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ABSTRACT

Writing an effective literature review is not an easy task for novice writers of research articles, who are oftentimes unaware of the exact functions and purpose of this section; they are often unsuccessful in establishing the necessary connection between what has already been reviewed and the proposed research. This paper discusses the rhetorical patterns of the literature review (LR) section of Hospitality and Management (HM) research articles (RAs) from the perspective of genre analysis using the move structures as posited by Swales (2004). Twenty literature reviews from research articles in the Hospitality and Management discipline were analyzed to determine the move structure of the LR section. A moves analysis was carried out to identify the main moves and steps in the LR section. The analysis indicates that the LR sections display cyclical move patterns that show the presence of the 3 moves and their respective steps as postulated in Swales (2004) revised CARS model, but with some variations. The findings show that the LR section has Move 1 as an obligatory step and that HM RA writers favour making general statements about current situations as a beginning strategy. The findings further show that Move 2 Step 1B, ‘Adding to what is known’, is prevalent in the LR section because the writers will go on to contribute to the existing field of research by adding other research findings that are deemed necessary. Another outcome is that only Move 3-Step 1 is prevalent while the other 6 steps are either not found at all or are present in only a few of the samples.
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INTRODUCTION

The genre analysis approach has been used as a framework for analyzing non-
literary texts in diverse scholarly domains such as linguistics, rhetoric, and English for Specific Purposes (ESP), to name a few. Furthermore, genre analysis has been used as a tool for developing educational practices, specifically in the area of writing (Hyon, 1995). Hyon (1995) states that genre theory has developed in three considerably different schools of thought, namely, the North American New Rhetoric studies (e.g. Miller, 1984; Berkenkotter and Huckin, 1993), Australian Systemic Functional Linguistics (Martin,1992; Halliday & Hassan, 1985) and English for Specific Purposes (e.g. Swales, 1990, Bhatia, 1993; Dudley-Evans, 1994).

Swales’ (1981b, 1990, 2004) formalistic approach to genre was both influenced by Hymes’ linguistic approach to ‘natural’ speech events and Millers’ rhetorical approach, which focused on ‘formal’ speech events. Swales expanded the area of genre studies by paying attention to written scientific discourse. As a formalist, his attention is focused on the physical attributes and properties of a genre. He argues that many of the guidelines on teaching students to write in the academic, professional and scientific fields are much too general to be effective for the reason that they do not take the specific genre, audience and context into consideration (Swales, 1981b, 1990, and 2004). Hence, Swales defines genre as a “recognizable communicative event characterized by a set of communicative purpose(s) identified and mutually understood by members of the professional or academic community in which it regularly occurs”. Swales (1990) contends that these communicative events and purpose(s), for which the text was initially written, shape the genre and give it an internal structure; that is to say, they determine the choice of linguistic styles as well as that of the text structure. Furthermore, the knowledge of the internal structure of the genre is acquired by specialist members of a specific professional or academic community from their extensive experience and arduous training within that specialist community (Swales, 1990). Accordingly, Swales developed a framework for analyzing the written genres of research articles’ (RA) introductions based on those approaches. The fundamental nature of Swales’ (2004) framework, which is called Create a Research Space (CARS) model and is used for introductions in RAs, was adopted and adapted from his earlier models.

Writing the literature review (LRs) is invariably a laborious task, inasmuch as the first and foremost priority is to understand the functions and features of a literature review (Paltridge, 2002), or employ similarities that are either multifaceted (Krathwohl and Smith, 2005) or that have a tendency to be culturally-specific to users of English as a first language (Kamler and Thomson, 2006). Only recently has the discussion of LRs in thesis or thesis-related documents begun to appear (Kwan, 2006). Hart (1998, 2001) defines the LR as both an argumentation for a student’s research and as part of the practice whereby he/she learns about his/her topic as well as the field (Kwan, 2006). Bruce (1994) carried out a study of how
students understood the notion of LR and discovered that, in general, it was conceived to be both a product (a written report of LR) and a process (reading and learning) through which one gains an understanding of the topic as well as insights into research facilitation. According to Yang and Zequan (2003), there are also cases whereby the literature reviews are written as historical narratives, devoid of critical comments from the authors. The literature review should 'make critical compilations of studies done previously', 'make a critical valuation of the literature that was studied' (Kramer et al., 1995) and 'progress by having a critical attitude'. In order to successfully carry out a critical analysis, researchers pay significant attention to the importance of writing an argument in a literature review, which should 'put forward arguments and counter-arguments' (Cryer, 1996), 'present a clear argument' (Hitchcock 1996), and present 'reference to studies that support the current argument,' (Locke et al., 1997).

