「論文」

Corpus-Assisted Discourse Studies in Airline Company Profiles Through the Lens of Moves and Adjectives

Yasunori NISHINA

Abstract

This study quantitatively and qualitatively investigates the discourse of airline company profiles, using a DIY-tagged corpus of 7,735 words. It examines the move structure and language behavior in this specific discourse by investigating the subcorpora of the three alliances to which the 61 airline companies under investigation belong. Additional to the identification of move types and discourse structure, this research examines the two types of language units of adjectives—namely, colligations (i.e., ADJ + N) and semantic preferences (e.g., *best* + AWARD). Since company profiles comprise a representative genre of the business community, it is crucial to reveal this genre's shared and conventionalized knowledge and its culture to better understand the community.

1. Introduction

This study quantitatively and qualitatively examines the characteristics of 61 airlines' corporate profiles, using a DIY-tagged corpus of 7,735 words and identifying their discourse features (i.e., move types and typical move structures) and the adjectives' linguistic properties while focusing on key adjectives, colligations, and semantic preferences. Move analysis is an effective approach to discourse analysis in genre studies; it focuses on communicative functions and purposes referred to as *moves* (Bhatia, 1993; Swales, 1981, 1990). The current study uses move structures to investigate the rhetorical composition of texts within a genre.

The business discourse literature has focused on various practices, patterns, and similar language strategies in corporate narratives among companies. However, research has neglected affiliations such as alliances that intervene between companies

and discourses. This perspective is essential to a more precise analysis of corporate narratives. Thus, this study clarifies how the three alliances to which 61 companies belong affected the moves and language choice in the profiles, as such social factors interrelate with top-down language behavior and discourse structure. The literature confirms the close connections between the culture and values of a (discourse) community and the language used (e.g., Charles, 2004; Groom, 2005; Nishina, 2009). This study looks to reveal the shared knowledge and culture of airline industries.

2. Literature Review

2.1 The Concept of Genre

Genres constitute social phenomena and behavior (Bhatia, 1993; Mauranen, 1993; Swales, 1981, 1990). Each genre has specific communication purposes shared by the discourse community. Such purposes also affect the internal structure of genre texts. These internal structures often include typical keywords, collocations, colligations, semantic preferences, patterns, and/or semantic sequences showing particular communicative functions (Groom, 2005; Hunston, 2008; Ventola & Mauranen, 1996). Thus, genre can be used as a powerful lens through which to examine discourse and community culture logically in both academic and professional settings (Bhatia, 1993; Swales, 1981, 1990) and linguistically (e.g., conventionalized structure and linguistic units).

Indeed, the concept of genre and its relationship to discourse communities vary somewhat among the three main approaches of systemic functional linguistics (SFL), English for specific purposes (ESP), and the new rhetoric school. In particular, the SFL and ESP approaches have similarities in their conceptualization of genre, which is defined and/or restricted by formal textual features such as rhetorical structure and grammatical features (Bloor, 1998; Martin, 2003; Ventola, 1987). The current study also supports these genre approaches through analyses of language and discourse.

2.2 Corporate Narratives

Many researchers and practitioners in the business field have studied corporate narratives. Thomas (1997) examined the corporate narratives of letters in five years' worth of annual reports from a particular company; she found that the company

attempted to maintain a good impression and attract shareholders by strategically emphasizing the company's profitability. Leppanen (2012) also investigated the CEO letters of five Finnish companies to determine the language strategies used to rationalize their activities, and found that company management uses positive language to justify its activities. Thus, studies show that the corporate narratives genre is likely to present itself with confidence, optimism, and positive language.

Several other studies conclude that disclosure practices and patterns in corporate narratives differ among companies, although each narrative focuses on competitive advantages. These studies include Ocler (2009), who investigated the corporate social responsibility (CSR) reports of four French companies; Danilet and Mihai (2013), who investigated the online CSR discourse of three Romanian companies in the energy sector; and Hossain et al. (2016), who investigated the annual reports of Bangladeshi banking companies.

2.3 Corpus-assisted Discourse Analysis with a Small DIY Corpus

Corpus-assisted discourse analysis combines quantitative and qualitative discourse analysis to identify issues and how information is disclosed. Corpus-data use can overcome the shortcomings of the simple discourse analysis used in previous corporate narrative research (e.g., researchers' subjective biases and sample size limitations), as it narrows the target to a few subjects (in this case, airline companies) in each case study (e.g., four French companies [Ocler, 2009] and three NZ companies [Higgins and Walker, 2012], *inter alia*). Generalizing the research results and better understanding the language used in corporate narratives require analyzing a sufficient number of samples quantitatively and qualitatively. As Boulton (2012) points out, corpus linguistics is significantly better at pinpointing the conventionalized language used in a specific genre or text type, and such language regularities include discourse, collocations, lexical bundles, and keywords peculiar to a genre's texts.

Regarding corpus size for specialized texts, Bowker and Pearson (2002: p. 48) points out that "even corpora of between a few thousand and a few hundred thousand words have proved useful for language for special purposes (LSP) studies." In fact, various studies with small corpora have been conducted over several decades, since small DIY corpora are easy to compile and handle (Boulton, 2012). Aston (1997), for instance, compiled a small-sized corpus of 35,000 tokens from 12 medical articles,

while Curado Fuentes (2007) used a 40,000-word corpus of tourist advertisements. Focusing on corporate narratives, Hyland (1998) used a corpus linguistic approach to analyze CEO letters and director reports, compiling a DIY corpus from multiple annual reports. The current study clarifies the role that textual metadiscourse plays in assisting readers' understanding of textual structure, contextual information, and differences in the functions of metadiscourse among genres; it mirrors previous studies in its attempt to use a small DIY corpus to reveal the discourse features of a specific discourse.

2.4 Three Major Airline Alliances

This study targets company profiles for three main reasons. (1) In the study of corporate narratives, the company profile genre has been insufficiently studied. (2) It was easy to obtain all the companies' profiles and build the DIY corpus by restricting website searches to the airline industry (no random sampling was required). (3) Unlike in academic research, in business research, it can be challenging to distinguish between community-facing and industry-facing discourse; however, restricting both the industry focus (airlines) and the text source (public-facing company profiles) makes this possible.

