

Rhetorical Structure of English and Czech Academic Book Reviews

Jana Kozubíková Šandová

University of South Bohemia in České Budějovice, Czech Republic

This study focuses on a contrastive analysis of linguistics book review articles written in English and Czech. The aim is two-fold: 1) to find out any variation in the rhetorical structure of these reviews; 2) to explore whether these structural differences somehow affect the way communicative goals of the genre of the book review article are achieved in the two language cultures. The theoretical framework of this study provides a modified version of Motta-Roth's (1995) taxonomy of rhetorical moves and their sub-functions in book review articles. The results show that in spite of a number of similarities between the two writing traditions, certain variation occurs attributable to different rhetorical preferences of both cultures and varied cultural expectations of the genre.

Keywords: *book review article, academic discourse, genre analysis, rhetorical structure, rhetorical move*

1. Introduction

This paper is an investigation about whether the rhetorical structure of the book review article written in English may be found in corresponding texts in different languages. Therefore, one aim of the present study is to examine any variation in the rhetorical structure of English and Czech academic book reviews. This paper also attempts to find out whether the possible differences in the internal structure somehow influence achieving communicative goals of the book review articles in the two different academic writing traditions.

Nowadays, academic review genres have taken on importance in applied linguistics literature. One of the reasons may be that the Internet abounds with various scholarly articles and scientific books so gaining access to them is much easier than ever before. As a result, it is very difficult for scholars to orient themselves in all these works and information they contain, and to distinguish between valuable contributions and those of a lower quality. Therefore, book reviews have gained significance in academia.

The genre of the book review article plays a crucial role in introducing new book titles to a specific discipline and in assessing their quality considering the latest development in the field. The book review article describes the structure and contents of the book, its purpose, the ease one can read the text, the clarity of tables or graphs, the quality or appropriateness of the corpus under study, etc. It highlights the most important parts of the book, evaluates it, and designates which given field of study the book belongs to. Therefore, such a review article belongs to discursive genres whose purpose is being descriptive, informative, and evaluative (Hyland 2000; De Carvalho 2001; Suárez & Moreno 2008, Dontcheva-Navrátilová 2018).

Even though the significance of the genre of the book review article has been clearly recognised by the academic community, not much is known about those attributes which make it a distinctive genre. Initially, genre has been a literary concept which became common when analysing non-literary discourse. In his seminal work concerning the study of genres, Swales (1990: 58) offers this definition:

A genre comprises a class of communicative events, the members of which share some set of communicative purposes. These purposes are recognised by the expert members of the parent

discourse community, and thereby constitute the rationale for the genre. This rationale shapes the schematic structure of the discourse and influences and constrains choice of content and style.

A similar claim has been made by Henry & Roseberry (1997: 480), who maintain that genre “groups texts together based primarily on their purpose within a social context.”

Thus, the concept of genre is understood as a set of communicative events serving a specific communicative purpose and performed by various discourse communities.

In order to be able to classify a text within a particular genre, it must follow adequate conventions and have a particular structure. This has been confirmed by Swales (1990, 2004), who points out that one of the aspects relevant for a comprehensive description of a genre is the generic rhetorical structure of a text, which has been proved by current research into the academic book review (cf. Motta-Roth 1995; Gea Valor & del Saz Rubio 2000-2001; Suárez & Moreno 2008; Hyland & Diani 2009, i.a.). The segment a text is composed of is called a *move*. The division of texts into rhetorical moves has also been developed by Swales (1990, 2004), who employed this approach by the functional description of particular sections of research articles. Swales defines a move as a “discoursal or rhetorical unit that performs a coherent communicative function in a written or spoken discourse” (2004: 228-229).

In genre analysis, the concept of move is most frequently utilised to determine which regularly repeating structures appear within a particular genre. Depending on the general communicative function of the genre, moves may differ in length, stretching from one sentence to several paragraphs, but they usually consist of at least one proposition. As moves represent complete semantic and functional stretches of text determinable on the basis of their communicative function and linguistic boundaries, move analysis is very useful in genre-based approaches to discourse analysis (Connor & Mauranen 1999; Ding 2007). Thus, in a move analysis, rhetorical units are classified according to a specific communicative function each of these units perform with the aim of designating the overall communicative purposes of a text. These specific communicative functions then contribute to the general communicative intention of the whole genre. The special arrangement of the moves of a particular genre determines its specificity, which makes it distinct from other genres.

As regards the number of moves of a particular genre, it is not fixed since there is no mutual relationship between the manner by which rhetorical units of a genre are organised and its formal arrangement (Parodi 2010). In this connection it must be emphasised that not all of the moves of a particular genre are always present in a text. Some moves are *optional*, i.e. discourse participants may choose to utilise these moves to make the communication more effective but they do not influence the function of the text. On the contrary, some moves are *obligatory* because they are vital for achieving the communicative function of the genre. All these features are examined within genre analysis, which started to be developed after the most significant work of Swales (1990) concerning this type of analysis was published.

