

A Study of Move Analysis in American NPOs' Online Fundraising Pages: A Comparison between Domestic and Global Campaigns in Health Operations

Nuttiya Sakulthong^{a,*}, Chanika Gampper^b

^anuttiya.skt@gmail.com, Language Institute Thammasat University, Bangkok, Thailand

^bchanika.g@litu.tu.ac.th, Language Institute Thammasat University, Bangkok, Thailand

*Corresponding author, nuttiya.skt@gmail.com

APA Citation:

Sakulthong, N., & Gampper, C. (2022). A study of move analysis in American NPOs' online fundraising pages: A comparison between domestic and global campaigns in health operations. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, (15)2, page 946-976.

Received
10/05/2022

Received in
revised form
30/06/2022

Accepted
05/07/2022

Keywords

Move Analysis,
Fundraising
Discourse, Online
Fundraising,
Domestic
Campaign (US),
Global Campaign

Abstract

This study examines the language used in the campaign descriptions (CDs) posted by nonprofit organizations (NPOs) through www.globalgiving.org, an international fundraising platform for nonprofits around the world. The purpose of this study aims to identify the similarities and differences among those that occurred in the campaign descriptions of domestic and global campaigns under the theme of health operations. One condition is that each NPO has to write a campaign description following the template provided by the website, which contains four different sections: 'Summary', 'Challenge', 'Solutions', and 'Long-term Impact'. A move analysis on 158 CDs found six moves and 15 steps used across the descriptions in both corpora. The results suggested that 'Identifying the Locations of the Problem' was an essential move for the global campaigns, while this move was not necessary to be included in the domestic campaigns. The common rhetorical moves found in this study can help other NPOs that are planning on putting their campaigns

online by writing their descriptions in English. The results will benefit nonprofits around the world. Language learners and professionals can also learn the persuasive writing style of fundraising discourses in this study.

Introduction

With broad internet access, many consumers now choose to purchase goods and services online, both domestically and internationally, as it is simple and convenient. Online platforms have helped many businesses around the world increase their sales and become more recognizable. For nonprofit organizations, having an online platform can mean a higher chance of receiving donations. Online donations have become increasingly common. Instead of only raising funds through their own websites, many nonprofits also join other platforms established by other organizations in order to reach more potential donors and raise more money for their campaigns. Either way, to communicate to potential donors worldwide, English is usually the language used to communicate, and this can be a problem for nonprofits from countries in which English is not spoken as a first language. Since the main tool they have to raise funds online is a campaign description, which needs to be written carefully to persuade their potential donors to make donations, understanding how fundraising content is composed by native speakers can be hugely beneficial.

Convincing readers to donate may not be as simple as persuading them to buy a product or service, as they usually do not receive any tangible benefit from their spending. Therefore, the language used in campaign descriptions plays a very important role. While online platforms did not exist in the past, a few studies on fundraising texts in letters have been carried out. These suggested that there were certain patterns applied in the letters to receive attention from their potential donors and to achieve their fundraising goal. The general strategies also differed from culture to culture (Upton, 2002). Goering et al. (2009) found that several techniques were applied to achieve the fundraising goals, such as providing rationale, logic and credibility and using emotional appeals. Abelen et al.'s study (1993) also found that organizations needed to illustrate the problems they sought to address through their campaigns to

gain empathy from donors. However, since letters are no longer a common method of communication, some of the strategies might not be applicable when it comes to online fundraising content.

This research will observe the writing pattern of both domestic and global fundraising campaigns written by native speakers to help current and future nonprofits — especially ones from non-English-speaking countries — reach potential global donors or be a part of global fundraising platforms.

The research questions are listed below.

1. What are the rhetorical moves that occur in the campaign descriptions of domestic and global campaigns in health operations?
 - 1.1 What rhetorical moves occurred in the domestic and global campaigns?
 - 1.2 What prominent moves occurred in each section (Summary, Challenge, Solution, Long-term Impact) of the domestic and global campaigns?
2. What are the similarities and differences in the rhetorical moves that occur in the campaign descriptions of domestic and global campaigns in health operations?

Review of Literature

The Foundation of Philanthropy

The word ‘philanthropy’ means an attempt by an individual or an organization with an altruistic desire to help improve human welfare that involves charitable giving. There are three types of donors: individuals, foundations, and corporations. Private foundations are also sometimes initiated by wealthy individuals. According to Barman (2017), there are three different gift-giving theories. The first is called ‘altruism’, which is an act of giving in which the donor does not expect anything in return from the recipient, such as a blood donation. The second form is an economic act of exchange, which is when a person contributes with the expectation of gaining social respect. In sociology, ‘self-interest’ is the term used to describe an act when an individual makes a charitable contribution in exchange for a reward (Becker, 1974; Tuner & Homans, 1961). The last gift-giving theory is ‘reciprocity’, in which the gift establishes a tight relationship between groups.

According to sociologists, there are three different determinants which impact a donor's motivation, depending on the social context. On a micro-level, there are certain key factors which can influence who gives and how much he or she donates. Religion, wealth, and ethnicity can be used to gauge donations, as researchers have found that people with certain traits may feel morally inclined to donate based on social pressure and peer expectations. On a meso-level approach, the relationship between donors and charitable organizations can be used to predict who will give. A key example of this is the local area or environment (field) in which the donor is based and the need of others in the vicinity for donations. The potential donors can be more easily convinced if they can see the outcome of the donation. A macro-level approach focuses on the difference in the geographical locations of donors. This can be looked at in terms of geographical units, such as states, cities, and neighborhoods. Relevant micro-level factors (e.g., religion, wealth, and ethnicity) are then considered to calculate likely donations. This is then cross-referenced with the historical data of these geographical locals, including development, religion, welfare programs, and economic factors, to finalize estimates. Another macro-level approach is to look at the political frameworks a geographical unit falls under. Specific types of political frameworks may either encourage or discourage donations. Laws and traditions may also hold influence over populations within geographical units.

There are several approaches used in philanthropic discourse, such as appeal letters, fundraising letters, and grant proposals. However, all documentation has the same aim of soliciting donations (Bhatia, 1998). Bhatia also claims that non-profit organizations can show that they are credible through their documentation to prospective donors. Organizations must aim to reach a diverse range of potential donors, and to achieve this, they must use creative discourse and techniques to gain maximum interest.