Alliances provide benefits to airlines—such as pooling personnel, technology, and aircraft, developing route networks, and providing high standards of service and safety (He & Balmer, 2004). The three major airline alliances have different business aims and strengths. First, Star Alliance (SA), established in 1997, was formed by only five airlines; as of 2020, there were 26 members in this massive alliance, which is a leader in the airline business. Some key phrases are found on the alliance's website, such as "dedicated to innovation," "excellent customer service," "absolute reliability," "smooth connections across a vast global network," and "improve your travel experience" (https://www.staralliance.com/). Second, **one**world (OW) was founded in 1998 by five airlines; it now includes 13 members and provides service and connections to 1,000 destinations in 158 countries (N.B. "one" is officially indicated in boldface with lowercase as in **one**world). OW's slogan is "travel bright." Once headquartered in Vancouver, Canada, the organization has been based in New York City since 2010. The motto found on the OW website is "make your flying experience as seamless as possible" (https://www.oneworld.com/). Finally, SkyTeam (ST) was founded in 2000 by four airlines and now includes 19 members, making it the second-largest airline

alliance in the world; it is headquartered in Amsterdam. Its network includes over 1,000 destinations in 175 countries. The catchphrases of this alliance are "make your travels smooth and enjoyable," "optimizing existing services," and "developing new benefits for our customers" (https://www.skyteam.com/).

All airlines ostensibly have the same goal: providing a comfortable flight experience for their customers. However, alliances differ in policies, membership requirements, customer loyalty strategies, and methods for improving SKYTRAX ratings. This study assumes that the external social factors surrounding these alliances influence the language used in their profile, and so corpus-assisted discourse analysis makes it possible to develop a detailed picture of discourse features and language behaviors. Thus, this study not only supports the validity of the move analysis of Swales (1981, 1990), Bhatia (1993), and others, but also shows that in typical business discourse, social factors have a significant influence on discourse content and structure.

3. Research Questions

Alliances have different goals, slogans, and histories that may affect discourse structure and language use in their corporate profile. However, if shared (language) knowledge and culture closely interrelate within the same genre and within a specific discourse community, it should be possible to identify similarities among the majority of profiles. These similarities pertain to common knowledge seen throughout the whole airline-company context, but dissimilarities nonetheless exist among alliances. Thus, this study looks to ascertain a common linguistic knowledge consistent throughout the genre of company profiles.

To accomplish this purpose, the current study combines move structure and adjective use analyses. Move structure analysis (e.g., Swales, 1990) is one of the most effective approaches in elucidating a specific discourse's structure (e.g., Kondo, 2018). Adjectives are a key part of speech to be investigated, as their ratios and varieties are salient in written texts (Baker, 2003; Biber et al., 1999). For instance, Charles (2004) and Nishina (2009) elucidate the writer's stance/evaluation system that is consistent in academic discourse, by investigating adjective patterns (e.g., it is ADJ that; ADJ PREP N) with corpus-based/driven approaches.

This study's research questions are presented below. RQs 1–3 concern discourse

structure, RQ 4 concerns language behavior, and RQs 5–6 concern discourse community culture.

(1) How many move types can be identified in airline company profiles?
(2) Which moves are obligatory, conventional, and optional?
(3) In airline company profiles, how is the typical move structure constructed?
(4) What are the similarities among the three alliances in terms of adjective use?
(5) What are the (dis-)similarities between this study and past corporate narrative studies?
(6) What are the (dis-)similarities among the alliance profiles?

4. Analysis

4.1 Basic Corpus Data

The current study is based on a small corpus of airline company profiles manually compiled with CotEditor (ver.4.0.1) from the websites of three major alliances (i.e., SA, OW, and ST). When the corpus was compiled in 2019, there were 61 airline members, including 28 in SA, 13 in OW, and 20 in ST. Each alliance website presents a profile that includes information about its history, purpose, strengths, and other attributes. This study extracted from the websites only the company profiles and converted them into text files in a UTF-8 format; line breaks were manually erased.

Table 1 presents the basic airline company profile data, with 7,735 tokens and

Table 1. Basic data about airline company profiles

	Texts	Tokens (avg.)	Types (avg.)	TTR (STTR)	Sent (avg.)	Para (avg.)	AWL
SA	28	4,153 (148.32)	2,724 (97.29)	65.59 (66.89)	196 (7.00)	92 (3.29)	5.30
OW	13	684 (52.62)	577 (44.38)	84.36 (85.53)	33 (2.54)	15 (1.15)	5.12
ST	20	2,704 (135.20)	1,827 (91.35)	67.57 (68.90)	118 (5.90)	45 (2.25)	5.43
Company	61	7,735 (126.80)	5,183 (84.97)	67.01 (70.67)	346 (5.67)	151 (2.48)	5.16

Note: Sent = the number of sentences; Para = the number of paragraphs; AWL = average word length.

5,183 types.[1] CasualConc (ver.2.0.7) was used for the corpus analysis. Based on the average token, type, sentence, and paragraph scores, SA was found to have the most information per profile.

4.2 Move Analysis

Next, the sentence and paragraph positions of all the profiles were analyzed, and moves were identified through hint language expressions (e.g., lexico-grammatical patterns) (cf., Nishina, 2021). First, sample labeling was conducted, and an expert in the field validated the results. Finally, I checked and finalized the move analysis results. Table 2 shows the sample labeling at the initial stage of the move analysis, in which the profile of United Airlines included four distinct, tentative moves. Following the expert's validation, I revised some of the moves (i.e., FOUNDATION→ALLIANCE HISTORY, STARTING COMPANY→FOUNDATION, CURRENT NETWORK→FLEET, NETWORK, CURRENT NETWORK→TIE-UP, OPERATION, NETWORK, EMPLOYMENT→EMPLOYMENT) (Table 2).

Table 2. Preparation for move analysis at the initial stage

Alliance	Airline	S	P	Example	Move
Star Alliance	United Airlines	1	1	United is a founding member of the Star Alliance network.	foundation
Star Alliance	United Airlines	1	2	The airline has a rich history in aviation, tracing its roots to 1926 when a small Swallow biplane owned by Walter T. Varney carried airmail to Nevada from Pasco, Washington – a flight that marked the true beginning of commercial air transportation and the birth of United Airlines.	starting company
Star Alliance	United Airlines	1	3	Today, the airline operates the most fuel efficient fleet among U.S. network carriers with the world's most comprehensive global route network, including world-class international gateways to Asia and Australia, Europe, Latin America and the Middle East.	current network
Star Alliance	United Airlines	2	3	United, together with United Express, offers more than 4,500 flights a day to 339 destinations from hubs in Chicago, Denver, Guam, Houston, Los Angeles, New York, San Francisco, Tokyo and Washington, D.C.	current network
Star Alliance	United Airlines	1	4	United employs more than 87,500 people worldwide.	employment

In all, 333 sentences were manually counted; this number differs slightly from that in Table 1. As in Nishina (2021), the unit of a function was essentially identified at the clause level; in some cases, two distinct functions were found in a compound/complex sentence. In this study, however, several functions were sometimes found at a narrower level (e.g., the phrasal level). I thus identified each move based on functions found in a sentence, even when many moves were identified at the sentence/clause level. In the following example, the first move is "Its hub in Lisbon" (labeled as BASE); the second and third ones were NETWORK and PRAISE. Using this procedure, I pinpointed 18 types of moves (Table 3).

