

Academic Citations within Rhetorical Move Structures in ELT Research Article Introductions Written by Thai and International Scholars

Natthaphong Sirijanchuen

Language Institute, Thammasat University, Bangkok, Thailand
snatthaphong.joe@gmail.com

Chanika Gampper

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

Abstract

The understanding of rhetorical move organization and academic citations is of paramount importance for novice scholars so that they know how to construct a quality research article introduction (RAI). This study is therefore an attempt to identify the ways in which the academic citations of the RAIs written by Thai and international scholars in the field of English language teaching (ELT) were constructed through rhetorical move structures. Based on the analysis of 60 RAIs in the corpora, the citation practice demonstrated its contextual variability within different move-step structures in terms of different sub-types in each corpus. The results showed that citations were a lot more frequently employed by the international ELT scholars than by their Thai ELT counterparts in every move-step structure, especially in Move 3: Presenting the present work. More importantly, under the sub-types of citations, the international scholars tended to use considerably more non-integral structures, including source and identification, while the integral structure, verb-controlling, seemed substantially preferred by Thai scholars. These marked differences in making references to other scholarly work could be due to their diverse socio-cultural norms and writing conventions.

Keywords: Citation practices, Rhetorical move structures, ELT Research article introductions, Academic discourse analysis, Academic writing

Introduction

Owing to the status of English as a main medium of international academic lingua franca, it is obvious that there are a large number of academic journals in which both local and international academicians can actively engage by displaying their language repertoire in certain variations among different discourse communities (Mauranen, 2008, 2010, 2012; Mauranen, Hyninen, & Ranta, 2010; Björkman, 2011, 2013). Hence, the ability to write academically is undoubtedly an indispensable skill for scholars in the field of English language teaching (ELT). The requirement to get research articles published constantly is of importance for their academic achievement. Nonetheless, the process of developing rhetorical knowledge in advanced academic literacy is both challenging and demanding for nonnative English speaking writers, especially when writing research article introductions (RAIs), an integral part where all academic writers need to contextualize relevant conceptions of their work as well as establish convincing arguments to “catch the reader’s interest” and draw the reader into the article for the first time (Swales, 1990,

2004; Cho, 2009; Feak & Swales, 2011). To date, in writing a well-structured RAI, it is crucial that writers need to be able to create textual organization based on proper rhetorical move structures (Swales, 1981, 1984, 1990, 2004; Connor, Upton, and Kanoksilapatham, 2007; Pho, 2008; Upton & Cohen, 2009) and academic attribution through citations, which is considered as the evident construction of disciplinary knowledge as well as credible authority (Swales, 1990; Hyland, 1999; Jalilifar, 2012; Jalilifar & Dabbi, 2013). The pragmatic functions of these two linguistic phenomena are closely interrelated in the academic rhetorical context (Del Saz Rubio, 2011). Yet, considering previous studies on academic discourse analysis in Thai and/or English empirical research articles, there is scant attention on the analysis of rhetorical move structures and academic citations in the Thai research context. As Henry and Rosenberry (2001) posited, the study of move-based analysis with the identification of other linguistic features related to rhetorical move structures can potentially develop the theoretical framework based on move-schema theory. As a result, this research study is an attempt to fill the gap and expand a new horizon by further investigating whether there are any variations in citation practices within the macro structures of move-based analysis in the RAIs in the field of English language teaching (ELT) written by Thai scholars (TS) in well-established national journals and those written by international scholars (IS) in international journals with high impact factor. To this end, using the Swales' CARS model (2004) on structural move analysis and the Thompson and Tribble's framework (2001) on the citation classification, it is hoped that the study would respectively lead to a better description for the communicative functions of the target discourse and a more productive, systematic instruction for academic writing of the field. The comparative study aims to answer the following research question: What are the salient similarities and differences in the use of citations found within the main rhetorical move structures in the two sets of English RAIs?