Strategies in Fundraising Discourse

The writing style of fundraising discourse is similar to that of advertising; however, fundraising text has its own genre, asking readers to be charitable instead of selling them goods or services (Lee, 2016).

Kitova (2014) identified the commonality in the fundraising genre by applying Longrace's (1992) hortatory genre structural analysis to

establish authority and credibility, present the problem, issue commands, and create motivation. The results showed that the texts were hortatory in nature, as they were designed to stimulate potential donors to contribute. Hortatory texts aim to influence conduct rather than implicitly ask for donations (Longacre, 1992).

Azhar (2015) analyzed linguistic perspectives in philanthropy as either an aspect of proposition or affection. The maxim of proposition had six characteristics: (1) showing feelings of love and affection, (2) showing the subject matter covered as a shared property, (3) putting the makers and readers of a discourse in the same brotherhood, (4) not attacking others to ensure that philanthropy language does not hurt other's feelings, (5) adding an invitation to reform something, but the invitation not contravening the first four characteristics, and (6) giving something to others, even though it is only in the form of hope.

This perspective is consonant with Ritzenhein's (1998) finding that four types of arguments are commonly found in fundraising letters: (1) stating the quality of the institute, (2) suggesting the importance of the donor's gift in allowing the organization to accomplish its goal, (3) focusing on the needs of the organization, and (4) asking for gifts and thanks.

Philanthropic writing can be identified through its lexical choice (Azhar, 2015). Personal pronouns and emotive verbs such as 'love', 'feel', 'hope', or 'want' for expressing emotions, attitudes and desires are often used (Kitova, 2014). This was also determined by Lee (2016), who stated that use of the pronoun 'you' tended to increase the probability of soliciting responses for donations.

According to Sandouka (2019), three strategies are used by potential donors to influence those who could help an organization achieve its financial goals. Firstly, the campaigns should provide facts when describing the purpose of the funding. Next, the people involved should be named in the campaign descriptions. Finally, the campaign should also be positive in nature and demonstrate the passion of the team behind it. It also suggested that fundraisers apply female references to help achieve these aims, as it will appeal to potential donors on both a logical and emotional front. Female pronouns can be used, or stories can be told from a woman's perspective. For example, "My Mom just returned from trying to buy groceries and believes she was robbed while she turned her back from her cart."

Zhou et al. (2016) view that there are three key elements in the persuasion process to ensure that writing captures the reader's attention. Positive language should be used; the layout and readability of the text can create a better understanding; and the text must be of an appropriate length.

Communicative Purpose

There are many different communicative purposes for which letters are written, including explaining a situation, maintaining cooperation in the future, and pleading (Swales, 1990). Thumvichit (2017) noted that a communication purpose explains why a genre was developed in a particular way. Swales also highlights two types of communicative purposes: official and hidden (Swale, as cited in Wei, 2014).

Askehave and Swales (2001) found that many different approaches to writing employed communicative approaches. The researchers analyzed company brochures, finding that they had the main aim of promoting the business. This is consistent with Swales' (1990) theory that a "communicative purpose is both a privileged criterion and one that operates to keep the scope of a genre as here conceived narrowly focused on comparable rhetorical action".

Genre Analysis in Discourse Analysis

Genre analysis is an area of discourse analysis which aims to analyze and explain texts. There are three basic aspects which can describe genre analysis: (1) the context in which texts occur, (2) their communicative purpose(s), and (3) the resulting linguistic structure (Swales, 1990). The goal of genre analysis is to discover the structure of genres in the texts (Biel, 2017). According to Swales (1990), the basic functional units of a genre are 'moves' and 'steps'. A move is a piece of information directed by a particular topic or a purpose. Swales created the CARS model (Creating a Research Space Model) by assuming the research articles' writers were likely to follow the traditional organization of the community in response to the challenge to find a space and to draw readers' attention to that space. Three moves were discovered as a result: *Establishing a Territory, Establishing a Niche, and Occupying the Niche*. A

step is a 'sub-move' or a strategy to achieve the main purpose or the 'move'.

Both written and spoken communicative behaviors (Bhatia, 2012) can show the structural use of language. Genre analysis is a useful linguistic tool that allows for the investigation, analysis, and interpretation of a text to understand its specific purpose. This information can then be used in the examination of lexis, grammar, and rhetorical structures in texts (Bhatia, 2002; Flowerdew, 2000).

Move Analysis of Fundraising Discourse

Move analysis is an approach that focuses on the communicative purposes, or moves, of a fundraising discourse. A sequence of moves is identified to represent a communicative function in the discourse by using a top-down approach, which focuses on the meaning and ideas in the context (Upton & Cohen, 2009). The sequence of moves can reflect the strategies used to persuade donors. According to Lee (2016), the move that always appears at the beginning of a fundraising discourse is 'situation' or 'problem', while 'response' is normally an ending move. 'Response', 'solution', and 'problem' are the moves usually intervening between the beginning and the final moves.

In appeal letters, either 'quality of institute' or 'needs we address' is used at the beginning of the text, followed by 'your gift matters' and ending with 'ask and thank you' (Ritzenhein, 1998). Burke (1945) referred to the letters beginning with either quality or needs as a ratio of scene-act, in which an act of giving is anticipated to follow from an obvious and interesting description of a scene or situation.

Previous Research Studies

Connor and Mauranen (1999) identified ten moves through researching grant applications in the European Union based on the theories of genre analysis (Bhatia, 1993; Swales, 1990) and the social construction of meaning (Berkenkotter & Huckin, 1994). Catching the reader's attention, presenting need, describing the idea, and establishing the writer's competence were the essential moves.

Similarities were found between American and Italian philanthropic fundraising literature by Fusari (2009), who used Upton's (2002) generic move structure. The methods used in the literature

typically depended on the role, scope, and nature of the campaign in both locations.

Rhetorical strategy, visual design, and linguistic features were researched by Goering et al. (2009) in relation to fundraising letters. Credibility was found to be important in the rhetorical stage and the use of effective linguistic tools helped persuade donors. However, the use of bullet points, which are part of visual design, was found to have no effect on donors.

The use of language by nonnative English speakers in campaign writing was analyzed by Sadeghi and Samuel (2013). They found that rhetorical moves were not followed, and the language used was inappropriate. However, the more flexible construction of the campaign was viewed positively.