Its hub in Lisbon | is | a key European gateway at the crossroads of Africa, North, Central and South America | , where | TAP stands out as the international leading carrier in operation to Brazil | . (TAP Air Portugal)

For instance, the move OVERVIEW concisely provides general introductory information about the company, especially in the first sentence of the first paragraph (45 instances; 51.72%). However, in many cases, the companies praised themselves subjectively through this move (76 instances; 87.36%), rather than provide simple information (11 instances; 12.64%). The following were the top five high-frequency modifiers used to emphasize company value: "leading" (14), "large" (14), "most" (11), "world" (11), and "flag(ship)" (9).

After revising the standard set of Amnuai and Wannaruk (2013),[2] I categorized moves with a range of 80 or more as obligatory, those with a range of 40–79 as conventional, and those with a range of under 40 as optional. Table 4 shows that in all alliances, the two moves OVERVIEW and NETWORK were obligatory; ALLIANCE HISTORY, FOUNDATION, and FLEET were conventional. The conditions for joining the alliance were that the airline company be large and financially strong, and operate international flights on a stable basis. Additionally, there had to be a positive factor for the other member companies (e.g., network). The purpose of a global airline alliance is to provide member-airlines' customers with access to a vast global network of additional destinations, flights, and convenient connections; therefore, networks are crucial for any alliance (and for any airline). This is why the move NETWORK is considered obligatory overall (91.80%).

Table 3. The 18 moves in the airline company profiles

Move	Description	Example
OVERVIEW	This move describes the general introductory information about the company concisely.	*Aeroflot is Russia's de facto national carrier and largest airline...*
SOCIAL EVALUATION	This move includes awards, rankings, records, or stars that the company has received from third-party organizations, magazines, or surveys of professionals/the general public.	*ANA was voted Airline of the Year for 2013 by Air Transport World Magazines...*
ALLIANCE HISTORY	This move indicates when the company joined an alliance.	*EVA Air became a Star Alliance member on 18 June 2013...*
FOUNDATION	This move indicates information about the early history of a company and when and/or how the company was founded.	*Shenzhen Airlines Co., Ltd, was founded in November 1992 and started operations on September 17 of the following year...*
FLEET	This move indicates information about a company's aircraft fleet.	*It comprises 190 aircraft, which are modern Airbus A320-family, A330, Boeing 737, Boeing 777 and Sukhoi Superjet 100 airliners...*
NETWORK	This move indicates detailed information about national and international hubs, routes, and/or destinations.	*Aeroméxico, Mexico's global airline, serves more than 70 destinations in Mexico and major cities in the United States, Canada, Central & South America and Europe...*
STRATEGY	This move indicates the management strategy, investment, vision, slogans, and/or policies enacted/owned by the company.	*It plans to grow its fleet in line with its 10-Year Growth Strategy, increasing this to about 120 aircraft by 2021, and to expand its network to over 115 destinations during the same period...*
OPERATION	This move indicates information about a company's number of daily, weekly, or annual flights and/or the number of passengers carried.	*Currently with 8 US gateways, Turkish Airlines offers 70 flights per week, serving some 5,000 passengers...*

SERVICE	This move communicates information about various kinds of in/out-flight services devised and offered by the company.	*It has been recognized for its distinguished style of attentive, personalized onboard service (complimentary amenities, meals and beverages – including cocktails) in Coach and Clase Premier®...*
TIE-UP	This move refers to joint ventures with other (airline) companies, collaborations, or M&A.	*On 23rd October 2013 AEGEAN acquired Olympic Air...*
BASE	This move indicates the location of a company's headquarters, its main hub, or its home base including area, country, city name, or airport.	*Its operational headquarters is in Beijing, a major domestic and international hub in China...*
EMPLOYMENT	This move indicates the number of people employed by the company.	*United employs more than 87,500 people worldwide...*
ORGANIZATION	The move indicates the parent company, subsidiaries, or branch offices of a company.	*Czech Airlines is the subsidiary of Czech Aeroholding – a group of companies that operate in air transportation and related ground handling services...*
ENVIRONMENT	This move indicates how the company deals with issues related to the protection of the environment.	*TAROM is a modern and future-oriented airline, respecting the environment by implementing innovative procedures that reduce CO2 emissions...*
SAFETY	This move indicates how the company deals with issues related to the improvement of safety measures.	*For 56 years Thai Airways International has operated with high safety standards, adopting new safety regulations and practices as a prerequisite by various authorities around the world, and going even further to implement safety programs that are beyond the requirement...*
ASSOCIATION HISTORY	This move indicates when the airline company joined the International Air Transport Association (IATA).	*Aeroflot was the first Russian airline company to join the International Air Transport Association (IATA) in 1989...*
STOCK	This move indicates information about the stock listing of the company.	*On August 18, 2006, Air China was listed on Shanghai Stock Exchange under code 601111...*
WEBSITE	This move is likely to be added to a profile as a final remark to inform the audience of the location of further information.	*For more information about Middle East Airlines, Middle East Airline flights and partners, visit www.mea.com.lb...*