In spite of the number of studies that have been carried out, research on the LRs in RAs remains underexplored (Kwan, 2006). This is the first study for the LR sections in RAs in Hospitality and Management (HM) using Swales' 2004 CARS model, which, as of yet, has not come to the foreground of public knowledge. Previous studies have used Swales’ 1990 model. This study is novel in that it applies the 2004 model to an unexplored area in HM RAs LR sections. Therefore, this paper will focus on and explore the terrain of the LR sections in HM RAs. An important aim of this paper is to describe the genre of RAs in HM through their rhetorical strategies in order to provide a detailed analysis. This paper will reveal the rhetorical strategies employed in writing the literature review section as well as describe how, and in which ways, its practices and textualization remain distinctive, with the primary aim being to contribute to the rhetorical understanding of this text as a distinctive genre. Since introductions in RAs and LRs share similar rhetorical purposes, it is possible that the two part-genres display similar rhetorical structures and propositional contents. As such, the researchers have argued for the use of the CARS model (Swales, 2004) to examine the moves of the LRs in HM RAs.

SWALES REVISED CARS MODEL (2004)

The main conceptual framework for this paper is developed from Swales’ (2004) CARS Model concept of moves (See Fig.1). In this paper, the rhetorical structures or features refers to the organization of ideas in a specific text or a part thereof, along with the textual features of the text based on an analysis of the semantic or communicative components of the text. Coulthard and Brazil (1979) suggest that there are two important characteristics of a unit analysis to consider in discourse analytic studies, i.e. ‘…what position or purpose it has in the organization of other larger units and what its own internal structure is’ (p.7). In this paper, the semantic unit of a text in the data analysis is called a Move. A Move may consist of one or more consequent
features called Steps. Therefore, the internal structure of a particular Move is made up of different types of Steps together with their position, their communicative functions and their sequence. Hence, using Swales revised CARS Model (2004) as shown in Fig.1, the analysis of the schematic structures of the LR section identified in this paper can provide a useful reference for students and novice writers of HM RAs on how to organize and develop arguments in their LRs.

MATERIALS AND METHODS
This study is based on genre analysis, with the samples studied being 20 RAs from the Journal of Hospitality and Management published between the years 2004 - 2006. The history of this journal provides a necessary backdrop to this study by yielding insights of the writing conventions that explicate the social interactions within the HM discourse community.

The International Journal of Hospitality and Management discusses the main trends and developments in various disciplines as they relate to the hospitality industry. The variety of topics covered by the journal includes the following: human resources management; consumer behaviour and marketing; business forecasting and applied economics; operational management; financial management; planning and design; information processing; education and training; technological developments; national and international legislation. The

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Move 1</th>
<th>Establishing a territory (citation required) via Topic generalizations of increasing specificity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Move 2</td>
<td>Establishing a niche (citations possible) via Step 1A: Indicating a gap or Step 1B: Adding to what is known Step 2: Presenting positive justifications (optional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move 3</td>
<td>Presenting the present work (citations possible) via Step 1: (obligatory) Announcing present research descriptively and/or purposively (obligatory) Step 2*: (optional) Presenting research questions or hypotheses Step 3: (optional) Definitional clarifications Step 4: (optional) Summarizing methods Step 5: (PISF**) Announcing principal outcomes Step 6: (PISF) Stating the value of the present research Step 7: (PISF) Outlining the structure of the paper</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Steps 2-4 are not only optional but less fixed in their order of occurrence than the others
**PISF: Probable in some fields, but unlikely in others

Fig.1: Swales’ Revised CARS model (Swales, 2004, p. 230, 232)
journal also comprises research papers, up-to-date evaluations and analyses of business practice within the industry.

The journal’s publishing company is Elsevier, a global scientific publishing company with its headquarters in Amsterdam. Elsevier depends on effective peer review processes to maintain not only the quality and validity of individual articles, but also the total reliability of the journals that they publish. The journal is an established refereed journal in the field of management, is easily accessible and is published 4 times a year. Each published journal consists of about 18 reviewed articles. In this paper, articles were randomly selected from the journal but with demarcations of the literature review sections clearly stated. Swales (1990) notes that shorter and longer introductions may have differing characteristic features; hence the corpora was compiled to include texts of various lengths in order to ensure that generalizations were made on the basis of texts of varying lengths. The main criteria used in the identification of the sources of the texts were reputation, representativity and accessibility (Nwogu, 1990).

1. Reputation. The journals must be highly regarded by members of the professional community as an indication of their representativity of the field.

2. Representativity. This is the second criteria for selecting sources for the data, i.e., texts must be a reliable sample of authentic discourse of the three disciplinary communities in terms of variety (Motta-Roth, 1995). Sources must present reliable variation so that generalizations can be made about the entire genre of LR sections without the risk of drawing generalizations about a specific style adopted by one given journal.