Following Swales, extensive research into various academic genres has been carried out, for example, into research articles (Dontcheva-Navrátilová 2016; Hyland 2000; Holmes 1997; Nwogu 1997, i.a.), grant proposals (Connor & Mauranen 1999), company audit reports (Flowerdew & Wan 2010), or essay conclusions (Henry & Roseberry 1997). The genre of the book review has not received as much attention. Therefore, Motta-Roth’s (1995, 1998) examination of the rhetorical macrostructure of English book reviews in the disciplines of chemistry, economics, and linguistics may be regarded as a pioneering study in the field of move analysis stemming from the Swalesian tradition. The outcomes of Motta-Roth’s study relating to the overall rhetorical structure of academic book reviews have been corroborated by work of other scholars, for instance, by Suárez & Moreno (2008), De Carvalho (2001), Gea Valor (2000), or Nicolaisen (2002). None of these studies reveal

any major differences in the basic organisation of book reviews, either cross-linguistically and cross-disciplinarily. This supports the claim that the book review may be considered a distinctive genre. However, as Suárez & Moreno (2008) correctly point out, subtle cross-linguistic and cross-disciplinary variations have been found out so in order to perform as accurate a description of the rhetorical structure of the book review as possible, it is necessary to reflect on these differences.

2. Material and method

For the purpose of this study, a corpus of 40 linguistics book review articles was compiled. The Anglophone sub-corpus contains 20 book reviews excerpted from distinguished linguistic journals (*Journal of Pragmatics*, *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *Journal of Linguistics*, *Applied Linguistics*, and *International Journal of English Studies*) written in English by Anglophone scholars affiliated with British or American universities. The Czech sub-corpus comprises likewise 20 book review articles, published in two distinguished peer-reviewed Czech linguistic journals (*Časopis pro moderní filologii*, *Slovo a slovesnost*). The authors of Czech reviews are academics of Czech origin employed by Czech universities. Even though there is a certain difference in the Anglophone and Czech journals used in this study as for the prestige and size of the target audience, the book reviews drawn from them form a representative sample for the purpose of this research.

All reviews were published between 2015 and 2018. The extent of the whole corpus is 80,237 words, the Anglophone sub-corpus containing 40,176 words, the Czech sub-corpus reaching the amount of 40,061 words. Both sub-corpora are almost identical in size, hence, they can be mutually compared.

Rhetorical move analysis was adopted to identify the individual moves of which each book review article is composed. The theoretical framework utilised in this study is a modified version of Motta-Roth's (1995) classification of rhetorical moves and their sub-functions in book reviews.

Now, let us describe the taxonomy of the book review rhetorical structure as proposed by Motta-Roth (1995) in greater detail. It consists of four basic moves, each of which is divided into several sub-functions, as apparent from Figure 1. Moves 1 and 2 belong to descriptive moves, whereas Moves 3 and 4 are evaluative. For the purpose of the present analysis, the sub-functions of Move 4 were modified in order to better differentiate between the categories of *evaluation* and *recommendation*, the latter category thus constituting a separate move.

Move 1 **Introducing the book**

Sub-function 1 Defining the general topic of the book	and / or
Sub-function 2 Informing about potential readership	and / or
Sub-function 3 Informing about the author	and / or
Sub-function 4 Making topic generalizations	and / or
Sub-function 5 Inserting book in the field	

Move 2 **Outlining the book**

Sub-function 6 Providing general view of the organization of the book	and / or
Sub-function 7 Stating the topic of each chapter	and / or
Sub-function 8 Citing extra-textual material	

Move 3 **Highlighting parts of the book**

Sub-function 9 Providing focused evaluation	
---	--

Move 4 Providing closing evaluation of the book

Sub-function 10A Definitely recommending / disqualifying the book or

Sub-function 10B Recommending the book despite indicated shortcomings

Figure 1: Schematic description of rhetorical sub-functions in book reviews (Motta-Roth 1995: 142)

In Move 1 (*Introducing the book*), with the help of sub-function 1 (*Defining the general topic of the book*) the reviewer describes the subject matter of the book briefly. It is followed by sub-function 2 (*Informing about potential readership*) which mentions the possible target audience of the book. This sub-function is sometimes left out as part of Move 1 and the information about target readers is provided at the end of the review in the closing evaluation of the book. Sub-function 3 (*Informing about the author*) supplies information about the author of the reviewed book, such as their previous works or academic career. In sub-function 4 (*Making topic generalisations*), reviewers relate the book to the known facts and theories in the field. Sub-function 5 (*Inserting book in the field*) is more specific than the previous sub-function and discusses previously published books on the same topic or mentions the gap that the book under review could have covered.

The other descriptive move, Move 2 (*Outlining the book*), focuses on the description of the structure of the book. It may contain evaluative comments but they are quite rare since the main intention of this move is to outline the book. Sub-function 6 (*Providing general view of the organisation of the book*) explains the general structure of the book, i.e. the number of parts or chapters. Sub-function 7 (*Stating the topic of each chapter*) is more specific and describes the contents of each chapter. In some cases the reviewer is very specific, while in other cases the content is summarised in just one sentence. Sub-function 8 (*Citing extra-textual material*) mentions additional material not being a direct part of the book, such as illustrations, tables, figures, appendices, etc.

Move 3 (*Highlighting parts of the book*), together with Move 4, belongs to the evaluative moves of the book review. It has only one sub-function (sub-function 9 *Providing focused evaluation*) in which positive and negative aspects of the specific parts or chapters of the book are discussed. This move is sometimes connected with Move 2, in case the reviewer describes the particular chapters and evaluates them at the same time.