Lee (2016) analyzed fundraising texts in Hong Kong by interviewing recipients. A key tool used in the campaigns was focusing on the solutions that would come from donations. Often the pronoun 'you' was used to convince readers, and most recipients were unaware of the tools that fundraisers use in order to gain donations.

Martin (2017) conducted a similar study to understand the responses of donors in relation to the effectiveness of philanthropic appeal letters. The results showed that over 55% of respondents were persuaded by emotions to donate, and over 30% felt that the benefits of donations were the main reason to give money.

In looking at grant proposals from the National Science Foundation, Cotos (2019) used the Contextualize-Demonstrate-Predict (CDP) model to analyze move patterns between funded and non-funded campaigns. The CDP model is a top-down corpus analysis which has three moves: Contextualizing Potential Impacts, Demonstrating Tangible Impacts, and Predicting significance. Cotos found that Swales' framework was not applied in the CDP moves and steps; 'constraints and expectations' (Connor & Mauranen, 1999) were found to be more relevant.

As fundraising letters seem to have become outdated in the digital age we are now in, money is donated by donors across the globe who can access the internet to nonprofits with online platforms. With a huge number of organizations and campaigns available online at the moment, it is worth observing the writing patterns of those campaign descriptions to find out if there are any similarities or differences. This initiated this

research, which can help guide other nonprofits which have not had an online platform of their own yet, as well as organizations from non-English speaking countries that are looking to raise funds internationally.

Methodology

Research Design

There were three stages in this comparative study of move analysis on American NPOs' online fundraising pages between domestic and global campaigns in health-related operations. Firstly, the campaign descriptions were analyzed to identify the rhetorical moves. The moves found from both sets of data were then coded. Finally, the frequency and patterns from both types of campaigns were compared and discussed. This study was assisted by an intercoder to code 100% of the data. The differences found in the coding process were taken to the advisor for suggestions.

Construction of the corpora

The data used in this move analysis study was collected from www.globalgiving.org, a US-based online fundraising platform for local and international nonprofits. More than 5,000 campaigns available on the website operate in 170 countries across all continents to address critical issues in 28 categories, including health, education, human rights, the environment, and girls and women (retrieved in September 2020). Each campaign needs to be written according to the template provided by GlobalGiving, which limits the scope of the description into four different sections: 'Summary', 'Challenge', 'Solution', and 'Long-term Impact' (see Figure 1).

Selection of Corpora

Out of 28 different categories, the theme of health, with 1,516 campaigns in total (retrieved in September 2020), was chosen to be analyzed in this research, as this theme contained the highest number of campaigns. The campaigns in this category cover physical health, mental health, reproductive health, health education, sanitation, consumption, and violence. Since the differences in text length can influence the move frequency and linguistic features (Thumvichit, 2017), a total of 158 campaign descriptions with word counts between 201 and 350 were

selected for this study. Half were domestic campaigns; the others were global campaigns.

Figure 1

Sample of a Campaign Description posted on GlobalGiving's Website

Summary

Seeding Sovereignty is a multi-prong approach to food sovereignty to support the White Mountain Apache community. It is run and organized by Cheryl Pailzote, a White Mountain Apache tribe member who credits her lifelong interest in water to her upbringing along the White River in Arizona. She is a farmer and an expert on water resources and applies that knowledge to water access solutions, sustainable food options, and community education and outreach.

\$15,000	\$5,870	99	2	11
total goal	remaining	donors	monthly donors	months

Challenge

Since Westward Expansion in the 1800s, Native American populations have lacked enough access to water. Eastern settlers pushed Native Americans off of fertile land and dammed and diverted rivers to benefit the colonists' endeavors, which took water access away from the area's original inhabitants. This has led to water and agricultural issues that still exist today. Tribes, including the White Mountain Apaches, also face Climate Change droughts and high rates of food insecurity.

Solution

Seeding Sovereignty provides hands-on classes to teach community members to use water pumps to improve water access. These classes will be taught by water resources expert and White Mountain Apache Tribe member, Cheryl Pailzote. She will support food sovereignty through community classes on cooking and nutrition, family gardens, and seed saving. These classes will create a productive, empowering, and supportive community environment that will both fight these issues and preserve their culture.

Long-Term Impact

As the effects of Climate Change worsen, these courses will equip community members to handle future droughts. Agricultural education will prepare families to sustainably feed themselves for the long-term. The communal and informal nature of the courses will also help strengthen the White Mountain Apache community and culture. These courses are empowering this community to thrive on their land and be fruitful in years to come.

Balance of Texts

Initially, 100 campaign descriptions (CDs) were chosen from the website for each corpus, but to make sure the two sets of data contained a similar number of words, the stratified random sampling technique was

applied to divide the descriptions into five different groups based on their word ranges (see Table 2).

Table 1

Number of CDs in Five Different Word-Range Groups

Word Range	DC (N=100)	GC (N=100)
100-150	4	0
151-200	17	6
201-250	18	17
251-300	43	50
301-350	18	27

The table above shows that most of the CDs were in the last three groups and the number of CDs in these groups was enough to make generalizations in this study. Therefore, the CDs in the first two groups, or the ones with word counts between 100 and 200, were excluded from both corpora. Next, some of the global campaigns needed to be eliminated to balance the total number of CDs of both corpora. Fifteen campaigns were then randomly removed from the GC corpus. This left a total of 158 campaign descriptions, 79 from each corpus, as shown in the table below.

Table 2

Number of CDs in Five Different Word-Range Groups

Word Range	DC (N=79)	GC (N=79)
201-250	18	17
251-300	43	43
301-350	18	19

Size of the Corpora

The total number of words in all the domestic campaigns was 21,463, with the average of 271.68 words per CD, whereas in the global campaigns there were 21,831 words in total, with the average of 276.37 words per CD. Therefore, the standard deviations (SD) between the two corpora were also similar (DC corpus = 31.19 and GC corpus = 28.11), which means there was a fair degree of similarity between them.

Descriptions of Rhetorical Moves and Steps in CDs

After analyzing all the campaign descriptions in the two corpora, six moves and 15 steps were identified based on the models of Conner & Mauranen (1999), Cotos (2019), Lee (2016), and Upton (2002), as shown in the table below.