Table 4. Quantitative information about moves in the three subcorpora

	SA (184 sentences)			OW (33 sentences)			ST (116 sentences)			Total (333 sentences)		
moves	RF	Range (%)		RF	Range (%)		RF	Range (%)		RF	Range (%)	
OVERVIEW	22.08 (51)	85.71 (24)	obg	27.66 (13)	92.31 (12)	obg	14.94 (23)	80.00 (16)	obg	20.14 (87)	85.25 (52)	obg
SOCIAL EVAL	8.23 (19)	42.86 (12)	conv	4.26 (2)	15.38 (2)	opt	4.55 (7)	25.00 (5)	opt	6.48 (28)	31.15 (19)	opt
ALLIANCE HIST	3.03 (7)	25.00 (7)	opt	25.53 (12)	92.31 (12)	obg	3.90 (6)	30.00 (6)	opt	5.79 (25)	40.98 (25)	conv
FOUNDATION	6.93 (16)	46.43 (13)	conv	8.51 (4)	30.77 (4)	opt	5.19 (8)	40.00 (8)	conv	6.48 (28)	40.98 (25)	conv
FLEET	7.79 (18)	50.00 (14)	conv	4.26 (2)	15.38 (2)	opt	10.39 (16)	70.00 (14)	conv	8.33 (36)	49.18 (30)	conv
NETWORK	19.48 (45)	92.86 (26)	obg	27.66 (13)	92.31 (12)	obg	16.88 (26)	90.00 (18)	obg	19.44 (84)	91.80 (56)	obg
STRATEGY	6.06 (14)	32.14 (9)	opt	2.13 (1)	7.69 (1)	opt	7.79 (12)	60.00 (12)	conv	6.25 (27)	36.07 (22)	opt
OPERATION	4.33 (10)	35.71 (10)	opt				5.19 (8)	30.00 (6)	opt	4.17 (18)	26.23 (16)	opt
SERVICE	6.49 (15)	39.29 (11)	opt				11.04 (17)	55.00 (11)	conv	7.41 (32)	36.07 (22)	opt
TIE-UP	2.60 (6)	21.43 (6)	opt				5.19 (8)	20.00 (4)	opt	3.24 (14)	16.39 (10)	opt
BASE	4.76 (11)	28.57 (8)	opt				4.55 (7)	35.00 (7)	opt	4.17 (18)	24.59 (15)	opt
EMPLOYMENT	0.87 (2)	7.14 (2)	opt				0.65 (1)	5.00 (1)	opt	0.69 (3)	4.92 (3)	opt
ORGANIZATION	0.87 (2)	7.14 (2)	opt				3.25 (5)	20.00 (4)	opt	1.62 (7)	9.84 (6)	opt
ENVIRONMENT	0.43 (1)	3.57 (1)	opt				1.30 (2)	10.00 (2)	opt	0.69 (3)	4.92 (3)	opt
SAFETY	1.30 (3)	7.14 (2)	opt				2.60 (4)	15.00 (3)	opt	1.62 (7)	8.20 (5)	opt
ASSOCIATION HIST	0.87 (2)	7.14 (2)	opt				0.65 (1)	5.00 (1)	opt	0.69 (3)	4.92 (3)	opt
STOCK	1.30 (3)	7.14 (2)	opt				0.00 (0)	0.00 (0)	opt	0.69 (3)	3.28 (2)	opt
WEBSITE	2.60 (6)	21.43 (6)	opt				1.95 (3)	15.00 (3)	opt	2.08 (9)	14.75 (9)	opt
total	100 (231)	100 (28)		100 (47)	100 (13)		100 (154)	100 (20)		100 (432)	100 (61)	

Note: obligatory moves ≧ 80; 80 > conventional moves ≧ 40; 40 > optional moves

The SKYTRAX website explains ratings: “A typical rating of standards is based on analysis of between 500 and 800 product and service delivery assessment items. This covers airport services at the airline’s hub and onboard standards across all applicable cabin/aircraft types” (*About Airline Star Rating*, Skytaxratings.com, 2021).[3] The SKYTRAX ranking of each airline is important in building customer loyalty. Keywords such as “service,” “hub,” and “cabin/aircraft” can be extracted from the website’s quoted information for use in airline company evaluations: “service” is included in the move SERVICE, “hub” in the move BASE, and “cabin/aircraft” in the move FLEET (Table 3). This is why the move FLEET is conventional overall (49.18%), especially for ST (70.00%) and SA (50.00%). The move SERVICE is also conventional for ST (55.00%) and optional, but almost conventional, in SA (39.29%). Since the move WEBSITE also indicates the IT service, its consideration changed the SA range scores; the total changed to conventional. The move BASE was treated as optional for SA (28.57%) and ST (35.00%); however, it showed the highest range score among the optional moves in ST. Therefore, SKYTRAX’s airline rating criteria and the alliance membership requirements affected the language used in the company profiles posted on each airline’s website.

Next, the move flow was calculated via [average scores of paragraph position (APP) × average scores of sentence position (ASP)]. For example, in the case of the move FOUNDATION, the score was calculated as 1.32 (APP) × 1.43 (ASP) = 1.89. By taking into account *both* the ASP and APP scores, it was possible to determine differences between two moves with similar ASP scores. Table 5 shows the order of the

Table 5. Move flow based on the APP × ASP score

#	Move	APP	ASP	APPxASP	#	Move	APP	ASP	APPxASP
1	FOUNDATION	1.32	1.43	1.89	10	ORGANIZATION	2.14	3.71	7.94
2	ALLIANCE HISTORY	1.44	2.36	3.40	11	FLEET	2.06	3.94	8.12
3	OVERVIEW	1.74	2.57	4.47	12	SERVICE	2.16	4.41	9.53
4	ASSOCIATION HISTORY	2	2.67	5.34	13	EMPLOYMENT	2.67	4.33	11.56
5	OPERATION	1.89	3	5.67	14	SOCIAL EVALUATION	2.46	4.93	12.13
6	NETWORK	1.81	3.25	5.88	15	SAFETY	2.86	5.29	15.13
7	TIE-UP	1.86	3.57	6.64	16	STRATEGY	2.74	5.7	15.62
8	ENVIRONMENT	1.67	4.33	7.23	17	STOCK	2.33	7.33	17.08
9	BASE	2.11	3.67	7.74	18	WEBSITE	2.67	6.89	18.40

Table 6. Typical move structure

S	SP	P	Example	Move
1	1	1	Founded in 1950, Aerolíneas Argentinas is one of the leading South American carriers.	FOUNDATION, OVERVIEW
2	2	1	From its home bases in Aeroparque Jorge Newbery and Ezeiza International Airport in Buenos Aires, Aerolíneas Argentinas flies to 18 international destinations in The Americas, Europe and the South Pacific.	NETWORK
3	1	2	Along with Austral Líneas Aéreas, Aerolíneas operates flights to 35 destinations in Argentina, flying to more cities in the Argentine territory than any other airline.	NETWORK
4	2	2	Aerolíneas provides dynamic links between Argentina and the region through its relaunched hub in Aeroparque Jorge Newbery city airport.	NETWORK
5	3	2	The Aerolíneas group is carrying out an ambitious fleet renewal program.	STRATEGY

18 moves based on this score. Darkly shaded cells indicate obligatory moves, while lightly shaded ones indicate conventional moves, as in Table 4. Table 6 presents one sample by Aerolíneas Argentinas, an ST member, thus supporting the validity of this move structure.