Literature review

The introduction section in research articles

The introduction section in empirical research articles (RAs) has gained enormous attention from applied linguistic scholars in the recent decades. The main reasons behind the inquisitiveness of this academic genre are many since the introduction is the first section elaborating overall mapping of research articles in virtually all disciplines and fields. It helps set out a realistic view about the statement of problems, relevant literature, research gaps, and purposes. Indeed, in the introduction section, academic writers are required to project background and rationale behind their individual research, refer to other relevant studies, and emphasize plausibility to fill any gaps in the existing literature and purposes (Swales, 1981, 1990). It is the transformation of knowledge that "requires writers to engage in the rhetorical act of persuading readers of their work's value, significance, and credibility" (Tardy, 2005, p. 325). It possesses marked features which provide the basic overview of the content necessary for readers before reading the whole article. In other words, it provides readers with sufficient key information to decide whether that research article is worth further exploration. Moreover, research article introductions often pose writers difficulty. Therefore, writing the introduction tends to be demanding to compose for many writers so they decide to finish it when much of an article has been completed (Swales, 1981, 1990, Feak & Swales, 2011, pp.1-2). As indicated by Cho's (2009) study, it was found that writing the introduction part is hard, especially for non-native English writers in the EFL context.

They need to put a lot of effort into deciding on the writing approach of what type and how much information are needed to sufficiently persuade the target audience to follow the whole article .

Rhetorical move structures

To create a novel research paradigm with the increased interest in the analysis of research article introductions (RAIs), Swales' Create-A-Research-Space (CARS) model (2004) on the rhetorical move-based analysis focused on a 'move' or 'move-based' approach in analyzing discursal data. In this sense, 'a move' as defined in genre analysis by Swales (2004, p. 228) means "a discursal or rhetorical unit that performs a coherent communicative function in a written or spoken discourse". The identification of so-called discursal units relies on two facets. First, it is considered as a functional element which is flexibly realized by linguistic realization in terms of grammatical units in sentence or paragraph level. Second, it can be signaled by lexical items representing different communicative functions in hierarchical orders which are distinctively divided into obligatory moves as well as obligatory/optional steps in discourse. The newly revised model (2004) is comprised of the following moves and steps.

Table 1. Swales' model of moves and steps in RAIs

MOVE 1 :Establishing a Territory citations required -via topic generalizations of increasing specificity)

MOVE 2 :Establishing a Niche citations possible -via

Step 1A :Indicating a gap or

Step 1B :Adding to what is known

Step 2) optional (Presenting positive justification

MOVE 3 :Presenting the Present Work citations possible -via

Step 1) obligatory (Announcing present research descriptively and/or purposefully

Step 2) *optional (Presenting RQs or hypotheses

Step 3) optional (Definitional clarifications

Step 4) optional (Summarizing methods

Step 5) PISF (**Announcing principal outcomes

Step 6) PISF (Stating the value of the present study

Step 7) PISF (Outlining the structure of the paper

*Steps 2-4 are not only optional but less fixed in their order of occurrence than the others

**PISF :Probable in some fields, but unlikely in others

Source: Swales 2004, p. 230-232

The purpose of CARS is to effectively capture and describe the rhetorical move structures in English research article introductions in a comprehensive manner. It has become an important tool for revealing hierarchical textual organization. Following the framework of the CARS model, a research article introduction can be constructed in a way that it is to be interpreted and reproduced to achieve specific goals in particular contexts. By the move-based composition, writers will be able to employ different discursal segments that help represent various communicative functions. These segments can be regarded as semantic units projecting

writers' communicative purposes (Swales, 2004). Basically, based on the CARS model, writers are supposed to illustrate their ideas into three obligatory moves in the introduction part. To put it another way, writers need to initially create a rhetorical move to specify topic generalizations of increasing specificity, showing that the target study is important, interesting or problematic. This move typically includes some related literature. Next, it is imperative to point out the necessity of conducting the present research via indicating a possible gap, or what is known and should be done in the next studies to fulfill what is missing in the existing literature. Research benefits or positive justifications can also be added here to assure readers that the study is well-established and worth exploring. In the final steps, announcing the present research descriptively or purposefully is a must since it will help convince readers to read the rest of the research article. This may include other optional steps such as presenting research questions, clarifying some central terms in the research, stating the value of the work, and outlining the structure of the article.

In identifying moves and steps, it is quite usual to notice some lexico-grammatical features which help indicate the types of moves and their possible steps. For example, when presenting topic generalization in *Move 1*, the present tenses are noticeably employed in the beginning of the paragraph. On the other hand, the use of negative or quasi-negative items (e.g. very little, underexplored, there is no...) is obviously marked when the writer tries to point to gap indication in *Move 2*. Also, the frequent use of 'was to' and 'aimed to' signals the beginning of *Move 3* as to demonstrate the present study. However, although some of these signals are adequately noticeable (e.g. the point of this study was to investigate further...), some more moves and steps seem to be subtle and difficult to identify, especially when there are little or no linguistic signals. Therefore, the move recognition based on the propositional context plays a significant role.