Table 3

Rhetorical Moves and Steps in CDs

Rhetorical moves and steps	Code
Move 1: Highlighting the Problem Step A: Describing the Problems Related to the Campaign Step B: Evaluating the Problems	M1 M1SA M1SB
Move 2: Identifying the Locations of the Problems Step A: Identifying a Larger Territory Step B: Identifying a Smaller Territory	M2 M2SA M2SB
Move 3: Giving Supporting Details Step A: Expressing the General Statement Step B: Describing Illnesses Step C: Providing References and/or Establishing Credibility	M3 M3SA M3SB M3SC
Move 4: Providing the Organization's/ Campaign's Information Step A: Giving the Background Step B: Stating the Goals of the Organization/Campaign Step C: Showing Previous Achievements	M4 M4SA M4SB M4SC

Move 5: Providing Solutions and/or Potential Benefits of the Campaign M5**Move 6: Persuading Donors M6**

Step A: Presenting Anecdotes M6SA

Step B: Inserting a Direct Quotation M6SB

Step C: Showing How a Donation Benefits Recipients M6SC

Step D: Soliciting Donations M6SD

Step E: Appealing to the Potential Donor's Emotions M6SE

M1: Highlighting the Problems talks about and evaluates the problems the organization aims to address.

M1SA Describing the Problems Related to the Campaign is used to describe the problems the campaign focuses on.

- *A million children worldwide die each year from contaminated drinking water, and many more are made ill with diarrheal diseases, preventing them from growing, attending school or helping their families. (GC5)*

M1SB Evaluating the Problems is used to analyze the problems by showing what the causes are, what might happen if they are not solved, and what can be done to address them.

- *With summer temperatures rising and COVID-19 cases spiking, there will be the need for additional water shipments to the Navajo Nation region. (DC21)*

M2: Identifying the Locations of the Problems specifies the location(s) of the problems.

M2SA Identifying a Larger Territory specifies a country, continental section, a continent, or many parts of the world combined.

- *This project will train community health workers and others in Latin America to accurately test water supplies for bacterial contamination. (GC5)*

M2SB Identifying a Smaller Territory specifies an area smaller than a country. For example, a village, town, state, etc.

- *To address the problem of malnutrition among the elderly in the downtown core area of Portland, Meals on Wheels People Elm Court Center serves and delivers more than 100,000 hot, nutritious meals every year. (DC25)*

M3: Giving Supporting Details provides additional factual information to support the texts.

M3SA Expressing the General Statement states information which is widely known or accepted by the majority of people.

- *Climate change affects every living thing on the planet. (DC52)*

M3SB Describing Illnesses describes the disease related to the campaign, including its signs, effects, and symptoms.

- *Symptoms of this rare genetic disorder include autism, seizures and developmental delays. (DC30)*

M3SC Providing References and Establishing Credibility gives reference information, such as study results, polls, or surveys by trustworthy sources to increase the reliability of the information.

- *The Centers for Disease Control states that PYFP significantly improves physical health, mental health, socio-economic health and environmental health. (DC8)*

M4: Providing the Organization's/Campaign's Information gives the audience any relevant information about the organization and campaign.

M4SA Giving the Background is used to present the organization's general information and history, as well as the location of their office.

- *The Genius of Caring is an interactive project that presents documentary portraits of family caregivers and those impacted by Alzheimer's and other caregiving diseases. (DC29)*

M4SB Stating the Goals of the Organization/Campaign describes the goal and expectations of the campaigns.

- *Trailblazer's mission is to improve health, food security, education and economic development in Cambodia's Siem Reap Province. (GC72)*

M4SC Showing Previous Achievements details the past accomplishments of the campaign or the organization.

- *For 19 years, Global Girls, Inc. has provided arts education and presentation opportunities for girls ages 5 to 18. (DC78)*

M5: Providing Solutions and/or Potential Benefits of the Campaign is used to show what the organization is going to do to achieve their goal as well as what the possible outcomes of the campaign will be.

- *Our nutrition program improves the health of 1,625 clients annually, reduces household food insecurity and helps clients stay out of hospitals and remain at-home. (DC36)*

M6: Persuading Donors aims to convince the audience to make donations using a few different strategies.

M6SA Presenting Anecdotes is telling short, interesting stories related to the campaign about a particular individual or group.

- Her 4-year-old son, desperate for a blood transfusion, was dying. With no money she could only watch him deteriorate overnight, until Olalo knew about the need. (GC71)

M6SB Inserting a Direct Quotation is used to convince the readers with what someone said.

- A girl student, Irene, says, "We were suffering in the villages...I am very happy to be in secondary school where I forget about being an orphan." (GC16)

M6SC Showing How a Donation Benefits Recipients describes what the donations from the donors will be used for.

- Your donation to this fund will help build stronger response capacities in communities around the world so that we are all better equipped to face future outbreaks. (DC43)

M6SD Soliciting Donations is used to emphasize the need for funds as well as to urge the audience to take immediate action.

- Funding is needed for girls mentoring, books, tutoring, and internships. (GC8)

M6SE Appealing to a Donor's Emotions expresses opinions to trigger the audience's emotions using imperative sentences, leading questions, or hypothetical situations.

- Imagine having to choose between having enough clean diapers for your baby or providing food for your family. Which would you choose? (DC29)

Results and Discussion

Results of Rhetorical Move Analysis

This study was conducted with two main objectives: identifying the rhetorical moves that occur in campaign descriptions of domestic and global campaigns in health operations and comparing the similarities and differences of the rhetorical moves that occur in campaign descriptions of domestic and global campaigns in health operations.

The Frequency of Rhetorical Moves

This section answers the first research question: 'What are the rhetorical moves that occur in the campaign descriptions of domestic and global campaigns in health operations?'. The first half provides the

response to the first sub-question: *‘What rhetorical moves occurred in domestic and global campaigns?’*.

After coding the occurrences of the moves in each campaign, they were counted to find out the total number of CDs each move appeared in. The breakdown can be seen in Table 5 below.

Table 4

Frequency and Percentage of Occurrences of Moves in Domestic and Global Campaigns

Move	Number of Occurrences			
	DC (N=79)		GC (N=79)	
	No. of CDs	%	No. of CDs	%
M1: Highlighting the Problems	72	91.14	78	98.73
M2: Identifying the Locations of the Problems	47	59.49	74	93.67
M3: Giving Supporting Details	26	32.91	19	24.05
M4: Providing the Organization’s/Campaign’s Information	45	56.96	39	49.37
M5: Providing Solutions and/or Potential Benefits of the Campaign	79	100	74	93.67
M6: Persuading Donors	44	55.7	39	49.37

Note: N refers to the total number of analyzed campaign descriptions in this study.