4.3 Adjective Analyses

4.3.1 Data

The company profile corpus was annotated with the C7 tagset by the CLAWS part-of-speech tagger (http://ucrel.lancs.ac.uk/claws7tags.html). The line feed codes were then eliminated and converted into small spaces to make it possible to search collocations, n-grams, and colligations properly. Then, to capture the whole picture of the adjective distribution in the subcorpora of each alliance, the adjectives were extracted from the corpora by searching for JJ (general adjective), JJR (general comparative adjective) (e.g., “older,” “better,” “stronger”), JJT (general superlative adjective) (e.g., “oldest,” “best,” “strongest”), and JK (catenative adjective) (“able” in “be able to,” “willing” in “be willing to”).

Table 7 presents quantitative information about the types and tokens of adjectives, with their ratio in each of the three subcorpora; Table 8 presents the token ratio of adjectives in seven genres in the new WordbanksOnline.[4] By comparing the data in Tables 7 and 8, we see that adjectives are more frequently used in company profiles than in the other genres, marking the highest token ratio (10.21%). Adjectives

constitute a key part of speech in airline company profiles.

Table 9 also shows the top 15 adjectives in each alliance, based on [relative frequency (RF) × file ratio (FR)] scores. This score quantitatively indicates each adjective's importance within each alliance by considering the balance, frequency, and range of word choices. This table also presents adjective ratio (AR) information. Five adjectives—namely, *international*, *domestic*, *leading*, *best*, and *largest*—were ranked in all three subcorpora. Several adjectives are salient in the subcorpora of two alliances (i.e., SA–ST, SA–OW, SA–ST, SA–ST, and OW–ST); other adjectives are salient in individual alliances.

Table 7. Information types and tokens of adjectives in subcorpora

	SA	OW	ST	Company
Types (Ratio)	197(7.23%)	35(6.07%)	139(5.14%)	273(5.27%)
Tokens (Ratio)	447(10.76%)	56(8.19%)	287(10.61%)	790(10.21%)

Table 8. Token ratio of adjectives in seven genres from the new WordbanksOnline

Newspaper	6.64%	Broadcasts (radio & news)	7.09%	Ephemera (leaflets, newsletters, ads)	9.13%	News website	7.46%
Magazine	7.19%	Books (fiction & non-fiction)	6.94%	Informal speech	4.16%		

4.3.2 Adjectives featured in all alliances: General picture of airline company profiles

Next, it is important to consider findings from data on the colligation of adjectives, namely ADJ + N, pointing to specific semantic preferences,[5] to uncover the features of specific discourses through the regularity of language use. As one of this study's aims is to find consistent elements among company profiles, it should examine the adjectives that commonly occur in the subcorpora of two or three alliances. There were five adjectives common to all alliances—namely, "international," "domestic," "leading," "best," and "largest." Table 10 summarizes the typical semantic preferences and collocates of these adjectives in the company profiles. In the example from Aegean Airlines ("AEGEAN, together with its subsidiary Olympic Air, provides scheduled passenger service directly to 145 destinations, 111 international, and 34 domestic, in 45 countries"), the adjective "domestic" modifies the noun collocate "destinations" at the L6 position, which cannot be identified through an automatic corpus search for the

Table 9. Adjectives in each alliance's profile in RF × FR score order

#	Adj. in SA	RF	AR(%)	FR(%)	RFxFR	Adj. in OW	RF	AR(%)	FR(%)	RFxFR	Adj. in ST	RF	AR(%)	FR(%)	RFxFR
1	*international*	6.46	6.71	75.00	484.58	*middle*	7.56	10.71	46.15	348.76	*modern*	3.98	4.18	60.00	238.86
2	*domestic*	3.02	3.13	39.29	118.46	*founding*	5.04	7.14	30.77	155.02	*international*	4.31	4.53	50.00	215.65
3	*leading*	2.80	2.91	39.29	110.01	*best*	2.52	3.57	15.38	38.74	*leading*	2.99	3.14	40.00	119.44
4	*best*	2.80	2.91	21.43	60.00	*domestic*	2.52	3.57	15.38	38.74	*largest*	2.99	3.14	30.00	89.58
5	*new*	2.59	2.68	21.43	55.40	*extensive*	2.52	3.57	15.38	38.74	*daily*	1.99	2.09	25.00	49.78
6	*regional*	2.15	2.24	25.00	53.85	*independent*	2.52	3.57	15.38	38.74	*middle*	2.99	3.14	15.00	44.79
7	*largest*	1.94	2.01	17.86	34.61	*international*	2.52	3.57	15.38	38.74	*other*	1.66	1.74	25.00	41.48
8	*central*	1.29	1.34	17.86	23.08	*largest*	2.52	3.57	15.38	38.74	*Atlantic*	1.99	2.09	20.00	39.82
9	*main*	1.29	1.34	17.86	23.08	*Latin*	2.52	3.57	15.38	38.74	*new*	1.66	1.74	20.00	33.18
10	*scheduled*	1.29	1.34	17.86	23.08	*leading*	2.52	3.57	15.38	38.74	*advanced*	1.33	1.39	20.00	26.54
11	*modern*	1.08	1.12	17.86	19.24	*main*	2.52	3.57	15.38	38.74	*best*	1.33	1.39	20.00	26.54
12	*other*	1.08	1.12	17.86	19.24	*major*	2.52	3.57	15.38	38.74	*domestic*	1.33	1.39	20.00	26.54
13	*efficient*	1.08	1.12	14.29	15.39	*recognised*	2.52	3.57	15.38	38.74	*European*	1.33	1.39	20.00	26.54
14	*swiss*	2.15	2.24	7.14	15.38	*star*	2.52	3.57	15.38	38.74	*innovative*	1.33	1.39	20.00	26.54
15	*haul*	1.29	1.34	10.71	13.84	*American*	2.52	3.57	7.69	19.37	*joint*	1.33	1.39	15.00	19.91

* Relative Frequency (RF) = word frequency / total tokens of each alliance * 1,000
* Adjective Ratio (AR) = adjectives / total adjectives * 100
* File Ratio (FR) = file range in each alliance

Table 10. Semantic preferences and collocates of the five adjectives common to all alliances

