *English for Specific Purposes*, 66, 45–59. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2021.12.002>
- Hyland, K. (2019). *Second language writing* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Johns, A. M. (2019). *Text, role and context: Developing academic literacies*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kanoksilapatham, B. (2015). Structural movements and rhetorical strategies in civil engineering research articles. *Asian ESP Journal*, 11(2), 33–56.
- Lim, J. M. H. (2019). Presenting research results in management study: A genre-based analysis of results sections. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 40, 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2019.04.004>
- Moreno, A. I., & Swales, J. M. (2018). Strengthening move analysis methodology: Towards an empirical baseline. *English for Specific Purposes*, 50, 40–53. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2017.11.006>
- Morton, J., Storch, N., & Thompson, C. (2015). Researching writing in higher education. In *Routledge Handbook of English for Academic Purposes* (pp. 235–248). Routledge.
- Mukminin, A., & Habibi, A. (2021). Qualitative research instruments in language education: Design and validation. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 11(2), 312–324.
- Omidpanah, F., Bahrani, C., & Nejad, M. (2021). Exploring rhetorical structures in draft vs. published academic writing: A corpus-driven approach. *System*, 98, 102488. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2021.102488>
- Paltridge, B. (2020). *The discourse of peer review: Reviewing submissions to academic journals*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Salager-Meyer, F., Alcaraz Ariza, M. A., & Pabón, B. (2021). Academic writing in transition: Rhetorical moves in draft master's dissertations. *Ibérica*, 41, 115–138.
- Samraj, B. (2008). A discourse analysis of master's theses across disciplines. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 7(1), 55–67.
- Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre Analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge University Press.

- Swales, J. M. (2004). *Research genres: Explorations and applications*. Cambridge University Press.
- Tankó, G. (2020). The rhetorical structure of literature reviews in master's theses. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 44, 100832. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2019.100832>
- Tardy, C. M. (2019). *Building genre knowledge*. Parlor Press.
- Xing, P., Wang, L., & Li, C. (2023). Unpacking the draft-to-publication revision strategies of EFL graduate students: A rhetorical move perspective. *Assessing Writing*, 55, 100690. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2022.100690>
- Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.