The occurrence of moves and steps can also be placed interchangeably in different parts within the introduction. As Samraj (2005) found that making generalizations in *Move 1* can occur after presenting the research objectives in *Move 3*, the identification of moves and steps can be judged without the distinctive boundaries as Nwogu (1990) proposed that identifying moves is like a bottom-up process which needs our schemata to doubly examine their true structural existence. The next topic of the theoretical background is concerned with the theoretical framework of citation practices as its principle was used to analyze and classify the second linguistic dimension within the textual organization of this study.

Studies on rhetorical move structures based on Swale's model were abundant, especially when the move analyses were conducted to reveal differences between two sets of corpora in terms of either different text types or different groups of authors from diverse backgrounds. For instance, Ozturk (2007) purposively identified the textual organization of the RAIs between the two sub-disciplines of applied linguistics including second language acquisition and second language writing. The result showed that the two sub-disciplines' move structures were uniquely different. One type of move structure in the second language acquisition corpus was substantially noticeable while two types of move structures in the second language writing corpus were more obvious and equally important. Using the same CARS model to find out a different aspect, Hirano (2009) conducted a comparative study of twenty research article introductions (RAIs) between Brazilian Portuguese and English within a subfield of applied linguistics. It was found that introductions in Brazilian Portuguese had different rhetorical move structures from those of the model. This is opposite to the introduction section written in English which significantly

followed the model's norms. Obviously, the key explanation to the results is due to the cross-cultural differences and academic writing styles between Brazilian Portuguese and English.

In the same vein, Jalilifar (2010) carried out a comprehensive study on one hundred and twenty research article introductions in various sub-disciplines of applied linguistics, each of which was drawn from by local and 20 international RAIs, to find out the overall generic organizational moves that were written in local Iranian and international journals in English for General Purposes (EGP), English Specific Purposes (ESP) and Discourse Analysis (DA). The findings were that there were some distinctive features in the second and third moves of the international articles. In addition, it was found that the generic organization between EGP and DA in local and international data was quite different, which led to the conclusion that some Iranian academic writers were not aware of some key generic structures which should be included in the introduction section. The interest in move analysis was still popularly worth investigated when Choi and Hwang (2014) conducted the corpus-based genre analysis of Korean postgraduate students' MA theses (MTs), PhD dissertations (DDs) and research articles (RAs) written by Korean experts (KRs) and by native English-speaking experts (ERs) when they established a niche in the introduction parts. The researchers found that there were significant traits in the textual organization according to native and non-native nature in terms of the first language variation and different academic proficiency level. The results revealed that very few MTs and DDs followed the rules and conventions of the CARS model, whereas most KRs and ERs maintained outlined patterns of the model. Nonetheless, KRs follow the CARS model most strictly while ERs tend to be more independent in creating structural moves and steps.

The realization of other different perspective in studying rhetorical move structures is not, of course, necessarily confined to the move-based analysis because understanding discursive practices of diverse discourse perspectives can always shed light on a new aspect of genre-based investigations. The combination of features such as citations embedded in rhetorical move structures are also interesting and worth exploring.

Academic citation classification

Making references to others' scholarly work in academic communities is the central feature in research article introductions (RAIs). To date, it enables writers to display their knowledge of the field and establish their own credible authority at the same time (Hyland, 1999, 2002). The recycles making references in academic discourse help establish the familiarity and inter-textual association between the academic context of the present work and the relevance of target disciplines within the field of study, thus guiding readers to understand and recognize values of the present work. The acknowledgement of these judicious references to previous academic resources is commonly known as 'citations' or 'evidentials' in metadiscoursal studies (Hyland & Tse; 2004; Hyland, 2005). From the very first analysis of academic citations by Swales (1986), he classified them into two main categories, namely integral and non-integral. This conception was later developed by Thompson and Tribble (2001) as the classification was expanded into other sub-types with their own descriptions. The details are listed below while the samples of citations found in the corpora are shown in Section 4.2.

Integral citations: they refer to names of previous scholars or researchers that are clearly provided in academic texts as part of a sentence element without the use of parentheses. There are three sub-types of the integral citations.