Move 4 (*Providing closing evaluation of the book*) provides a final summary of the book review and simultaneously expresses an unequivocal opinion of the general significance of the book under review. Compared to the evaluation provided in Move 3, this assessment is not that specific and relates to the book as a whole. Motta-Roth (1995) identifies two sub-functions within this move: Sub-function 10A (*Definitely recommending / disqualifying the book*) and sub-function 10B (*Recommending the book despite indicated shortcomings*). At this point, we have modified Motta-Roth's classification since we consider *evaluation* and *recommendation* to be two different rhetorical functions, which cannot be subsumed under one joint category. When evaluating the book, the reviewer expresses their subjective viewpoint of the book and assesses it in either positive or negative terms. When recommending the book, the reviewer encourages readers to act somehow, e.g. buy the book, read the book, borrow the book, etc. Therefore, Move 4 consists of sub-function 10 *Completely positive evaluation* and sub-function 11 *Positive evaluations with aspects to improve*. In case of an overall negative evaluation, sub-function 12 *Completely negative evaluation* could be added. However, it was not found in the analysed corpora.

Move 5 (*Recommendation*) comprises three sub-functions: *Definitely recommending the book* (sub-function 13), *Recommending the book despite indicated shortcomings* (sub-function 14), and *Not recommending the book* (sub-function 15). Sub-function 13 contains a straight-forward recommendation of the book being reviewed. In sub-function 14 the reviewer recommends the book, although, certain negative aspects are also highlighted. Finally, sub-function 15 consists in an outright

rejection of the book under review. The modified version of Motta-Roth's classification described in the preceding paragraphs is illustrated below (Figure 2).

Move 1	Introducing the book	
Sub-function 1	Defining the general topic of the book	and / or
Sub-function 2	Informing about potential readership	and / or
Sub-function 3	Informing about the author	and / or
Sub-function 4	Making topic generalizations	and / or
Sub-function 5	Inserting book in the field	
Move 2	Outlining the book	
Sub-function 6	Providing general view of the organization of the book	and / or
Sub-function 7	Stating the topic of each chapter	and / or
Sub-function 8	Citing extra-textual material	
Move 3	Highlighting parts of the book	
Sub-function 9	Providing focused evaluation	
Move 4	Closing evaluation	
Sub-function 10	Completely positive evaluation	or
Sub-function 11	Positive evaluation with aspects to improve	or
Sub-function 12	Completely negative evaluation	
Move 5	Recommendation	
Sub-function 13	Definitely recommending the book	or
Sub-function 14	Recommending the book despite indicated shortcomings	

Figure 2: A modified version of Motta-Roth's taxonomy of rhetorical sub-functions in book reviews

3. Results and discussion

One aim of this paper was to explore any variation in the rhetorical structure of Anglophone and Czech linguistics book review articles. The possible differences in the use of moves and their sub-functions are indicative of distinctions connected with the specific academic culture. By rhetorical structure we mean the way a text is organised into a coherent whole in a given genre. A text, of course, does not represent a mere series of clauses but it is composed of hierarchically organised constituents being in diverse relations to each other.

According to the above-described classification, the basic rhetorical structure of book review articles consists of five moves and their sub-functions. Their occurrence in both corpora is summarised in Table 1 below.

Table 1: The absolute frequency of rhetorical moves and sub-functions in English and Czech BRs

	M1, SF1	M1, SF2	M1, SF3	M1, SF4	M1, SF5	M2, SF6	M2, SF7	M2, SF8	M3, SF9	M4, SF10	M4, SF11	M4, SF12	M5, SF13	M5, SF14	M5, SF15
English BRs (20)	20	4	0	9	7	16	19	3	17	8	12	0	2	2	0
Czech BRs (20)	20	6	10	9	15	16	17	11	14	15	5	0	1	2	0

The figures in Table 1 indicate the absolute frequencies of the moves and sub-functions. As is apparent, some cross-linguistic differences occur. Perhaps one of the most striking variations is the absence of Move 1, sub-function 3 (*Informing about the author*) from the Anglophone sub-corpus, while in the Czech sub-corpus it occurs in 10 out of 20 reviews. It is quite common for Czech reviewers to introduce the author of the book briefly. They usually provide basic information about their affiliation and/or recent publications, often on a similar topic as the reviewed book. This background information may contribute positively to the author-reader relationship, which becomes more interpersonal and, consequently, it may raise the interest of the reader to buy or read the book under review or other publications written by the same author. Furthermore, the reader may learn about the author's expertise. Last but not least, the reviewer may be regarded as an expert who knows other authorities in the field. Anglophone reviewers do not consider such kind of information important or necessary as it may divert attention from the merits of the book under review. Below are two examples excerpted from the Czech sub-corpus.