3. Accessibility. Accessibility refers to the ease with which texts in the corpus can be achieved, not to the amount of knowledge which the researcher has about the content of discourse in the texts that are analysed (De Mello, 2011, p.108-109).

Therefore, the sources and the texts were carefully chosen to ensure that a typical sample of the exact regularity of the language used by members of the academic profession was obtained (De Mello & Rafik-Galea, 2009, p.31). The size of the corpus is based on Sankoff’s (1972) stipulation of 20 being the minimum sample that is representative of the whole in studies of complex speech communities (Stubbs, 1987, p. 223). Ozturk (2007) had a corpus of 10 research articles taken from the Journal of Second Language Writing for his study on the textual organization of RA introductions in applied linguistics. Another study on RA introductions in ESP that shows a contrast between Brazilian Portuguese and English that was carried out by Hirano (2009) made use of 20 RAs as her corpus. Thus, the 20 articles in the corpus for this paper are considered large enough to allow the purpose of a convincing degree of reliability in the presence of recurrent patterns in the structure of the literature review section of...
It was also necessary to present an unbiased, objective and representative sample by extracting articles from different issues rather than the same ones (Simons, 1978).

This paper followed closely the genre analysis method for analyzing the LR section of the HM RAs, as it offers “an understanding and copious description of academic and professional texts” besides being a powerful device for determining form-function relationships (Bhatia, 1993, p. 11). The notion of move that was used was developed by the Swales (2004) model which is shown in Fig.1. The model in Fig.1 was used as the instrument to identify the moves and sub-moves within the literature review section of the HM RAs.

The corpus of 20 RAs from the HM discipline was first analysed to determine the move structure of the LR section and the constituting elements within these moves. Then, the entire structure of the RAs and the detailed structure of the various sections within these RAs were analysed. As mentioned earlier, the shortage of unambiguous rules for decisions on move boundaries calls for partiality of judgment. As such, decisions in this study regarding the classification of moves were based on Swales (2004) observation that a “move in genre analysis is a discoursal or rhetorical unit that performs a coherent communicative function in a written or spoken discourse. Although it has sometimes been aligned with a grammatical unit such as a sentence, utterance or paragraph, it is better seen as flexible in terms of its linguistic realization. At one extreme, it can be realized by a clause, at the other, by several sentences. It

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Move Step</th>
<th>HMLR RAs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Move 1: Establishing a territory</strong></td>
<td>M1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topic generalization of increasing specificity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Move 2: Establishing a niche (citations possible)</strong></td>
<td>M2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1A Indicating a gap</strong></td>
<td>M2 S1A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1B : Adding to what is known</strong></td>
<td>M2 S1B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2 : Presenting positive justification</strong></td>
<td>M2 S2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Move 3: Presenting the present work (citations possible)</strong></td>
<td>M3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1: Announcing present research descriptively and/or purposively</strong></td>
<td>M3 S1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2: Presenting RQs and hypothesis</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3: Definitional clarifications</strong></td>
<td>M3 S2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 4: Summarizing methods</strong></td>
<td>M3 S3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 5: Announcing principal outcomes</strong></td>
<td>M3 S4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 6: Stating the value of the present research</strong></td>
<td>M3 S5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 7: Outlining the structure of the paper</strong></td>
<td>M3 S6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **TABLE 1**
Coding Scheme for the LR sections based on Swales’s (2004) revised CARS model
is a functional not a formal unit” (p. 228-229). Such decisions, therefore, were made based on the root of linguistic evidence and understanding of a text. Subsequently, the LR section of the RAs were first copied and pasted onto separate files to provide a sub corpus containing the LR to be analysed. The moves were identified and then labeled at the beginning of each sentence. The coding system and abbreviations used in the analysis and the discussion of the analysis are as follows:

CODING SCHEME FOR LITERATURE REVIEW SECTIONS

The coding scheme used for the LR sections is Swales’s (2004) revised CARS model as shown in Table 1.

A sample of an LR section which illustrates how the move analysis was conducted on the HM Literature Review RAs using the coding scheme is provided in Appendix A.

The analysis of the HMLR 1 consists of 1365 words in 37 sentences within 10 paragraphs. The following move structure was identified: M1 – M2s1A – M1 – M3s4. The occurrences of individual moves in the LR sections were noted to regulate if a particular move occurred regularly to be considered obligatory. As mentioned earlier for the introduction section, to be obligatory, it was arbitrarily set that the cut-off frequency of 60% was the probable measure of move stability for any move proposed in the study (Kanoksilapatham, 2007). For a move to be accepted as a conventional or obligatory move, it must take place in 60% of the corpus of the HM RA LR sections. If the frequency of the move appears in less than 60% of the corpus, the move is considered optional.