The number of move occurrences shown in the table above reflects the significance of each move as part of a campaign description. It is obvious that *Highlighting the Problems* (M1) and *Providing Solutions and/or Potential Benefits of the Campaigns* (M5) were both mandatory elements of a campaign description, both in domestic or global campaigns, with occurrences in between 91 and 100 percent of all campaigns. *Providing the Organization’s/Campaign’s Information* (M4) and *Persuading Donors* (M6) had very similar occurrences in both types of

campaigns, with around 55% in the DC corpus and 39% in the GC corpus. *Giving Supporting Details* (M3) was the least common move, occurring in about a third of the domestic campaigns and only around a quarter of the global campaigns. *Identifying the Locations of the Problems* (M2) was the only move that showed quite a big difference between the results of the two corpora, appearing in 74 global campaigns and 47 domestic campaigns. While the move occurred in more than 50% of both types of the campaigns, which indicates greater popularity than some other moves, the difference between the two corpora has intriguing implications.

To further clarify the necessity of the moves, they were classified into three categories of typicality based on their percentage of occurrences. These categories were obligatory (90-100%), conventional (49-89.99%), and optional (0.01-49.99%). The cut-off points were adapted from the studies of Kanoksilapatham (2005) and Thumvichit (2017). The table showing the categorization is provided below.

Table 5

Categorization of Moves in Campaign Descriptions

Typicality	Cut-off Point (%)
Obligatory	90.00 -100%
Conventional	49.00 - 89.99%
Optional	0.01 - 48.99%

Obligatory moves are the most essential moves which are always required in writing a fundraising campaign description. *Highlighting the Problems* (M1) and *Providing Solutions and/or Potential Benefits of the Campaign* (M5) in both corpora were in this category. *Conventional* moves, meanwhile, are not compulsory but can help fulfil the text's purpose(s). Therefore, the author can decide if there is a need to include these moves in their description or not. In both corpora, the moves that were considered *conventional* were *Providing the Organization's/Campaign's Information* (M4), and *Persuading Donors* (M6). However, *Identifying the Locations of the Problems* (M2) was *obligatory* only in the global campaigns, while it was merely *conventional* in the domestic campaigns. The moves with low occurrences were called *optional*. They help add extra

information and support other parts of the context but can be omitted without affecting the overall purpose(s) of the description. The only move in this group in both corpora was *Giving Supporting Details* (M3).

The answer to the second sub-question of the first research question, 'What prominent moves occurred in each section of the domestic and global campaigns?', refers to the following results.

Table 6

Prominent Rhetorical Moves by Each Section in Domestic and Global Campaigns

Move	Summary		Challenge		Solution		Long-term impact	
	No. of CDs	%	No. of CDs	%	No. of CDs	%	No. of CDs	%
DC (N=79)								
M1: Highlighting the Problems	29	36.71	72	91.14	9	11.39	15	18.99
M2: Identifying the Locations of the Problems	28	35.44	26	32.91	10	12.66	10	12.66
M3: Giving Supporting Details	10	12.66	16	20.25	4	5.06	3	3.8
M4: Providing the Organization's/Campaign's Information	31	39.24	6	7.59	12	15.19	16	20.25
M5: Providing Solutions and/or Potential Benefits of the Campaign	69	87.34	26	32.91	73	92.41	71	89.87
M6: Persuading Donors	24	30.38	13	16.46	14	17.72	16	20.25

Move	GC (N=79)							
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
M1: Highlighting the Problems	38	48.1	77	97.47	12	15.19	9	11.39
M2: Identifying the Locations of the Problems	61	77.22	29	36.71	30	37.97	21	26.58
M3: Giving Supporting Details	5	6.33	14	17.72	4	5.06	2	2.53
M4: Providing the Organization's/Campaign's Information	18	22.78	4	5.06	15	18.99	24	30.38
M5: Providing Solutions and/or Potential Benefits of the Campaign	69	87.34	21	26.58	75	94.94	68	86.08
M6: Persuading Donors	27	34.18	10	12.66	10	12.66	17	21.52

Note: The red colored figures are the highest percentage of frequency of each section of the campaign.

Since each campaign description was written by following the template of the four sections created by GlobalGiving, it is also useful to acknowledge the importance of certain moves which stood out in each individual section. The table above reveals that the most notable move in each section of the CDs in both DC and GC corpus was identical. Moreover, the number of CDs each move was included in was also very similar between the two corpora. *Providing Solutions and/or Potential Benefits of the Campaign* (M5) was the most frequently used in three sections of both types of the campaigns, which were 'Summary', 'Solution', and 'Long-term Impact', while *Highlighting the Problems* (M1) was the most preferred in the 'Challenge' part.

Comparison of Rhetorical Moves in the Campaign Descriptions

To see how the writers of both domestic and global campaigns approached the audience to persuade them to make donations, the use of the steps of each move was also observed, as they represented the writing strategies of the authors.

The results presented in this section respond to the second research question: *'What are the similarities and differences in the rhetorical moves that occurred in the campaign descriptions of domestic and global campaigns in health operations?'*

Table 7

Comparison of Frequency of Steps in the Campaign Descriptions of the Two Corpora

Rhetorical moves and steps	DC corpus (N=79)		GC corpus (N=79)	
	No. of CDs	%	No. of CDs	%
M1: Highlighting the Problems	72	91.14	78	98.73
M1SA: Describing the Problems Related to the Campaign	69	87.34	77	97.74
M1SB: Evaluating the Situation of the Problem	37	46.84	52	65.82
M2: Identifying the Locations of the Problems	47	59.49	74	93.67
M2SA: Identifying a Larger Territory	22	27.85	69	87.34
M2SB: Identifying a Smaller Territory	33	41.77	32	40.51
M3: Giving Supporting Details	26	32.91	19	24.05
M3SA: Expressing the General Statement	7	8.86	4	5.06
M3SB: Describing Illnesses	5	6.33	4	5.06
M3SC: Providing References and Establishing Credibility	17	21.52	14	17.72
M4: Providing the Organization's/Campaign's Information	45	56.96	39	49.37
M4SA: Giving the Background	20	25.32	11	13.92
M4SB: Stating the Goals of the Organization/Campaign	16	20.25	17	21.52
M4SC: Showing Previous Achievements	27	34.18	25	31.65