- (1) *Docentka Martina Šmejkalová, vedoucí katedry českého jazyka na Pedagogické fakultě Univerzity Karlovy*, [Associate Professor Martina Šmejkalová, Head of Czech Department at the Faculty of Education, Charles University] *je odborné veřejnosti známa jako autorka rozsáhlé monografie Čeština a škola [...]*. [CMF6]
- (2) *Autorkou publikace je brněnská Portugalistka Iva Svobodová* [The author of the publication is the Brno-based expert in Portuguese linguistics Iva Svobodová], *jež se specializuje zejména na oblast morfologie současného portugalského jazyka (problematika členu)*. [CMF2]

Another difference between the two corpora lies in the occurrence of Move 2, sub-function 8 (*Citing extra-textual material*). It appears only three times in the Anglophone sub-corpus, whereas in the Czech sub-corpus it was found in 11 reviews. This sub-function provides the readers with information about additional parts of the book, such as illustrations, appendices, figures, tables, or references. Anglophone reviewers focus more on providing readers with the contents of the book and a detailed evaluation of particular chapters. Czech reviewers give information about the extra-textual material in about half of the reviews. However, they do not add any further specific details. Reviewers sometimes emphasise the additional character of these parts by using expressions such as *at the end of each chapter*, as in Example 3, or *only at the end, finally*, etc.

- (3) *Finally, there is an appendix and index. References are included at the end of each chapter and not as a list in the end-matter of the book.* [IJES2]

- (4) *Rozsáhlá monografie, doprovázená bohatou bibliografií* [extensive bibliography] *a obsahující množství podrobných tabulek, soupisů a názorných grafů*, [comprehensive tables, lists, and illustrative graphs] *podává v rámci zkoumaných korpusových dat [...] vyčerpávající a detailní analýzu* [...]. [CMF6]
- (5) *Následují závěr, bohatá sekce referencí, řada příloh, rejstřík a anglické summary*. [What follows are conclusions, extensive references, a number of appendices, index, and an English summary.][SS4]

A further variation between the Anglophone and Czech corpora, though not particularly wide, concerns Move 1, sub-function 5 (*Inserting book in the field*). This sub-function contextualises the reviewed book in the field by referring to books published previously on an identical topic or by stressing the importance of the new book which should fill a gap in the existing literature. Even though this sub-function may build the relationship and common ground between the reviewer and the audience, its occurrence in the Anglophone corpus is, with 7 occurrences, relatively low, compared to the Czech corpus where it appears in 15 out of the total of 20 reviews. In all the examples below, the reviewer places the book under review within a certain theoretical framework without making any generalisations about the topic which are the subject of sub-function 4.

- (6) [...], *and it brings together a collection of papers which explore topics and themes from across a range of work within the relevance-theoretic pragmatic framework*. [JP3]
- (7) *Faces of English Education sets out to provide coverage of some of the key issues in current debates on English language education throughout the world* [...]. [JEAP1]
- (8) *Autorky se hlásí k odkazu Noama Chomského, především k jeho konceptu univerzální gramatiky z 60. let minulého století*. [...the legacy of Noam Chomsky, especially his concept of Universal Grammar][SS2]
- (9) *Jednotlivé stati prolíná problematika funkční perspektivy větné (FSP), pojímaná ve smyslu teorie Jana Firbase* [the theory of the Functional Sentence Perspective, dealt within Jan Firbas's theory][...] *a jeho žáků a pokračovatelů* [...]. [CMF3]

Focusing on the rest of the moves and their sub-functions, there are no major differences between the two writing cultures. Sub-functions 2, 7, 9, 10, and 11 occur with a very similar frequency in both corpora, the occurrence of sub-functions 1, 4, and 6 is even identical.

All reviewers find it necessary to briefly describe the general topic of the book and its contents (Move 1, sub-function 1), see Examples 10-14 below. Apart from stating the general topic, they sometimes mention the theoretical framework employed by the author of the book (Example 10). One means of drawing the reader's attention to the book is employing the nominal phrase *this book/volume/monograph*, followed by a verb in the present tense and an object (Examples 10 and 11). Another means is stating the full title of the book in italics (Example 12) or the author's name (Examples 13 and 14).

- (10) *This book re-examines this notion in the light of recent advances in Minimalism and compares the framework to alternatives that do not embrace the notion*. [JL3]

- (11) *This book provides an important account of the issues surrounding institutional English language proficiency requirements and the types of institutional support needed to support the increasing international student cohort.* [JEAP1]
- (12) *Publikace Právní překlad v teorii a praxi, jak napovídá název, je syntézou teorie překládání českých právních norem a praktických pokynů a návodů vycházejících z případového rozboru nového občanského zákoníku (NOZ).* [The publication *Legal translation in theory and practice* is a synthesis of the theory of translation of Czech legal norms and practical instructions based on a case analysis of the new Civil Code.][CMF1]
- (13) *Kniha Petra Pořízky* [Petr Pořízek's book] *seznamuje čtenáře s problematikou vytváření jazykových korpusů a vyhledávání v nich.* [SS4]
- (14) *Monografie Naděždy Kudrnáčové* [Naděžda Kudrnáčová's monograph] *je jedním z výsledků mnohaletého autorčina zájmu o sémantiku anglických pohybových sloves.* [CMF4]

Contrary to Move 1, sub-function 1, which is not missing from any review in both sub-corpora, only a minority of the reviewers consider it important to inform about the target readers of the book (Move 1, sub-function 2) at the beginning of the review (Examples 15-18 below). This information, if present, is more frequently provided at the very end of the review together with closing evaluation of the whole book. The potential readership is referred to explicitly, e.g. *postgraduate students, applied linguists, research community, academic support staff*, etc.; however, an implicit reference, such as *it offers an introductory guide...*, *it provides a basic insight...*, may occur, which means that the book under review is meant for undergraduate students or non-specialist readers. In case of a direct reference, moves belonging to this category contain phrases related to the interest of the target audience, such as *be of (great) interest to, be useful for, be of great value to, be helpful, providing rich insights that would benefit researchers from many disciplines*, etc. Sometimes there is reference to background knowledge or expertise (*introductory, general, essential*) or reference to education (*undergraduate, more advanced, graduate (students)*).