Citations	Examples
1.1) Verb controlling: this citation acts as the agent of the verb in either active or passive voice.	<i>X (2012) stated that...., ... was described by Y (2015) as...</i>
1.2) Naming: this is the use of citation as part of a noun or prepositional phrase in a sentence.	<i>According to X (2016),..., Based on Y (2004)'s framework,...</i>
1.3) Non-citation: this citation provides only the scholar's name without a year reference.	<i>X believes that...., Y asserted...</i>

2. Non-integral citations: this group of citations refers to the exclusion of academicians' names and year references from a sentence element in academic texts by putting them in parentheses. There are four sub-types of the non-integral citations.

Citations	Examples
2.1) Source: this indicates where the paraphrased or summarized idea or information is taken from.	<i>... (X & Y, 2015), ... (X, 2016; Y, 2017; Z, 2018)</i>
2.2) Identification: this item identifies scholars or researchers within the sentence it refers to. This kind of citation is usually related to topics of previous studies shown by e.g.	<i>...a number of studies...(e.g. X, 2009; Y, 2011; Z, 2012)</i>
2.3) Reference: this is basically signaled by the use of the directive "see" to guide readers to relevant information from other sources.	<i>...(see X, Y, & Z, 2014)</i>
2.4) Origin: this citation indicates the pioneer of a concept, technique or theory.	<i>...a concept...(X, 1990) ...a theory...(Y, 2000)</i>

Importantly, academic writers would not be able to justify their arguments and fail to establish the novelty of their works without the use of appropriate references. Even world reputed scholars who presented originally seminal frameworks still undoubtedly need to cite former scholars' perspectives, theories, and findings. The publication of an academic paper would not, therefore, be possible if the sufficient attribution to previous sources from other scholars is ignored (Swales, 1986; Charles, 2006). To understand the usage of citations as rhetorical devices in the academic prose is important, and it could be said that citations, if used properly, help enhance writers' credibility whilst protecting against plagiarism (Jalilifar & Dabbi, 2013).

Quite a number of research studies have been done to reveal citations practices among scholars worldwide. Mansourizadeh and Ahmad (2011) studied the use of citations in 14 research articles among non-native expert and novice scientific writers working in a major research university in Malaysia. The findings were that types and functions of citations employed between the two groups were different; the novice writers mostly cited their work in isolation to attribute their ideas whereas the experts substantially used non-integral citations from many sources to justify and support their arguments. In the field of applied linguistics, Jalilifar (2012)

analyzed the production of academic citations created in 65 Iranian master's theses and 65 international research articles. The results indicated that there were several differences between the two corpora. Citations found in the MA theses were higher produced than those of the RAs. Also, the integral citations outnumbered non-integral citations in the MA theses. Conversely, in the RAs, the non-integral citations were more preferred to be used than the integral citations. This showed the fact that Iranian MA graduates tended to be familiar with the formal features of the integral citation without realizing the functional feature of the integral citation. In addition, the citation practices among university students were studied by Lee, Hitchcock, and Casal (2018). Their corpus was 100 research papers written by L2 undergraduate students in a first-year writing course. It was found that the students used citations in terms of surface forms where they limited reporting structures. They also merely used sources for supporting and justifying their knowledge of the topics. More importantly, the students frequently expressed their positive stance towards the citations by either acknowledging or disengaging themselves from cited materials. This suggested that they were likely to show their respect to the perceived authority of published sources.

Corpus forming and method of analysis

The corpora of this study consisted of two diverse sets of 30 research article introductions (RAIs), making a total of 60 RAIs, from accredited peer-reviewed English empirical research article journals in the field of ELT between 2010 to 2016, written by Thai scholars (TS) and international scholars (IS). The text corpus of TS was collected from *Language Education and Acquisition Research Network (LEARN) Journal*, Language Institute Thammasat University (LITU), *Journal of English Studies*, the Department of English, Faculty of Liberal Arts, Thammasat University, and *the PASAA Journal*, the Chulalongkorn University Language Institute (CULI). All of the selected research articles in the corpus were checked through the biographical data to make sure that the writers are all native Thais. This included their names and other related records. The IS corpus was drawn from *TESOL Quarterly* published by TESOL International Association and *Language Learning*, a Journal of Research in Language Studies published by Language Learning Research Club, University of Michigan.

Table 2. Corpora of RAIs published in Thai national and international journals.