M5: Providing Solutions and/or Potential Benefits of the Campaign	79	100	74	93.67
M6: Persuading Donors				
M6SA: Presenting Anecdotes				
M6SB: Inserting a Direct Quotation	44	55.7	39	49.37
M6SC: Showing How a Donation Benefits Recipients	4	5.06	4	5.06
M6SD: Soliciting Donations	25	31.65	22	27.85
M6SE: Appealing to a Donor's Emotions	17	21.52	11	13.92
	16	20.25	16	20.25

The previous section revealed that some moves seemed to be more common than others as they appeared more frequently in campaigns. However, there were also multiple ways to achieve the purpose of each move, and the table above shows how many CDs each step was applied in. It should be noted that while *Providing Solutions and/or Potential Benefits of the Campaign* (M5) was an obligatory move and was opted for in most CDs, it did not have any steps as the goal of this move is clear and precise. The authors simply described how the campaigns were going to address the problem and/or showed the benefits the recipients were going to get and that was the only strategy adopted to achieve the aim of this move based on the pilot test.

Every domestic campaign was written using this move, while only five of the global campaigns were written without it. Highlighting the Problems (M1), the other obligatory move in this study, appeared in 72 domestic campaigns and 78 global campaigns. Describing the Problems Related to the Campaign (M1SA) was much more common, as evidenced by its much higher percentage compared to its counterpart, *Evaluating the Situation of the Problem* (M1SB).

Providing the Organization's/Campaign's Information (M4) and *Persuading Donors* (M6) were considered conventional in both corpora; when they were included in a campaign description, *Showing Previous Achievements* (M4SC) and *Showing How a Donation Benefits Recipients* (M6SC) were their most common steps, respectively.

As the only optional move, *Giving Supporting Details* (M3) wasn't a necessary element of a campaign description, but when this moved was

used, *Providing References and Establishing Credibility* (M3SC) was the most common strategy.

Identifying the Locations of the Problems (M2) was the only move with contradictory results between the two corpora in terms of the popularity according to the previous section. As for the steps, there was also a contrast between the two corpora. In the GC corpus, *Identifying the Locations of the Problems* (M2) was an obligatory move which appeared in almost 100 percent of all campaigns and was commonly applied using *Identifying a Larger Territory* (M2SA), whereas *Identifying a Smaller Territory* (M2SB) was a more common step in the DC corpus.

Discussion of Move Analysis Results

Each campaign description used in this study was written following the template of four sections: 'Summary', 'Challenge', 'Solution', and 'Long-term Impact'. It was possible that this format was created with the intention to limit the scope of information for the writers and to keep the content uniform and organized for the readers, as there are thousands of participating organizations as well as a huge audience. The strategy of persuasion in Goering et al.'s (2009) study of fundraising letters called 'visual design', in a way, resembles the template of the descriptions used for this study. The 'visual design' refers to how the authors apply bullet points when writing the letters to separate the text into smaller sections. However, this is a stylistic choice of the author and not a requirement.

Even though the ultimate goal of a campaign description is to solicit donations from the audience, each individual section has a different purpose in terms of what type of information it provides. The 'Summary' section briefly introduces the campaign to the audience and, as a first section, it also needs to catch the readers' attention to keep them reading to the end. The 'Challenge' part describes the problems the campaign aims to address. 'Solution' is the third section, which emphasizes the organization's mission to allow the audience to clearly see their action plan and know what their donations will be used for. The last part of the description is 'Long-term Impact', which states the predicted outcomes of the campaign to show the readers how much the recipients will benefit from the organization's mission funded by their donations.

Table 8*Similarities and Differences between Domestic and Global Campaigns*

Similarities	Discussion
<p><i>Highlighting Problems</i> (M1) and <i>Providing Solutions and/or Benefits of the Problems</i> (M5) were the most frequently used in both corpora.</p>	<p>The fact that these two moves were applied repeatedly in every campaign description shows that no matter where the organizations target to raise money for, locally or internationally, it is essential that the readers see clearly what the problems are and how their donations will make a difference to the recipients. It also implies that these moves are also likely to have an impact on whether the donors will make a donation or not.</p>
<p>In both types of the campaigns, <i>Highlighting Problems</i> (M1) appeared the most often in the 'challenge' section while in the other three sections (summary, solutions, and long-term Impact), <i>Providing Solutions and/or Benefits of the Problems</i> (M5) was the most common.</p>	<p>As all the campaigns on Globalgivings.org have to be written following the restricted format of four sections, there was a limitation of what the writers could include in their descriptions. Therefore, the results basically reflected the names of those sections. In the 'challenge' section, the writers were compelled to discuss the problems that led them to the initiation of the project. In the 'solutions' and 'long-term impact' sections, they had to show how the campaigns operate and what the outcomes were going to be for the recipients of the donations. And even though 'Summary' was a general title, this section was still restricted by the others as it was the information from the other three parts summarized into one.</p>
<p><i>Giving Supporting Details</i> (M3) was considered an 'optional' move in both corpora.</p>	<p>The move was clearly not a major element of the campaign descriptions according to its low frequency. However, it did help clarify some of the information by giving a little bit further explanation. So, while <i>Highlighting Problems</i> (M1) and <i>Providing Solutions and/or Benefits of the Problems</i> (M5) are vital components in writing a description, the writer can always consider using this move only to add some extra detail to part(s) of the content.</p>