ADJ	Freq.	Typical Semantic Preference	Other Collocates
international	45	+COMPANY(11) [*airline(s)*(6), *carrier*(2), *airways*(1), *company*(1), *group*(1)]; +BASE(11) [*airport*(10), *hub*(1)]; +PLACE(7) [*destinations*(6), *cities*(1)]; +ROUTE(4) [*routes*(3), **gateways*(1)]; +BUSINESS(2) [*logistics*(1), *trade*(1)] **Gateways* are used *international gateways to ~,* indicating ROUTE rather than PLACE in the example.	*association*(4), *awards*(1), *brand*(1), *flights*(1), *passenger*(1), *presence*(1), *services*(1)
domestic	20	+COMPANY(7) [*airline*(3), *branches*(1), *carrier*(1), *group*(1), *offices*(1)]; +PLACE(5) [*destinations*(4), *cities*(1)]; +ROUTE(5) [*routes*(3), *network*(2)]	*hub*(1), *passenger*(1), *services*(1)
leading	28	+COMPANY(20) [*carrier(s)*(8), *airline(s)*(6), *group(s)*(3), *provider(s)*(2), *players*(1)]; +EVALUATOR(2) [*magazines*(1), *site*(1)]	*venture*(2), *brand*(1), *class*(1), *network*(1), *position*(1)
best	19	*+AWARD(16) [*airline(s)*(9), *service*(3), *dining*(1), *lounge*(1), *record*(1), *staff*(1)] *All SPs are double-quoted or followed by *award(s)/prize(s)* to indicate the name of award.	**pilots/crews/staff*(1), *place*(1), *proof*(1) *Not indicating the name of award
largest	21	+COMPANY(19) [*airline(s)*(12), *carrier*(2), *group*(2), *operator*(2), *company*(1)]	*economies*(1), *part*(1)

colligation ADJ + N. Thus, I manually examined colligations and semantic preferences.

Airlines play an important role in connecting people within or among countries. It is thus naturally understood that the adjectives "international" and "domestic" would be key to all airline company profiles, irrespective of the alliances to which they belong. In terms of the adjective "international," several airlines praise themselves as global companies, as represented by [*international* + COMPANY] (11/45; 24.44%). The nouns "airport" and "hub" are also salient collocates that point to another semantic preference [*international* + BASE] (11/45; 24.44%). The various global and local networks owned by airline companies are also featured in the following ways: [*international* + PLACE] (7/45; 15.56%), [*international* + ROUTE] (4/45; 8.89%), [*domestic* + PLACE] (5/20; 25%), and [*domestic* + ROUTE] (5/20; 25%). As Section 4.2 mentions, the semantic preference [ADJ + BASE/PLACE/ROUTE] reflects the fact that external social factors—such as SKYTRAX's airline rating and alliance membership requirements—influence the language used in airline company profiles.

- Passenger traffic routes have reached 377, including 98 **international**, 16 regional, and 263 **domestic** routes. (Air China)
- Today, the airline operates the most fuel-efficient fleet among U.S. network carriers with the world's most comprehensive global route network, including world-class **international** gateways to Asia and Australia, Europe, Latin America and the Middle East. (United Airlines)

Figure 1 contains word clouds of the collocates of *leading*, based on their raw frequency at the R1–R3 positions. The word cloud on the left comprises collocates, and that on the right comprises only nouns. The adjective "leading" occurs 28 times, often co-occurring with the nouns of the COMPANY category (e.g., "carrier(s)," "airline(s)," "group(s)" [20/28; 71.43%]). Owing to space limitations, I present as examples only the word clouds for "leading."

Figure 1. Word clouds of collocates at R1–R3 of *leading* (left: any word; right: only nouns)

The general superlative adjective "best" occurs 19 times, and often co-occurs with the name of an AWARD received by the airline company to emphasize how superb it is (16/19; 84.21%) (e.g., *Business Traveler*'s "World's Best Airline" Award, "Europe's Best Airline," and "Best Business Airline Lounge" prizes). Verbs such as "win," "name," "award," "vote," and "honor" also co-occur with [*best* + AWARD] units, sometimes in passivized forms. As a marker of AWARD, the units are often single- or double-quoted (11/19; 57.89%) without literally mentioning "award(s)" or "prize(s)." The generative superlative adjective "largest" also ranks in the top 15 adjectives among all alliances. This adjective is often used to praise the size, capacity, or ability of a

company in a country or specific area, and is followed by nouns such as "airline(s)," "carrier," "company" to create the semantic preference [*largest* + COMPANY] (19/21; 90.48%).

· China Southern Airlines has been the **largest airline** in the People's Republic of China for more than 35 years. (China Southern Airlines)

4.3.3 Adjectives featured in alliance pairs

The following five adjectives, all within the top 15, are salient among alliance pairs: "new" (SA–ST), "main" (SA–OW), "modern" (SA–ST), "other" (SA–ST), and "middle" (OW–ST). I manually counted the typical semantic preferences and their frequencies (Table 11).

Table 11. Semantic preferences and collocates of the five adjectives salient among alliances pairs

ADJ	Freq.	Typical Semantic Preference	Other Collocates
new	25	+PLACE(12) [*New York*(5), *New Europe*(3), *New Zealand*(3), *destinations*(1)]; +FLEET(7) [*aircraft*(2), *fleet*(2), *Airbus*(1), *Boeing*(1), *product*(1)]	*service*(2), *fares*(1), *shareholder*(1), *regulations and practices*(1), *Terminal*(1)
main	10	+BASE(9) [*hub*(9)]	*drive*(1)
modern	18	+FLEET(12) [*fleet(s)*(9), *aircraft*(2), *airliners*(1)]; +COMPANY(5) [*airline(s)*(4), *enterprise*(1)] *Airliners* include *Airbus, Boeing* and *Superjet* in the example.	*technology*(1)
other	10	+COMPANY(6) [*airline(s)*(4), *carrier*(1), *subsidiaries*(1)]	*changes*(1), *hub*(1), *locations*(1), *service*(1)
middle	19	+DIRECTION(19) [*east*(18), *eastern*(1)] *Some instances seem ADJ+ADJ.	

* New Europe indicates central and eastern European countries that joined the EU in 2004.

"New" occurs more frequently in SA–ST because SA covers routes in most parts of Europe, the United States, and New Zealand. For instance, the national carrier of New Zealand, Air New Zealand, is an SA member; this fact reflects in the high frequency of area names including *New* in the semantic preference [*new* + PLACE] (19/25; 76%). The description of modern aircraft using [*new* + PLANE] (7/25; 28%) is

also salient. The adjective "main" is followed by the company's home base—namely, [*main* + BASE] (9/10; 90%)—servicing national/international flights, essentially indicating large airports as its focus.

- [typical pattern: main + hub + airport] The airline and its affiliates service some 200 destinations in nearly 90 countries throughout Europe, North America, South America, Asia, Africa and Australia, with its **main hub London Heathrow**. (British Airways)

The adjective "modern" is used to emphasize the newness of aircraft operated by airlines (12/18; 66.67%) or the advanced vision held by companies (5/18; 27.78%). In other words, in their internal evaluations, two alliances (SA and ST) appear to hold the specific view that newness is an admirable value. These results imply the influence of external social factors on the language used in company profiles (as discussed in Sections 4.2 and 4.3.2) through the semantic preference [ADJ + PLACE/FLEET/BASE/DIRECTION], focusing on the global network, the hub airports, and cabin/aircraft.