- (15) *As such, this book is essential reading for a range of people in the university system, from policy-makers and administrators, through to lecturers and academic support staff.* [JEAP1]
- (16) [...], *it is of great interest to the wider research community to learn more about this corpus resource for Turkish, and gain insights into the politeness (and impoliteness) principles of a non-Indo-European language.* [JL2]
- (17) *Z tohoto důvodu je text určen především pro studenty oboru Portugalský jazyk a literatura uvedené univerzity.* [for students of Portuguese language and literature][CMF2]
- (18) *Kniha je určena především vysokoškolským studentům portugalštiny* [for university students of Portuguese], *užitečné informace v ní však nepochybně naleznou i další romanisté a lingvisté* [other Romanists and linguists]. [CMF6]

Almost half of Anglophone and Czech reviewers makes specific topic generalisations (Move 1, sub-function 4). In this move, they provide further details concerning theories or facts presented in the reviewed book. They may give definitions of important terms or concepts, sometimes with examples

(Example 19). Also, important schools of thought or authorities are cited, as well as experiments or discoveries (Example 20).

- (19) *In attributive usage, he distinguishes three patterns of modification: intersective attribution (such as beautiful picture, which denotes the intersection of the set of pictures and the set of beautiful things), intensional attribution (such as false friend, where the attribute augments “the semantics of head with the feature “not actual”, and subsecutive attribution (as in beautiful dancer, in the sense “a person who dances beautifully”). [JL3]*
- (20) *Autorky kromě výkladu vycházejícího z chomskyánského teoretického rámce [Chomskyan theoretical framework] popisují některé provedené psycholingvistické experimenty [psycholinguistic experiments][...]. [SS2]*

Another move with identical distribution across both corpora is Move 2, sub-function 6. With an incidence of 16 out of 20 reviews, it belongs to the most frequent ones. In this sub-function, reviewers pay attention to providing a general overview of the organisation of the book. They do it by explicitly stating how many sections or chapters the book contains, or alternatively the topics addressed in these parts. Some typical verbs expressing this sub-function are *divide*, *subdivide*, or *organise* used in the passive voice preceded by the noun *book* or *volume*. Of course the specific numeral indicating the number of chapters or parts is stated. Below are several examples of this rhetorical sub-function:

- (21) *The volume is divided into four parts.* [AL1]
- (22) *Recenzovaná kniha je rozdělena do osmi kapitol.* [The book under review is divided into eight chapters.][SS2]

What appears quite frequently in both corpora is the co-occurrence of sub-functions 6 and 7. Firstly, the reviewer describes the general organisation of the book while then continuing with a more specific summary of the key ideas of the particular chapters (Example 23). In some reviews, the chapters are described one after another (Examples 25 and 26), or sometimes, depending on the length of the reviewed book, they are grouped into sections and discussed together (Example 24).

As regards linguistic features employed by reviewers to express sub-function 6, they most frequently refer to individual sections of the book as *chapters*, combining this noun with a specific numeral (cardinal or ordinal number) or adjectives such as *following*, *next*, or *final*. All these means serve for a better orientation in the review itself as well as in the reviewed book since they indicate how the particular parts are arranged in a logical order. The most frequent verbs used in this sub-function are *feature*, *present*, *define*, *illustrate*, *discuss*, *show*, etc.

- (23) *Their volume consists of seven chapters [...]. Chapter 1 sets the tone by offering a general overview and a justification for their work [...]. The second chapter features an excellent summary of various socioeconomic and institutional confluences [...]. Chapter 3 features an impressively integrated history of EAP [...]. [JEAP1]*
- (24) *The following four chapters deal with discourse markers, but exploit different theoretical frameworks.* [JL2]
- (25) *Kapitola Komunikační funkce věty a modalita obsahuje pojednání o způsobu oslovování a pozdravech, které většina dostupných gramatik v podstatě ignoruje.* [The chapter

“Communicative function of a sentence and modality includes a treatise on the way of address and greetings.][SS3]

- (26) *Autoři v osmé kapitole nabízejí precizní výklad jednotlivých jevů* [...]. [In Chapter 8 the authors offer an accurate explanation of the particular phenomena.][CMF4]

As is apparent from the figures in Table 1, Move 3 occurs very frequently in both corpora as well. In this move, which is realised only through sub-function 9 (*Providing focused evaluation*), the reviewers discuss positive and negative remarks of particular parts, usually chapters, of the book, which means that it is not a descriptive move, as Move 2, but rather evaluative. Judging from the occurrence of evaluative critical comments, Move 3 is the most evaluative move in both corpora.