Thai national Journals	Number of RAIs
<i>LEARN Journal</i>	13
<i>Journal of English Studies</i>	7
<i>The PASAA Journal</i>	10
International Journals	Number of RAIs
<i>TESOL Quarterly</i>	12
<i>Language Learning</i>	18

All journals selected are regarded as the leading academic journals among their kind. That is, the Thai national journals are indexed in Tier 1 of Thai-Journal Citation Index (TCT) and also found in the ASEAN Citation Index (ACI). For the international journals, they are among the top journals according to their high impact factor (IF) quality indicators in TESOL and applied linguistics (Egbert, 2007; SCImago, 2014). The two set of the corpora can thus well

represent the status quo of the core research construct in academic written discourse of English research journals in the field of English language teaching in Thai and international settings .

The total number of 60 RAIs in the corpora is deemed sufficient due to the fact that several research studies on this particular section of research articles (RAs) employed between 20-60 pieces of RAs. Yet, they could yield generalizable, productive results and discussions (e.g. Brett, 1994; Williams, 1999; Samraj, 2002; Yang & Allison, 2003; Kanoksilapatham, 2005; Samraj, 2005; Hirano, 2009; Sheldon, 2011; Stoller, & Robinson, 2013). Together, the format of the research articles selected as the sampling is in accordance with the Introduction-Method-Results-Discussion (IMRD) conventional sections (Swales, 1990) to ensure the consistent RAIs of the same type. Besides this, as a result of the fact that research articles with different research designs tend to have different writing conventions, only the RAIs with similar writing conventions, namely experimental method, quasi experimental method, and surveys, were included in the corpora.

Since a longer RAI tends to have more rhetorical moves and citations than a shorter one, therefore, controlling the number of words in this comparative study was of paramount importance. The unfair comparison between the two sets of data with unequal length or numbers of words could be a confounding variable that has a hidden effect on the research findings thereby posing a threat to internal reliability and validity. To address this problem, the researchers selected the target RAIs by employing both stratified and purposive sampling, thereby unavoidably making the number of the RAIs in Thai national and international journals vary from 7-18 pieces.

In this study, it was initially found that the number of research articles on the side of the TS corpus was scant when only 48 RAIs was gathered. The numbers of words in the RAIs also varied greatly from 214 to 1,358. Therefore, in order to select 30 out of 48 RAIs, Nwogu (1997)'s RAI selection was used as the criteria. That is, the range of words of RAIs should be between 250-600 words and that the paragraph numbers should not exceed 6 paragraphs. The RAIs with more or less numbers of words from the criteria were as a result excluded from being the corpus candidates. The same criteria were also used in selecting 30 of 61 RAIs for the IS corpus.

To further illustrate the corpora construction, the range was separated into groups of word numbers including 251-300, 301-350, 351-400, 401-450, 451-500, 501-550, and 551-600 respectively in the stratified sampling. When comparing the two sets of the RAIs, the word numbers of each RAI between 301 and 600 were sufficient to be selected as the target corpora. In order to minimize the differences in corpora size and balance the length of the selected RAIs, the purposive sampling was then used as the final stage to select the real RAI candidates and form the corpora. The selection was done by sorting the RAIs within each word ranging group (e.g. 301-350 words) in descending order of the proportion of words, bearing in mind that a member of the corpora based on the approximate numbers of words should not exceed 15 percent when compared between the two sets of corpora.

The study was conducted by prior dividing the main rhetorical moves and then identifying the citation practices. Altogether, both 60 RAI corpora contained 26,943 words. There were 13,432 words in the TS corpus and 13,511 words in the IS counterparts. The word average of each corpus was very close (447.73 for the TS vs. 450.36 for the IS), and so were the standard deviations (SD) (82.530 for the TS vs. 82.858 for the IS). This showed the approximate numbers as well as the fairly stable spread among the two sets of corpora, thereby allowing a fair degree of comparison. The corpora were next transferred into Microsoft Word format ready to