Differences	Discussion
<p><i>Identifying Locations of the Problems</i> (M2) was only obligatory in the global campaigns while it was a 'conventional' move in the other corpus.</p>	<p>What contributed to the trend was the frequency of occurrences of the two steps of M2: <i>Identifying a Larger Territory</i> (M2SA) and <i>Identifying a Smaller Territory</i> (M2SB) which was different between the two corpora. <i>Identifying a Larger Territory</i> (M2SA) was used thrice more in the global campaigns while the other step was applied almost equally as frequently in both global and domestic campaigns.</p>
	<p>The locations in the descriptions, both large and small, were identified for different purposes. Most of them were the places where the donation was for, and the others were part of the references, statistics, organizations' background, goals and former achievements as well as other supporting details.</p>
	<p>As the global campaigns aimed to help people outside the US, giving the name of the country of operation was a must, while for the campaigns within the US, the country name could be omitted because it was already clear where the campaigns were for. In many campaigns, the same country name was repeated many times throughout the content, and these were often the countries where the campaigns take place. For example, '<i>India</i>' (GC48) and '<i>DR Congo</i>' (GC73) were repeated 5 times. '<i>South Sudan</i>' (GC1), '<i>Iraq</i>' (GC18), '<i>Guatemala</i>' (GC32), '<i>Venezuela</i>' (GC38), and '<i>Vietnam</i>' (GC66) were mentioned 4 times. '<i>Latin America</i>' (GC5), '<i>Nicaragua</i>' (GC25), '<i>Mexico</i>' (GC52) '<i>Zambia</i>' (GC69) were included 3 times. Moreover, since a country was considered a 'larger territory' in this study,</p>

this was what caused the higher occurrences of *Identifying a Larger Territory* (M2SA) in the global campaigns. In the domestic campaigns, the 'larger territory' commonly found was 'the US' and 'America', but those were in only less than a quarter of the corpus.

It is possible that the repetition of the country name was to get more attention from readers as *Globalgiving* is a US-based fundraising platform thereby reminding readers that the campaigns were for recipients overseas. Furthermore, many times these country names came as part of statistics which could emphasize the need of help of that particular country and therefore might be able to urge readers to donate.

For example,

Yemen has more than two million children that are so acutely malnourished that they become permanently impaired or, in many cases, die. (GC3)

Chronic malnutrition is the single biggest contributor to the deaths of children under 5 **in Guatemala**. (GC32)

It is estimated that prevalence of blindness is 1% and there are 12 million people suffering from complete blindness **in India**. (GC43)

There is a current sanitary and nutritional emergency in more than 4000 schools **throughout Argentina**. (GC54)

In the Philippines, more than a fifth of the population live in poverty, most have a low level of education and strong beliefs. (GC68)

This kind of information wasn't included nearly as much in the domestic campaigns.

There were also occasional references to broader territory such as a continent or region in the global campaigns when talking about the problems even though that campaign was only for a country or a smaller territory. This, once again, may have an impact on the donors as these statements can raise more awareness of the issue.

For example,

A million children **worldwide** die each year from contaminated drinking water. (GC5)
Preventable diseases contribute to Guatemala's infant mortality rates; the third highest **in Central America and the Caribbean**.
Uganda (M2S2A) has the highest teen pregnancy rate in **sub-Saharan Africa** with over 30% of Ugandan girls having their first baby by the time they are 18. (GC35)

In the domestic campaigns, problems overseas were barely discussed.

Conclusion

This research shows that there are more similarities than differences between domestic and global campaign descriptions observed in this study. *Providing the Solutions and/or Potential Benefits of the Campaign* (M5) and *Highlighting the Problems* (M1) are the core of description writing whether it is for local or international campaigns. However, the other moves are also there to help complete the text. *Providing the Organization's/Campaign's Information* (M4) and *Persuading Donors* (M6) are the options for writers to make a decision if they would like to include in their content or not. *Giving Supporting Details* (M3) is another move that helps fulfill the fundraising content even though it is not considered necessary. The major difference was the contradiction of the use of *Identifying the Locations of the Problems* (M2) between the two corpora caused by the much higher preference of *Identifying a Larger Territory* (M2SA) over *Identifying a Smaller Territory* (M2SB) in the global

campaigns. Therefore, to write a campaign description for a project overseas, it is necessary to emphasize the country of operation. To do this, specific issues from that country can be discussed, statistics can be presented, and solutions can be described along with the country name.

An interesting point to keep in mind is that all the descriptions chosen for this research were written following a format set by Globalgivings.com. This was thought to help keep the website content organized and easy to read for the audience as there are thousands of participating campaigns. As the topics were restricted to four sections, the authors were compelled to write with the limitation of what they could include. It is possible that the writing patterns of the campaign descriptions on other fundraising platforms might be different from the ones found in this study, especially when the writers have the freedom to write and present the campaign the way they want. Nevertheless, the moves discovered in this research are similar to, or share the same purposes as the ones in the previous works regarding fundraising discourses. If any nonprofits wish to join *Globalgiving*, then writing a campaign description applying the strategies found in this study, especially the move trends of each of the four sections, is highly recommended. If they want to write a campaign description for their own website or any other platforms without any restrictions, the results from this research can still guide them in terms of what kind of information they should focus on, or what they should consider adding or leaving out if not necessary. Even though it cannot be concluded from this work if the strategies found will lead to successful fundraising, the fact that *Globalgiving* is now a successful online fundraising platform with more than 1.5 million people so far donating to the projects in more than 175 countries across the globe somehow implies the efficiency of these writing patterns. Nonprofits looking to create a campaign description can choose to follow the trend of moves and steps in the type of the campaigns that matches their own. This research may also be useful for learners who are interested in studying fundraising content.

Limitations

Firstly, as the only source of the online campaign descriptions used in this study was GlobalGiving, it is possible that common move structures in the campaigns from other online sources might be different. Secondly,

the fixed template used on the website might have limited the number of moves found in this study. Finally, as a comparative study, the size of the corpora was limited. The results would have been more conclusive if more CDs had been included for the analysis.

Recommendations for Future Study

Firstly, the word choice by the authors of the campaigns can be further analyzed to find out if there are any specific language features which help persuade donors. Secondly, the moves and steps found in this study should be further studied in order to determine their effectiveness. Other types of campaigns can also be observed in the same way to discover if there are any different moves and steps used by the authors. Finally, fundraising descriptions in other languages are also worth being observed to determine the similarities and differences in the language used by authors from different cultural backgrounds.

About the Authors

Nuttiya Sakulthong: A master's degree student at the Language Institute of Thammasat University, Bangkok, Thailand. Her research interests include move analysis and fundraising discourses.

Chanika Gampper: A lecturer at the Language Institute of Thammasat University, Bangkok, Thailand. Her research interests include testing and evaluation, contrastive rhetoric, and discourse analysis.