To express their subjective attitude, both Anglophone and Czech reviewers employ lexical phrases such *in my view*, *z mého pohledu* [from my point of view], *in my/our opinion* (Example 29), or *in my own experience*. Assessing information is further conveyed explicitly by evaluative adjectives, nouns, or verbs, either positive or negative, e.g. *excellent*, *interesting*, *useful*, *weak*, *limited*, *convincing*, *value*, *strength*, *problem*, *shortcoming*, *succeed*, *overlook*, *lack*, etc. Also, superlative expressions such as *the best example*, *one of the greatest parts*, *the major strength* occur in this move.

- (27) *Having set the standard for conceptualising the linguistic and literacy needs of the university student, Murray provides an excellent critique of pre-enrolment language testing in the fourth chapter.* [JEAP1]
- (28) *The papers in this third volume, therefore, constitute a definite strength in the collection.* [JL2]
- (29) *Velmi přínosná je podle našeho názoru kapitola pojednávající o Šmilauerově činnosti lexikografické.* [Very beneficial is, in our view, the chapter dealing with...] [CMF6]
- (30) *Podkapitola o členu působí kvůli svému rozsahu (celkově pouze tři strany) poněkud odbytě* [rather sloppy][...]. [SS3]
- (31) *Zařazení této kapitoly spíše lexikologické povahy se nám jeví jako velmi vhodné* [very suitable][...]. [CMF2]

The reviewers may also employ various positive or negative attitude markers, such as *nicely*, *clearly*, *impressively*, *convincingly* or *unfortunately*:

- (31) *In an extensive overview [...], the author Kathleen Currie Hall convincingly proposes a probabilistic metric of phonological relationships [...].* [JL2]
- (32) *Unfortunately these are not always accompanied by substantial suggested answers [...].* [JL2]
- (33) *Na s. 71 jde bohužel [unfortunately] o překlad zavádějící [...].* [SS4]
- (34) *Nesmírně zajímavá [particularly interesting] je podkapitola pojednávající o Šmilauerově “slovenském období” [...].* [CMF6]

Another lexical means of expressing evaluation is validity markers, such as the modal verbs *would* or *should*. When employing them, the reviewer attenuates the force of their judgments to be not so

emphatic and to leave some room for the reader to decide about the validity of the reviewer's evaluation.

- (35) *If there is to be a subsequent edition, a concluding chapter would prove helpful in this regard.* [AL2]
- (36) *Rather, percentages based on small raw number can be misleading, and should be treated cautiously.* [JP2]
- (37) *Domnívám se však, že by bylo ze strany překladatele vhodné uvést [it would be appropriate to mention][...].* [SS3]

In conclusion, Move 3 stresses the positive and negative points occurring in the reviewed books, and reasons are provided why the reviewer assessed something positively or negatively, offering citations or data from the book. As is apparent from Table 1, Move 3 is not present in all the reviews, even though it provides evaluation, the key characteristic of this academic genre. The reason is that Move 4 also contains evaluation, which is present in this move in every review. The difference between these two moves is that Move 4 provides a closing evaluation of the book and summarises its most important aspects.

Thus, in Move 4, reviewers express their overall, either positive (sub-function 10 *Completely positive evaluation* and sub-function 11 *Positive evaluation with aspects to improve*) or negative (sub-function 12 *Completely negative evaluation*) opinion of the reviewed book. Move 4 is present in every review because apart from an overall assessment, it explicitly closes the review, especially in case Move 5 is absent. The evaluation may be completely positive, positive with aspects to improve or negative. Sometimes a combination of positive and negative features occurs. Lexical phrases indicating closing the review are, for example, *overall*, *altogether* or *in conclusion/summary*. Examples 38 and 39 illustrate sub-function 10, while Examples 40 and 41 demonstrate sub-function 11.

- (38) *Overall, the volume forms a much needed middle ground between introductory textbooks and research papers and is suitable for a variety of students [...].* [IJES1]
- (39) *V našem případě jde o studii velmi podařenou a inovátorskou, která mj. ukazuje, že lze srovnávat i více než dva jazyky [...]*[In our case it is an outstanding and innovative study, which shows that it is possible to compare more than two languages]. [CMF6]
- (40) *Also, given the nature of the publication, it would have been very interesting to include Kachru's early work [...].* [JL2]
- (41) *Podobných zdánlivě důležitých významových a formulačních nesrovnalostí je v knize celá řada. Pro případné druhé vydání knihy by proto bylo žádoucí provést revizi překladu.* [The book contains a number of similar, seemingly minor, inconsistencies in meaning and formulations.] [SS2]

The reviewer sometimes uses lexical phrases typically associated with academic life, such as *courses*, *libraries*, *shelves*, etc. (Example 42). Future applications of the reviewed book are suggested by employing the modal auxiliary *will* (Example 43).

- (42) *Faces of English Education is a very useful addition to the bookshelves of those involved in TESOL programmes, especially at Masters level.* [JEAP1]
- (43) [...] *this is undoubtedly a very useful collection of many of Kachru's key papers, which will prove invaluable to both researchers and students of sociolinguistics and World Englishes.* [JL2]

Move 5 (*Recommendation*) does not appear much frequently in both corpora. An explicit recommendation occurs only in three book reviews altogether: in two English reviews and in one Czech review (Examples 44-46). The majority of book reviews in both corpora contain an implicit recommendation, which was included in Move 4 since the reviewer stresses the positive points but does not recommend the book explicitly.