5. Discussion

This study has shown that external conditions (e.g., SKYTRAX's airline rating and alliance membership requirements) can influence the language airlines use in company profiles. It has also quantitatively shown how such language is used systematically in profiles. The findings support the validity of move analysis as proposed by Swales (1981, 1990), Bhatia (1993), and others, and shows that in business discourse, social factors can significantly influence discourse content and structure. Answers to the RQs follow.

(1) How many move types can be identified in airline company profiles?

▸ With the help of an expert in the field, this study identified 18 move types through three stages. See Table 3.

(2) Which moves are obligatory, conventional, and optional?

▸ The moves OVERVIEW and NETWORK are obligatory, and the moves ALLIANCE HISTORY,

FOUNDATION, and FLEET are conventional. The remaining 13 moves are optional. The purpose of a global airline alliance is to provide member-airline customers with access to vast global networks, and so networks are invaluable to alliances and member airlines. This is why the move NETWORK can be seen as obligatory. Additionally, each airline's SKYTRAX ranking is important in building customer loyalty: the keywords "cabin/aircraft" were extracted from the SKYTRAX evaluation and included in the move FLEET, explaining why that move is conventional.

(3) In airline company profiles, how is the typical move structure constructed?
▸ Moves are likely to follow a specific order, based on the scores of move discourse position: FOUNDATION → ALLIANCE HISTORY → **OVERVIEW** → (ASSOCIATION HISTORY) → (OPERATION) → **NETWORK** → (TIE-UP) → (ENVIRONMENT) → (BASE) → (ORGANIZATION) → FLEET → (SERVICE) → (EMPLOYMENT) → (SOCIAL EVALUATION) → (SAFETY) → (STRATEGY) → (STOCK) → (WEBSITE). (Boldfaced moves in this flow are obligatory, and moves in parentheses are optional.) These findings contribute to genre studies, since the move structures of airline company profiles have been previously unexamined.

(4) What are the similarities among the three alliances in terms of adjective use?
▸ Adjectives are more likely to be used in (airline) company profiles than in other profile types. Based on original RF × FR scores, it was found that several adjectives are commonly used by two or three alliances. An investigation of adjective colligation also showed that in this specific discourse, there are specific trends in the semantic preferences of high-demand adjectives.

(5) What are the (dis-)similarities between this study and past corporate narrative studies?
▸ This study showed that (airline) company profiles are no exception to the rule found by Thomas (1997) and Leppanen (2012) that positive language is likely to be used in corporate narratives (and business society) to justify past and current activities. Additionally, findings on corporate narratives (Danilet & Mihai, 2013; Hossain et al., 2016; Ocler, 2009) hold true for airline company profiles, in that disclosure practices and patterns in corporate narratives differ among airline companies and each profile is likely to focus on competitive advantages. The value of the current study is in its

finding that alliances also affect member-airlines' company profile language, as alliance policies differ (e.g., customer loyalty strategies, SKYTRAX ranking strategies, and membership conditions for joining). The examined discourse reflects this.

(6) What are the (dis-)similarities among the alliance profiles?
▸ The answer to this RQ is partly described in the previous answers. Some moves are commonly prioritized in all alliances, while others are featured in only some. A move is consistently structured, irrespective of alliance. The use of adjectives sometimes differs with the combination of two alliances. Tables 4 and 9 show that alliances differ in terms of their moves and adjectives. For instance, SA more heavily prioritizes international and domestic networks, relative to OW and ST.

6. Concluding Remarks

This study examined the discourse of airline company profiles through the lens of move structure and adjective usage, with the assistance of corpus-assisted methods; this method made it possible to solve the complex puzzle of this unknown discourse in a straightforward manner, using the moves, orders, scores, and language items detected herein. In line with many previous studies, this study found that each move includes a characteristic specific to a genre (Bhatia, 1993). Knowledge about move flow—specifically, the structural pattern of the text—is invaluable to understanding a specific genre. This study also discusses how external social factors implicitly restrict moves, move structures, and language use.

To resolve the problem of the size of the DIY corpus constructed herein—and support the results of this study—I would like in future research to compile a corpus of online annual reports. From the qualitative research, for example, I found that Singapore Airline's profile contents and its annual report correlate, and so its annual report can be considered a detailed version of its profile. Therefore, analysis of a company's annual report would clarify the specific content of the company's appeal, and the reliability and validity of the results would be enhanced on account of a larger dataset. However, since the annual report contains many images and infographics, qualitative discourse analysis may be more appropriate than a corpus analysis.

Under another agenda driven by the current study, I will examine in the near

future interrelations among various profile types of profiles, while focusing on their language behavior and discourse features.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my gratitude to Prof. Judy Noguchi for validating the moves identified in this study. I would also like to thank three anonymous reviewers for their invaluable comments and suggestions. Needless to say, all remaining errors are my own.

Notes

1. As of 2019, the members of each alliance were as follows. [Star Alliance] (28 airlines): South African Airways, Air New Zealand, Brussels Airlines, Scandinavian Airlines, ANA, Air China, TAP Air Portugal, Croatia Airlines, Avianca, Asiana Airlines, Avianca Brasil, Swiss International Air Lines, Singapore Airlines, Austrian Airlines, Ethiopian Airlines, Shenzhen Airlines, Air Canada, Lufthansa, Eva Air, LOT Polish Airlines, Egyptair, Aegean Airlines, Air India, Adria Airways, United Airlines, Thai Airways, Copa Airlines, Turkish Airlines; [**one**world] (13 airlines): Qatar Airways, S7 Airlines, American Airlines, British Airways, LATAM, SriLankan Airlines, Royal Jordanian, Iberia, Japan Airlines, Malaysia Airlines, Finnair, Cathay Pacific, Qantas; [SkyTeam] (20 airlines): Aerolíneas Argentinas, TAROM, Aeroflot, China Airlines, Garuda Indonesia Airlines, Air Europa, Czech Airlines, Delta Air Lines, Alitalia, China Eastern Airlines, Vietnam Airlines, Xiamen Air, Air France, China Southern Airlines, Korean Air, Middle East Airlines, KLM, Saudia, Kenya Airways, Aeroméxico. Adria Airways and Avianca Brazil went bankrupt in September and October 2019.
2. According to Amnuai and Wannaruk (2013), moves occurring in every file are obligatory, those in the 60–99% range are conventional, and those below 60% are optional. However, the current study eased this standard, as it seemed too strict to label each move as obligatory, conventional, or optional. For instance, as per Amnuai and Wannaruk's (2013) standards, one move at the range 5% and the other move at the range 55% are both considered optional. The current study eased the ratio restrictions for obligatory and conventional moves to find the typicality of the discourse structure.
3. For more information, please visit the following websites:
   (1) For the airlines' star ratings: https://skytraxratings.com/about-airline-rating.
   (2) *SkyTeam News*: https://www.aeroflot.ru/us-ja/about/skyteam_alliance/skyteam_news/38289?_preferredLocale=us&_preferredLanguage=ja
   (3) On alliances (joining, benefits, and pitfalls): http://www.airsource-partners.com/project/62-joining_an_alliance___benefits__pitfalls.html