In the HM LR1 example (See Appendix A), the following move structure was identified: M1 – M2s1A – M1 – M3s4. This move shall be elucidated below.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The following analysis and discussion involves the rhetorical structure of the move analysis in the LR sections of HM RAs.

Table 2 shows the occurrence of moves in the RA LR sections of the HM journal articles. The strokes/slash (/) shows the frequency of the moves found in each of the 20 samples in the corpus. The sample of the corpus studied are coded HM LR 1 to 20 using Swales’s (2004) revised CARS model. Based on Table 2, S1A denotes Step 1A. Indicating a gap, S1B denotes Step 1B. Adding to what is known, S2 denotes Step 2 presenting positive justification and S1-S7 denotes Step 1 – Step 7 presenting the present work (citations possible).

Fig.2 shows the total number of moves in the LR section of HM RAs based on the presence of moves found in Table 2. A more elaborate explanation of each of the moves present in the HM RA LR section is discussed below.

Move 1: Establishing a territory via topic generalizations

Table 2 and Fig.2 show that Move 1 in the LR section is found in all 20 of the RAs (100%). Move 1, ‘establishing a territory,’
contextualizes a research study being presented within the scope of its relevant literature. The excerpts below clearly show that, as the discussion progresses, the level of specificity increases. Due to the fact that a high number of LR sections of the HM RAs contain Move 1, this move is considered obligatory. Excerpts with the presence of Move 1 are shown below, with (R) being used to represent citations.

Excerpt 1(HMLR 1)

"...The TPB (R) is a cognitive model of human behavior, ... According to (R), the principal predictor of behavior is intention. ..." (Cheng, Lam and Hsu, 2005,p.477)
Excerpt 2 (HMLR 2)

“... According to (R), “Purchasing products and services account for more than 60% of the ...” (Kothari, Hu and Roehl, 2005, p. 369)

Move 2: Establishing a niche (citations possible) via Step 1A (Indicating a Gap)

In accordance with Swales (2004), Move 2 in RAs constitutes the author’s attempt to establish a niche for his or her own work. This move is realised in a series of evaluative statements made about the state of art related in Move 1. Most evaluations related in the move tend to be negative and are thus signaled by adversative discourse markers such as ‘however’, ‘nevertheless’, ‘yet’, ‘but’, ‘despite’ and ‘even though’. In our corpus, Move 2 is present in 13 out of the 20 (65%) LR sections of the HM articles. So the frequency of Move 2: Step 1A is an obligatory move since its occurrence is more than the 60% of the cut off mark.

The semantic features employed to identify gap-indicating follow what has been exemplified in most studies and include the following items:

- Scarcity or paucity of research, realized in such expressions as ‘little empirical research’ and ‘few studies’;
- Scarcity or paucity of knowledge, realized in such expressions as ‘little is known’ and ‘not much is known’
- Needs for actions, realized in such expressions as ‘there is a need’, ‘research into X is valuable’ or ‘it is worthwhile to …’
These can be seen in the following excerpts.

Excerpt 6 (HMLR 5)

“... Despite the literature, there is still much confusion about what is and what is not PBL. In the 1960s, the McMaster Medical School introduced a learning environment that was a combination of small groups, cooperative, self-directed, interdependent, self-assessed PBL. Since then, this approach has been called PBL...” (Kivela, 2005, pp.437-464)

Excerpt 7 (HMLR 6)

“... Even though the impact of culture on consumers’ decision-making processes has been extensively studied, the impact of national culture on travelers’ information search behavior has not been given much attention by tourism researchers. Only a few studies examined the impact of national culture on travelers’ external information search behavior...” (Gursoy & Umbreit, 2004, pp.55-70)

Step 2: Presenting positive justifications (optional)

Only 2 LR sections of the HM articles out of the 20 (10%) contain this move. This move is said to be optional since it has not met the cut-off mark of 60% and is therefore not a must for the writers of HM RAs to include in their writing. These are shown in the excerpts below.

Excerpt 11 (HMLR 12)

“... Similarly, with hospitality acquisition announcements outside investors and market makers rarely know if good or poor prospects exist for the combined firms, but managers in acquiring firms may have this information. In the case that hospitality managers perceive poor prospects for their firms, the managers and other informed traders can use their private information to sell their firms’ shares on their personal account and this trading can lessen the market value of their firms for outside investors and adversely affect market makers in the stock...” (Oak & Andrew, 2006, pp.570-585)

Excerpt 12 (HMLR 14)

“... However, although these findings concern management accountants in general, some evidence that this shift in job content relates to on-property controllers can be found in published articles...”