- (44) *So I recommend it wholeheartedly to the readership of this journal.* [AL2]
- (45) [...] *I recommend this as an addition to your personal shelves or university library if you are interested in any of those areas.* [IJES2]
- (46) *Práce zaplňuje prostor synchronní lingvistické komparistiky velmi účinně a lingvisticky zajímavě. Je bezesporu přínosná v mnoha ohledech [...]. Lze ji proto vřele doporučit [We may thus heartily recommend it] každému vážnému zájemci o tuto jazykovou oblast a problematiku.* [CMF6]

What must be emphasised at this point is that the structure of some book review articles is not that homogeneous as one might assume from the description in this section. The so-called *cycling of the moves* occurs in both corpora and is related to Moves 2 and 3. This feature appears in 5 out of 20 Czech reviews and in 6 reviews written in English. In these reviews, Move 3 precedes a sub-function of Move 2, as, for instance, in Examples 47 and 48 below. Here, Move 3 is combined with sub-function 7. A particular part of the book is evaluated and outlined at the same time. This sequence is repeated several times throughout the review.

- (47) *Chapter 6 presents perhaps the most positive appraisal of segments in the first section of this volume, eschewing the distinction between categorical segments and gradient representations in favour of new probabilistic models [...].* [JL2]
- (48) *Sedmá kapitola (Nejstarší portugalsky psané texty) poskytuje čtenáři z mého pohledu velmi zajímavé informace o okolnostech hledání nejstaršího portugalského textu [...]* [Chapter 7 (The oldest Portuguese-written texts) provides the reader, from my point of view, with very interesting information on the circumstances of searching for the oldest Portuguese text.]. [CMF6]

4. Conclusion

This paper has aimed to investigate variation in the rhetorical structure of English and Czech book review articles and to find out whether this variation in internal structure somehow influences achieving communicative goals of the book review articles in two different writing cultures.

The detailed analysis has revealed the existence of several recurring patterns present in both sub-corpora. For instance, it has shown that a group of texts of the same genre is composed of

prototypical moves, which usually appear in the same order. Opening and closing moves show a tendency to be obligatory, while central moves are more varied and optional. This is apparent, for instance, in sub-function 3 (*Informing about the author*), which does not occur in the Anglophone sub-corpus at all, whereas in the Czech sub-corpus it occurs in half of the reviews. Hence, basic features are combined in various ways in particular reviews and some moves may be missing but these texts are still considered to be book review articles because they contain obligatory moves and sub-functions designating the genre. Regarding linguistic realisation, the moves are expressed by the same or very similar language means in both language cultures. Furthermore, the sub-functions of the particular moves in English and Czech reviews correspond to each other. These findings confirm the understanding of the book review article as a genre in its own right within the two academic writing traditions. Thus, this study may contribute to a more accurate definition of this genre.

Nevertheless, the contrastive analysis of both sub-corpora has indicated a certain variation in the distribution of sub-functions across the moves. A higher incidence of sub-function 3 referred to in the previous paragraph suggests a positive contribution both to the author-reader and reviewer-reader relationship. Furthermore, Czech reviewers pay more attention to the extra-textual material in the book under review than their Anglophone counterparts. Last but not least, Czech reviewers contextualise the book within the particular field to relate it to the books on the same topic. All these three sub-functions appear much more frequently in the Czech sub-corpus, which supports the tendency of Czech reviewers to utilise descriptive moves far more frequently than evaluative ones. Besides, evaluation in Czech reviews is incorporated in the whole body of the review to a higher extent than in English reviews, where evaluation is usually found in the respective evaluative moves.

The ratio of descriptive versus evaluative moves in the Anglophone sub-corpus is more balanced. In addition, Czech reviewers are more sympathetic with the authors of the reviewed books in their overall evaluation than Anglophone reviewers. 15 out of 20 books are evaluated positively without any objections, whereas in the Anglophone sub-corpus only 8 books are rated completely positively, in 12 reviews the reviewers recommend some aspects to be improved. When Czech reviewers evaluate the book positively in all respects, such evaluation may be found in the introduction of the review as well, rather than only at the end. This is not a common practice in English reviews.

Another feature found exclusively in Czech reviews is the fact that the reviewer sometimes starts the review with information about the author of the book (sub-function 3) and after that they return to defining the general topic of the book (sub-function 1). In the Anglophone culture, it is more common to address the content of the text rather than place the scholar's background in a positive or negative light so that the text is judged on its own merits.

In conclusion, we can say that the differences mentioned in the previous paragraph reflect preferences of the two writing cultures concerning rhetorical structure of the genre of the book review article, which may also be connected with different cultural expectations and with a different way of achieving communicative purposes of this genre.

Many inquiries remain for further discussion. It would be useful to carry out a more detailed qualitative and quantitative research to explain possible sources of cross-cultural variation by focusing more on the cultural characteristics of academic writing traditions. It would be no less interesting to examine other disciplines besides linguistic book reviews and compare review articles assessing books written in the field of hard sciences with those of soft sciences.