(4) Why do airlines join alliances? What are the benefits? at https://simpleflying.com/airline-alliance-benefits/

4. WordbanksOnline in the Shogakukan Corpus Network was renewed by the end of 2019. The corpus size has increased to 600 million through the addition of several new titles of magazines, reviews, novels, and new language data that mainly date from the 2010–2018 period. The search formula ~P(AJ.*) was used to extract the adjective ratio of each subgenre.
5. According to Firth (1968), Sinclair (1996, 1998), Stubbs (2001), Tognini-Bonelli (2001), and Xiao and McEnery (2006), discourse features can be detected by investigating various conventionalized language units, such as collocations, colligations, semantic preferences, lexico-grammatical patterns, and lexical bundles; a colligation is the relationship between an individual word and grammatical categories (or originally between grammatical categories), and semantic preference is a semantic set of collocates.

References

Aston, G. (1997) "Involving Learners in Developing Learning Methods: Exploiting Text Corpora in Self-access." In Benson, P. and P. Voller (Eds.), *Autonomy and Independence in Language Learning.* London: Longman, pp. 204–214.

Amnuai, W. and A. Wannaruk (2013) "Investigating Move Structure of English Applied Linguistics Research Article Discussions Published in International and Thai Journals." *English Language Teaching 6*: 1–13.

Baker, M. (2003) *Lexical Categories: Verbs, Nouns, and Adjectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bhatia, V. K. (1993) *Analysing Genre: Language Use in Professional Settings*. London: Longman.

Biber, D., S. Johansson, G. Leech, S. Conrad and E. Finegan (1999) *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. London: Longman.

Bloor, M. (1998) "English for Specific Purposes: The Preservation of the Species." *English for Specific Purposes 17*: 47–66.

Boulton, A. (2012) "Corpus Consultation for ESP: A Review of Empirical Research." In Boulton, A, S. Carter-Thomas, and E. Rowley-Jolivet (Eds.), *Corpus-informed Research and Learning in ESP: Issues and Applications*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 261–291.

Bowker, L. and J. Pearson (2002) *Working with Specialist Language: A practical Guide to Using Corpora*. London: Routledge.

Charles, M. (2004) The Construction of Stance: A Corpus-based Investigation of Two Contrasting Disciplines. PhD Dissertation, University of Birmingham, UK.

Curado Fuentes, A. (2007) "A Corpus-based Assessment of Reading Comprehension in English." In Hidalgo, E., L. Quereda and J. Santana (Eds), *Corpora in the Foreign*

Language Classroom. Amsterdam: Rodopi, pp. 309–326.
Danilet, M. and O. Mihai (2013) "CSR Online Discourse Practices in the Romanian Energy Sector." *Journal of Eastern Europe Research in Business and Economics 2013*: 1–9.
Firth, J. R. (1968) *Selected Papers of J. R. Firth 1952–59*. London: Longman.
Groom, N. (2005) "Pattern and Meaning Across Genres and Disciplines: An Exploratory Study." *Journal of English for Academic Purposes 4*: 257–277.
He, H. and J. M. T. Balmer (2004) "The Oneworld Alliance Brand: A Preliminary Inquiry." *Working Paper Series 4*: 3−19.
Hossain, D. M., A. T. S. Al Bir, K. M. Tarique, and A. Momen (2016) "Disclosure on Green Banking Issues in the Annual Reports: A Study on Bangladeshi Banks." *Middle East Journal of Business 11*: 19–30.
Hunston, S. (2008) "Starting with the Small Words: Patterns, Lexis and Semantic Sequences." *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics 13*: 271–295.
Hyland, K. (1998) "Exploring Corporate Rhetoric: Metadiscourse in the CEO's Letter." *Journal of Business Communication 35*: 224–245.
Kondo, Y. (2018) "Move Development of London Hotel Overviews on Official Websites: Luxury Strategies in Overview Texts." *English Corpus Studies 25*: 21–40.
Leppanen, J. (2012) Studying Corporate Texts: Critical Discourse Analysis of Finnish Companies' Discourses on Growth in Russia. Master's thesis, Aalto University, Finland.
Martin, P. (2003) "Genre and Discourse Community." *ES: Revista de Filología Inglesa 25*: 153–166.
Mauranen, A. (1993) *Cultural Differences in Academic Rhetoric*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
Nishina, Y. (2009) "A Study of ADJ PREP N Patterns in Two Soft-Applied Disciplines." *Language Education & Technology 46*: 213−232.
Nishina, Y. (2021) "Is an Impressive Background so Important to a CEO? Investigating the Discourse Structure of Personal Profiles in the Specific Business Field." *LET Kansai Chapter Collected Papers 19*: 59−81.
Ocler, R. (2009) "Discourse Analysis and Corporate Social Responsibility: A Qualitative Approach." *Society and Business Review 4*: 175–186.
Sinclair, J. (1996) "The Search for Units of Meaning." *Textus IX*: 75–106.
Sinclair, J. (1998) "The Lexical Item" In Weigand, E. (Ed.), *Contrastive Lexical Semantics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 1–24.
Stubbs, M. (2001) *Words and Phrases.* Oxford: Blackwell.
Swales, J. M. (1981) *Aspects of Article Introductions*. Birmingham: University of Aston.
Swales, J. M. (1990) *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Thomas, J. (1997) "Discourse in the Marketplace: The Making of Meaning in Annual Reports." *Journal of Business Communication 34*: 47–66.
Tognini-Bonelli, E. (2001) *Corpus Linguistics at Work*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ventola, E. (1987) *The Structure of Social Interaction: A Systemic Approach to the Semiotics of Service Encounters*. London: Pinter.

Ventola, E. and A. Mauranen (1996) *Academic Writing: Intercultural and Textual Issues*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Xiao, R. and T. McEnery (2006) "Collocation, Semantic Prosody, and Near Synonymy: A Cross-linguistic Perspective." *Applied Linguistics 27*: 103–129.

（仁科　恭徳　神戸学院大学　E-mail: ynishina@gc.kobegakuin.ac.jp）