Move 2: Step 1B (Adding to What is Known)

None of the 20 LR sections of the HM articles contain this move. Move 2 step 1B is not needed at all for the LR section of HM RAs.

Move 3: Introducing the Present Work

Step 1: Announcing present research descriptively and/or purposively.

Based on the study, 11 out of the 20 (55%) samples carry statements announcing the targets of investigation by relating the aims of investigation, research questions to answer, or hypotheses to test. However, its frequency does not meet the cut off mark of 60% and is therefore only an optional move and not obligatory for the LR section of the HM RAs. Excerpts from the HM RA LR are shown below.

Excerpt 13 (HM LR 1)

“... In this study, the three customer complaining behaviors of voice, negative word-of-mouth communication, and exit were analyzed…” (Cheng, Lam and Hsu, 2005, p.477)

Excerpt 14 (HMLR 8)

“... In this study we will apply this approach to the performance of slot machines within a casino…” (Lucas, et al, 2004,p. 103)

Move 3 Step 2: Presenting research questions or hypotheses (optional)

The writers may move on to the present research by stating the research objectives and describing the steps taken in the research being reported. They may also formulate a hypothesis to signal that a new attempt is being made to investigate an issue or a problem in the research. The aim or goal of a study in the HM LR corpora can be formulated as research questions or hypotheses as illustrated by the excerpts below.

Excerpt 18 (HMLR 8)

“... The following hypothesis (H1) and sub-hypotheses (H1a, H1b, and H1c) were developed. There are significant positive relationships between past behavior and behavioral intentions of engaging in voice (H1a), negative word-of-mouth communication (H1b), and exit (H1c). All resulting hypotheses are stated in the null form, where B represents the beta or derived regression coefficient for each independent variable. For example, if theory suggested a positive relationship between a predictor variable and the criterion variable, the null hypothesis would test the following condition: \( B_{\text{predictor}} \leq 0 \)...” (Lucas, et al., 2004, p.103)
Excerpt 19 (HMLR9)

“... Relating to the primary objective of this research, then, which is to test empirically how positive and negative feedback affects managers’ self-efficacy using a field study, the corresponding hypotheses are...” (Reynolds, 2006, p.54)

Move 3 Step 3: Definitional clarifications (optional)

Although optional, this move was found in 5 out of the 20 samples (25%) of the HM LR section. The main aim of this move is to provide further definitions and clarifications as to the importance of the study. The findings show that writers of HM RAs need not mention Move 3 Step 3 in the LR section. Excerpts with Move 3 Step 3 are shown below.

Excerpt 21 (HMLR 13)

“... This study discusses best practices hotels use in survey design, including intent, clarity, scaling, and validity, as well as the methodological issues of timing, question order, and sample size...” (Su, 2004, p.397)

Excerpt 22 (HMLR 19)

“... According to NRA’s 1998 quick-service operator survey, four types of rewards such as pay raises, promotions, bonuses, and profit sharing had positive impacts on lowering turnover rates (Ebbin, 1999)...” (Cho, et al., 2006, p.262)

Move 3 Step 4: Summarising methods

Elaboration of the research design or methodological considerations was also observed in some of the instances of Move 3. In HM LR, this move only occurs in 3 out of the 20 samples (15%). Interestingly, this shows that the use of this step would most likely be optional. Writers of the HM RAs are not obligated to include this step in the literature review. Excerpts from the RAs that have Move 3 Step 4 are shown in the excerpts below.

Excerpt 24 (HMLR 13)

“... This study adopts content analysis by utilizing comparison and recording of GCCs based on Gilbert–Hornell GCC checklist criterion, in order to examine the guest comment card design and policy in Taiwan’s international tourist hotels...” (Su, 2004, p.398)

Excerpt 25 (HMLR 19)

“... This study also employed turnover rate to investigate whether HRM practices took effect in the hotel and restaurant industries...” (Cho et al., 2006, p.262).
Move 3 Step 5: Announcing principal outcomes (PISF)

The realization of Move 3- Step 5 was not found in any of the 20 HM LR sections of the research article. This finding suggests that, particularly in the HM corpus, announcing principal outcomes does not occur in the LR section. HM authors need not announce principal outcomes in the LR section. Move 3 Step 5 is most likely to appear in the results section of an RA.

Move 3 Step 6: Stating the present research (PISF)

This step goes beyond the objective results produced by the study, highlighting the contribution of the knowledge gained from the particular study (e.g. breaks new ground).

Move 3 Step 6 is not an obligatory move for the LR section. It occurs in only 30% of the corpus. Excerpts from the RAs are shown below.