References

- Abelen, E., Redeker, G., & Thompson, S. A. (1993). The rhetorical structure of US-American and Dutch fund-raising letters. *Text - Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse*, 13(3), 323-350. <https://doi.org/10.1515/text.1.1993.13.3.323>
- Askehave, I., & Swales, J. M. (2001). Genre identification and communicative purpose: A problem and a possible solution. *Applied Linguistics*, 22(2), 195-212. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/22.2.195>

- Azhar, I. (2015). Philanthropy language construction. *International Journal of Humanities and Cultural Studies*, 2(2), 119–129. <http://ijhcschiefeditor.wix.com/ijhcs>
- Barman, E. (2017). The social bases of Philanthropy. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 43(1), 271–290. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-060116-053524>
- Becker, P. (1974). *A theory of social interactions*. National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Berkenkotter, C., & Huckin, T. N. (1994). *Genre knowledge in disciplinary communication: Cognition/culture/power*. Routledge.
- Berzlánovich, I., & Redeker, G. (2012). Genre-dependent interaction of coherence and lexical cohesion in written discourse. *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory*, 8(1), 183–208. <https://doi.org/10.1515/cllt-2012-0008>
- Bhatia, V. K. (1993). *Analysing genre: Language use in professional settings*. Routledge.
- Bhatia, V. K. (1998). Generic patterns in fundraising discourse. *New Directions for Philanthropic Fundraising*, 1998(22), 95–110. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pf.2207>
- Bhatia, V. K. (2002). Applied genre analysis: A multi-perspective model. *Ibérica: Revista de La Asociación Europea de Lenguas Para Fines Específicos (AELFE)*, 4, 3–19.
- Bhatia, V. K. (2004). *Worlds of written discourse: A genre-based view*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Bhatia, V. K. (2012). Critical reflections on genre analysis. *Ibérica: Revista de La Asociación Europea de Lenguas Para Fines Específicos (AELFE)*, 24, 17–28.
- Biel, Ł. (2017). Genre analysis and translation. In K. Malmkjær (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of translation studies and linguistics* (pp. 151–164). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315692845-11>
- Browning, B. (2012). *Perfect phrases for fundraising*. McGraw-Hill Education.
- Burke, K. (1945). *A grammar of motives, semantics with a difference*. Prentice Hall.
- Connor, U., & Mauranen, A. (1999). Linguistic analysis of grant proposals: European Union Research Grants. *English for Specific Purposes*, 18(1), 47–62. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0889-4906\(97\)00026-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0889-4906(97)00026-4)

- Cotos, E. (2019). Articulating societal benefits in grant proposals: Move analysis of Broader Impacts. *English for Specific Purposes*, 54, 15–34. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2018.11.002>
- Flowerdew, L. (2000). Using a genre-based framework to teach organizational structure in academic writing. *ELT Journal*, 54(4), 369–378. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/54.4.369>
- Fusari, S. (2009). Philanthropic direct mail in an English/ Italian perspective: A corpus-based study. *Facta Universitatis*, 7(2), 149–161. <https://www.cceol.com/search/article-detail?id=268223>
- Gautier, A., & Pache, A. C. (2013). Research on corporate philanthropy: A review and assessment. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 126(3), 343–369.
- Goering, E., Connor, U. M., Nagelhout, E., & Steinberg, R. (2009). Persuasion in fundraising letters: An interdisciplinary study. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 40(2), 228–246. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764009339216>
- Kanoksilapatham, B. (2005). Rhetorical structure of biochemistry research articles. *English for Specific Purposes*, 24(3), 269–292. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2004.08.003>
- Kitova, Y. (2014). *Discourse and linguistic features in appeal letters*. Academia.edu.
- Lainer-Vos, D. (2014). Brothers' keepers: Gift giving networks and the organization of Jewish American diaspora nationalism. *Socio-Economic Review*, 12(3), 463–488. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ser/mwu003>
- Lee, P. C.-W. (2016). A discourse description of four fundraising texts – linguists meet practitioners: An exploratory study. *Discourse and Interaction*, 9(2), 25–50. <https://doi.org/10.5817/di2016-2-25>
- Longacre, R. E. (1992). The discourse strategy of an appeals letter. In W.C. Mann & S.A. Thompson (Eds.), *Discourse description: Diverse linguistic analyses of a fund-raising text* (pp. 109–130). John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.16.06lon>
- Martin, J. (2017). Move analysis and the philanthropic letter. *ERA: Education and Research Archive*. University of Alberta Libraries. <https://doi.org/10.7939/R3BK17389>
- Musick, M. A., & Wilson, J. (2007). *Volunteers*. Amsterdam University Press.

- Ritzenhein, D. N. (1998). Content analysis of fundraising letters. *New Directions for Philanthropic Fundraising*, 1998(22), 23–36.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/pf.2202>
- Sadeghi, V., & Samuel, M. (2013). Genre analysis of the letters of appeal. *Discourse Studies*, 15(2), 229–245.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445612471467>
- Sandouka, K. (2019). Text analysis of crowdfunding: A literature review. *Proceedings of the Americas Conference on Information Systems (AMCIS)*, 1–5.
- Swales, J. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge University Press.
- Swales, J. M. (2000). Languages for specific purposes. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 20, 59–76.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/s0267190500200044>
- Thumvichit, A. (2017). *A comparative genre analysis of Thai and UK hotels' responses to complaints on TripAdvisor* [Doctoral dissertation, Thammasat University]. Thammasat University Library. <https://doi.org/10.14457/TU.the.2017.745>
- Turner, R. H., & Homans, G. C. (1961). Social behavior: Its elementary forms. *American Sociological Review*, 26(4), 635-636.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/2090265>
- Upton, T. A. (2002). Understanding direct mail letters as a genre. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 7(1), 65–85.
<https://doi.org/10.1075/ijcl.7.1.04upt>
- Upton, T. A., & Cohen, M. A. (2009). An approach to corpus-based discourse analysis: The move analysis as example. *Discourse Studies*, 11(5), 585–605.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445609341006>
- Wei, J., & Gampper, C. (2014). A corpus-based collocation study and move patterns in online smartphone press releases. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, 7(2), 99–110.
- Zhou, M., Lu, B., Fan, W., & Wang, G. A. (2016). Project description and crowdfunding success: An exploratory study. *Information Systems Frontiers*, 20(2), 259–274. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10796-016-9723-1>