Sources

- Applied Linguistics* (2015), 36 (1). [AL1]
Applied Linguistics (2016), 37 (1). [AL2]
Časopis pro moderní filologii (2015), 97 (1). [CMF1]
Časopis pro moderní filologii (2015), 97 (2). [CMF2]
Časopis pro moderní filologii (2016), 98 (1). [CMF3]
Časopis pro moderní filologii (2016), 98 (2). [CMF4]
Časopis pro moderní filologii (2017), 99 (1). [CMF5]
Časopis pro moderní filologii (2017), 99 (2). [CMF6]
International Journal of English Studies (2016), 16 (1). [IJES1]
International Journal of English Studies (2017), 17 (1). [IJES2]
Journal of English for Academic Purposes (2018), 31. [JEAP1]
Journal of Linguistics (2015), 51. [JL1]
Journal of Linguistics (2016), 52. [JL2]
Journal of Linguistics (2017), 53. [JL3]
Journal of Pragmatics (2016), 103. [JP1]
Journal of Pragmatics (2016), 98. [JP2]
Journal of Pragmatics (2018), 123. [JP3]
Slovo a slovesnost (2016), 77 (1). [SS1]
Slovo a slovesnost (2017), 78 (2). [SS2]
Slovo a slovesnost (2017), 78 (3). [SS3]
Slovo a slovesnost (2017), 78 (4). [SS4]

References

- Connor, Ulla & Mauranen, Anna. 1999. Linguistic analysis of grant proposals: European union research grants. *English for Specific Purposes* 18(1). 47–62.
- De Carvalho, Gisele. 2001. Rhetorical patterns of academic book reviews written in Portuguese and in English. *Proceedings of the 2nd International Linguistics Conference*. Rio de Janeiro: Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, 261–268.
- Ding, Huiling. 2007. Genre analysis of personal statements: Analysis of moves in application essays to medical and dental schools. *English for Specific Purposes* 26(3). 368–392.
- Dontcheva-Navrátilová, Olga. 2016. Cross-Cultural Variation in the Use of Hedges and Boosters in Academic Discourse. *Prague Journal of English Studies*, Prague: Charles University 5 (1), 163-184.
- Dontcheva-Navrátilová, Olga. 2018. Persuasion in academic discourse: Cross-cultural variation in Anglophone and Czech academic book reviews. In Jana Pelclová & Wei-lun Lu. *Persuasion in Public Discourse: Cognitive and Functional Perspectives*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 227-257.
- Flowerdew, John & Wan, Alina. 2010. The linguistic and the contextual in applied genre analysis: The case of the company audit report. *English for Specific Purposes* 29(1). 78–93.
- Gea Valor, Maria-Lluïsa & del Saz Rubio, María Milagros. 2000-2001. The coding of linguistic politeness in the academia book review. *Pragmalingüística*, 8-9, 165-178.

- Gea Valor, Maria-Lluïsa. 2000. *A Pragmatic Approach to Politeness and Modality in Book Review Articles*. SELL Monograph. València: Universitat de València.
- Henry, Alex & Roseberry, Robert L. 1997. An investigation of the functions, strategies and linguistic features of the introductions and conclusions of essays. *System* 25(4), 479-495.
- Holmes, Richard. 1997. Genre analysis, and the social sciences: An investigation of the structure of research article discussion sections in three disciplines. *English for Specific Purposes* 16(4). 321-337.
- Hyland, Ken. 2000. *Disciplinary discourses. Social interactions in academic writing*. Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Hyland, Ken & Diani, Giuliana. (eds.). 2009. *Academic evaluation: Review genres in university settings*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Motta-Roth, Desiree. 1995. *Rhetorical features and disciplinary cultures: A genre-based study of academic book reviews in linguistics, chemistry, and economics*. Florianópolis: UFSC.
- Nicolaisen, Jeppe. 2002. Structure-based interpretation of scholarly book reviews: A new research technique. *Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Conceptions of Library and Information Science*, 123-135.
- Nwogu, Kevin Ngozi. 1997. The medical research paper: Structure and functions. *English for Specific Purposes* 16(2). 119-138.
- Parodi, Giovanni. 2010. The rhetorical organization of the textbook genre across disciplines: A ‘colony-in-loops’? *Discourse Studies* 12(2). 195–222.
- Suárez, Lorena & Moreno, Ana I. 2008. The rhetorical structure of academic book reviews of literature: A Spanish-English cross-cultural approach. In Ulla Connor, Nagelhout, Ed & Rozycki, W William V. (eds.), *Current Research in Contrastive Rhetoric: Building Toward Intercultural Rhetoric*. 147-168. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Swales, John. 1990. *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Swales, John. 2004. *Research genres: Explorations and applications*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jana Kozubíková Šandová.
 Department of English
 Faculty of Arts, University of South Bohemia
 Branišovská 31a
 370 05 České Budějovice
 Czech Republic
sandova@ff.jcu.cz

In SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics [online]. 2018, vol. 15, no. 3 [cit. 2018-13-12]. Available on web page http://www.skase.sk/Volumes/JTL38/pdf_doc/13.pdf. ISSN 1336-782X.