Excerpt 27 (HMLR 2)

Therefore, this study was conducted to assist the hotel companies to decipher the need to put technology to work for them. In doing so, the authors investigated their purchasing process and examined the need for the hotels to work more closely with their vendors to streamline the supply chain and improve the bottom line …” (Kothari, Hu & Roehl, 2005, p. 370)

Excerpt 28 (HMLR 5)

“ …. the embedded-PBL methodology gave students the opportunity to learn about “Introduction to Food Production” (IFP) and “Food and Beverage Operations Project” (F&B Ops) by confronting problem narratives …” (Gursoy & Umbreit, 2004, pp.55-70)

Move 3 Step 7: Outlining the structure of the paper (PISF)

The final step outlined in Swales’ (2004) Revised Model, Move 3-Step 7, was found in only 2 (10%) of the HM LR sections and is thus not an obligatory move. According to Swales (2004), this step is only likely to be used in fields that do not use a fixed Introduction-Method-Results-Discussion structure, such as economics and computer science. Excerpts from the RAs are shown below.

Excerpt 29 (HMLR 2)

“ ... Therefore, this study was conducted to assist the hotel companies to decipher the need to put technology to work for them. In doing so, the authors investigated their purchasing process and examined the need for the hotels to work more closely with their vendors to streamline the supply chain and improve the bottom line …” (Kothari, Hu and Roehl, 2005, p. 369)
Excerpt 30 (HMLR 13)

“... This study discusses best practices hotels use in survey design, including intent, clarity, scaling, and validity, as well as the methodological issues of timing, question order, and sample size ...”
(Su, 2004, p.398)

FREQUENTLY OBSERVED PATTERNS AND ORDER OF MOVES IN HM LR SECTION

The discussion below involves the move patterns and move structure of the RA literature review sections in the HM journals. Fig.3 shows the predictable move patterns in the HM RAs literature review section and Table 3 displays the move structure.

| Move 1 | Establishing a territory (citation required) via Topic generalizations of increasing specificity |
| Move 2 | Establishing a niche (citations possible) |
| Move 3 | Presenting the present work (citations possible) |
| Move 2 | Establishing a niche (citations possible) |
| Move 2 | Establishing a niche (citations possible) |
| Move 3 | Presenting the present work (citations possible) |
| Move 2 | Establishing a niche (citations possible) |
| Move 1 | Establishing a territory (citation required) via Topic generalizations of increasing specificity |
| Move 3 | Presenting the present work (citations possible) |
| Move 3 | Presenting the present work (citations possible) |
| Move 1 | Establishing a territory (citation required) via Topic generalizations of increasing specificity |

Fig.3: Predictable Move Patterns in HM LR sections
The most frequently observed pattern with the largest number of moves in the 20 HM RAs LR sections was Move 1 - Move 3 – Move 3. This means that the HM RA LR section begins with Move 1, Establishing a territory (citation required) via topic generalizations of increasing specificity, followed by Move 3, Presenting the present work and finally Move 3, Presenting the present work again. This pattern was found in 8 (40%) of the analysed HM RA LR section samples. This is followed by the pattern Move 1 (Establishing a territory (citation required) via topic generalizations of increasing specificity) – Move 2 (Establishing a niche (citations possible) respectively in 2 (10%) out of the 20 analysed samples. The pattern involving only Move 1 (Establishing a territory (citation required) was found in 2 (10%) of the analysed samples. This finding highlights that, in writing the literature review, the writing pattern based on the 20 analysed samples of HM RAs do not adhere to Swales’ (2004) model of the Move 1-2-3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESEARCH ARTICLE</th>
<th>MOVES</th>
<th>NUMBER OF MOVE UNITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HM LR 1</td>
<td>1 3</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM LR 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM LR 3</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM LR 4</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 3 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM LR 5</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM LR 6</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM LR 7</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM LR 8</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM LR 9</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM LR 10</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM LR 11</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM LR 12</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM LR 13</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM LR 14</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM LR 15</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM LR 16</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM LR 17</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM LR 18</td>
<td>3 2 3</td>
<td>2 3 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM LR 19</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>2 3 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM LR 20</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
structure. This signifies that the LR section of the HM RAs can be written following other move patterns, as shown in Table 3.

Table 3 shows the move structure found in the HM RA LR sections. The numbers next to the article number are the move numbers in their order of occurrence followed by the number of move units in the HM RA corpus.

The findings in Table 3 show that the pattern of moves can follow regularly in that one or more moves can reappear in a text in a pattern, instead of the linear structure which is Move 1, followed by Move 2, Move 3 and so on. The patterns or move cycles found in the LR section of HM RAs (See Table 3) denotes that the LR section can begin with a Move 3, for example, and continue with Move 2, then back again to Move 3 and Move 2. These move cycles signify that there is no distinct linear structure that needs to be followed when writing the LR section for HM RAs (Hopkins and Dudley-Evans, 1988). Consequently, the move cycles found in the LR sections of HM RAs are in line with the move cycles suggested by Hopkins and Dudley-Evans (1998) in the discussion section of dissertations. They posit that move cycles contain groups that ‘arise from the text’ and that defines the ‘transactional, interactional and rational functions of language in a way as to reflect the writer’s frequently shifting ‘foregrounding’ of these different features. Hopkins and Dudley-Evans’s (1998) move cycles are also advanced from Swales’s (1981) four-move structure and Dudley-Evans’s (1994) move cycles to analyse the discussion section of dissertations. Thus, the findings show that the HM RA LR section also conform to Swales’ (2004) Revised Model (Fig.1).

CONCLUSION

The generic structure analysis of the study is based on Swales’ 3 move model (2004). The findings indicate that Swales (2004) move structure effectively explained the rhetorical pattern of the LR section of the studies analysed in this discussion. The HM RA LR section supports the general framework posited by Swales (2004). Move 2 Step 1B, which was ‘Adding to what is known’, was prevalent in the LR sections. The reason for this is that in the LR sections the writers will go on to contribute to the existing field of research by adding other research findings deemed necessary. Another step used in realizing Move 3 is step 2. Move 3 Step 7, or ‘Outlining the structure of the paper’, appears in 2 of the LR sections.

As for the cyclical patterning of the Moves in the samples, it was found that Move 1 and Move 2 are consistent with Swales (2004, p. 230), particularly in longer literature reviews. The iteration of these moves indicates that the study being presented is complex, reflecting accumulated efforts in investigating what has been done on the topic and identifying niches that remain unaccounted for (Kanoksilapatham, 2007). At the level of steps, Move 2-Step 1A, or ‘indicating a gap’, occurs more often than Step 1B, ‘adding to what is known’ and Step 2, ‘providing positive justifications’, in the LR sections of the HM RA. This clearly indicates that ‘indicating a gap’ is a preferred
strategy in establishing a niche in the LR section. Another outcome worth mentioning is that of Move 3, which has seven steps in Swales’ 2004 model; however, in the HM RA LR section, only Move 3-Step 1 is prevalent, while the other steps, such as Step 2, Step 3, Step 4, Step 5, Step 6 and Step 7 are either not found at all or are present in only a few of the samples. Congruent with Swales’ 2004 model, the order of steps found is less fixed. Fig.4 represents the proposed model delineating only and all of the steps found in the LR section of the HM RAs based on their frequency of occurrence.

This study’s analysis shows that the move structure in the LR section of the HM RA is realized in the model outlined in (Fig.4) above (De Mello, 2011). The model above shows that it is in accordance with the model constructed by Swales (2004) but with some variations. The model provides a clearer conceptual framework for this study (De Mello, 2011). The analysis carried out confirms the claim that genre analysis discovers correlations between form and meaning and also contributes to a better understanding of how information is structured in a text (Lakic, 2000). In the HM RAs LR section, it was found that not all the steps in Move 3 are obligatory; therefore, the following can be reasonably ascertained based on the findings: the researcher has not included Move 3 Steps 3, 4 and 7 from the new proposed model above (Fig.4). The other moves are either obligatory or optional for the LR section of the HM RAs. Finally, the proposed model may prove beneficial to teachers by assisting them in teaching students to utilise these writing conventions in writing the LR section for HM RAs.
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APPENDIX A

A SAMPLE OF HM RA LR SECTION ILLUSTRATING MOVE-STEP BREAKS AS IDENTIFIED IN HM RA LR 1


“... 2.1. The theory of planned behavior

M1 The TPB (Ajzen, 1985) is a cognitive model of human behavior, in which the central focus is the prediction and understanding of clearly defined behaviors. According to Ajzen, the principal predictor of behavior is intention. People tend to act in accordance with their intention to engage in a behavior. Intention can be regarded as a motivation to engage in a particular behavior and represents an individual’s expectancies about his/her behavior in a given setting. Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) operationalized intention as the likelihood to act. Intention is influenced by attitude, subjective norm, and perception of control over the behavior. Attitude toward a particular act represents a person’s overall positive and negative beliefs and evaluations of the behavior. In turn, attitude is derived from salient behavioral beliefs of particular outcomes and evaluation of those outcomes. Subjective norm is an individual’s perception of general social pressures from important others to perform or not to perform a given behavior. It, in turn, is determined by an individual’s normative beliefs and his/her motivation to comply with his/her referents. Lastly, perceived behavioral control represents an individual’s perception of whether the performance of the behavior is under one’s control; “control” reflects whether the behavior is, on the one hand, easily executed (control beliefs) and whether, on the other, the required resources, opportunities, and specialized skills are available (perceived control) (Conner et al., 1999).

2.2. Customer complaining behavior

The actions that customers take in response to dissatisfaction are usually referred to as customers’ complaining behavior (Singh, 1988). It is regarded as a behavioral outcome of a
perceived discrepancy between one’s expectations for a product and the actual performance of the product (Hunt, 1991; Oliver and Swan, 1989). Customer complaining behavior (CCB) is generally considered as a set of multiple responses, some or all of which are triggered by perceived dissatisfaction with a purchase episode (Rogers et al., 1992; Singh, 1988). These responses may be non-behavioral or behavioral, involving any and all actions intended as an expression of dissatisfaction (Rogers et al., 1992; Singh, 1988). Customer complaining behavior can take the form of no action, exit, voice (Hirschman, 1970), or negative word-of-mouth communication (Day, 1984). These responses have been viewed by many researchers as a combination of negative responses stemming from dissatisfaction (Scaglione, 1988). M3S1 In this study, the three customer complaining behaviors of voice, negative word-of-mouth communication, and exit were analyzed.

2.3. Direct effect of past behavior on behavioral intention
Eagly and Chaiken (1993) and Ouellette and Wood (1998) suggested that the best predictor of behavioral intention is the frequency of a past behavior. A possible reason that past behavior can predict future behavioral intention is the assumption of value consistency imposed by individual customers (Cialdini, 1988). Given a general preference for consistency and an individual’s systematic striving for it, one would expect a high level of consistency between past and future behaviors. Leone et al. (1999) demonstrated that the inclusion of past behavior in the TPB could help explain a substantial portion of additional variance in behavioral intention. Ouellette and Wood (1998) also state that past experience and behavior can explain more of the variance in behavioral intention than can attitude, subjective norm, and perceived behavioral control individually. Other studies empirically tested the direct effects of past behavior on the behavioral intention. For example, Verplanken et al. (1998) have shown that the prediction of intention in car use as a travel mode was significantly improved by the addition of previous experience of car use (Verplanken et al., 1998). Therefore, it was hypothesized in the study that past behavior would have a direct effect on customers’ behavioral intention to engage in dissatisfaction responses. That is, the frequency of past behavior significantly predicts behavioral intention. M3S2 The following hypothesis (H1) and sub-hypotheses (H1a, H1b, and H1c) were developed.

H1. There are significant positive relationships between past behavior and behavioral intentions of engaging in voice (H1a), negative word-of-mouth communication (H1b), and exit (H1c).
2.4. Mediating effect of the TPB variables on the relationships between past behavior and behavioral intentions

According to the learning theory (Howard, 1977), behavior is a function of prior learning. As such, experiences gained from past complaint behaviors provide dissatisfied customers with information on consumer rights and complaint channels, which could help consolidate their behavioral and normative beliefs, help them evaluate behavioral outcome, and manipulate the perceived behavioral control of various dissatisfaction responses. Consequently, past experiences will serve as a yardstick for an individual’s behavioral intention. Ajzen (1988) claimed that frequent performance of a behavior leads to the formation of a habit, and that that habit can increase a person’s perceived control of a particular behavior. Ajzen also suggested that the effect of past behavior on behavioral intention is mediated by the variables included in the TPB (i.e., attitude, subjective norm, and perceived behavioral control). Supportive results were reported in the study by Albarracin et al. (2001) in which past behavior was found to relate significantly with attitude and subjective norm based on the Theory of Reasoned Action. Therefore, it was hypothesized in this study that the influence of past behavior on behavioral intentions of engaging in dissatisfaction responses are mediated by attitude, subjective norm, and perceived behavioral control. The following hypotheses (H2, H3, H4) and sub-hypotheses (H2a, H2b, H2c; H3a, H3b, H3c; H4a, H4b, H4c) were developed:

H2. Attitude mediates the effect of past behavior on behavioral intentions of engaging in voice (H2a), negative word-of-mouth communication (H2b), and exit (H2c).

H3. Subjective norm mediates the effect of past behavior on behavioral intentions of engaging in voice (H3a), negative word-of-mouth communication (H3b), and exit (H3c).

H4. Perceived behavioral control mediates the effect of past behavior on behavioral intentions of engaging in voice (H4a), negative word-of-mouth communication (H4b), and exit (H4c).

In summary, the hypotheses of the study are illustrated in Fig. 1. …” (Cheng, Lam & Hsu; 2005, pp.475-492).