print out for a manual codification. To additionally examine any fixed lexical and syntactic features and variations (Sinclair, 1991) (e.g. reporting verbs etc.), each corpus was further transformed into .txt format in Microsoft Notepad so that it could be processed in the concordance program, AntConc (Version 3.4.4) (Anthony, 2014) to find out the exact number of target items. As the number of words and sentences in the corpora as well as between the three primary moves can be inevitably varied, the density calculation through frequency count and content analysis is important in this comparative analysis. Therefore, in comparing the entire number of academic citations within the main rhetorical move structures, the density in terms of the number of words and sentences is classified as the number of each citation per 1,000 words and per 10 sentences respectively. This examination approach was done following Crismore et al. (1993) and Kim & Lim (2013) to ensure the comparability and consistency of the corpora's textual length. Also, in order to maintain a reliable count of citation numbers, each occurrence of the writer's name from one source was regarded as one citation, no matter whether it was followed by the year reference or other writers. The use of citations found in the main rhetorical moves (M1-M2-M3) in the introductory sections of the RAIs between Thai vs. International scholars was next identified according to Thompson and Tribble's (2001) framework.

Results

General findings

To answer the research question, the table below shows the density of citations in each corpus per 1,000 words and per 10 sentences from the total of 13,423 words and 505 sentences in the TS corpus and the total of 13,511 words and 404 sentences in the IS corpus. That is to say, the density of citation frequency (F) in the TS corpus was 24.13 per 1,000 words, while 36.19 per 1,000 words were found in the IS corpus. For the sentence density, it was found that the TS corpus had 6.47 per 10 sentences. The IS corpus had as many as 12.10/10 sentences, almost double those found in its counterparts. Next, the citations found in the corpora were identified based on the classification of their sub-types. This was done to later reveal the salient differences in the two groups of academicians in each main rhetorical move (M1-M2-M3).

Table 3. Academic citations in the RAIs per 1,000 words and per 10 sentences

Citation Counts	TS corpus (13,423/505) F =327	IS corpus (13,511/404) F =489
No .of words per 1,000 words	24.13	36.19
No .of sentences per 10 sentences	6.47	12.10

Following the norms of the CARS model, the table provided below illustrates the results regarding the occurrences of academic citations found in each rhetorical move-step structure.

Table 4. Occurrences of academic citations in each rhetorical move-step structure

Rhetorical move-step structures	TS corpus	IS corpus
M1 :Establishing a Territory	266 (81.34%)	370 (75.66%)
M2 :Establishing a Niche via		
M2S1A :Indicating a gap (or)	55 (16.81%)	74 (15.13%)
M2S1B :Adding to what is known	-	3 (0.61%)
M2S2 :Presenting positive justification	1 (0.30%)	4 (0.81%)
M3 :Presenting the Present Work via		
M3S1 :Announcing present research descriptively and/or purposefully	2 (0.61%)	15 (3.06%)
M3S2 :Presenting RQs or hypotheses	-	2 (0.40%)
M3S3 :Definitional clarifications	1 (0.30%)	12 (2.45%)
M3S4 :Summarizing methods	-	4 (0.81%)
M3S5 :Announcing principal outcomes	-	-
M3S6 :Stating the value of the present study	2 (0.61%)	-
M3S7 :Outlining the structure of the paper	-	5 (1.02%)
Total	327	489

The TS and IS see the importance of establishing their research contexts through giving a territory and a niche in the primary *Move 1 (M1)* and *Move 2 (M2S1A)*, as well as strengthen their research objectives through the obligatory *Move 3 (M3S1)*. However, as is observed from the given data, the total occurrences of each corpus generally indicate the characterization that RAIs written by the international scholars (IS) used about 1.5 times citations (489 occurrences) more than those of the Thai counterparts (TS) (327 occurrences). Besides this, both TS and IS widely used citations in *Move 1: Establishing a territory* and the similar trend was found in *Move 2: Indicating a gap*. However, the TS apparently used far fewer citations in *Move 3* and *other steps*, whereas the IS tended to also employ quite a number of citations in *Move 3* and *other steps* more frequently, especially in *M3S1* and *M3S3*.

Samples of academic citations in the rhetorical moves found in the corpora

To illustrate their distribution in the rhetorical move structures in a clearer manner, the characteristic of each academic citation was exemplified and marked by the RAI code#. That is, TS9 refers to the ninth research article introduction (RAI) from the Thai scholar (TS) corpus, while IS18 was taken as an example from those of the international scholar (IS) corpus, for instance.

The number of citations found in the target RAIs reflects an awareness of TS and IS towards the acknowledgement of the academic attribution in helping assess the quality of a scholarly work itself (Swales, 1990; Hyland 1999; Thompson & Tribble, 2001; Charles, 2006; Jalilifar, 2012; Jalilifar & Dabbi, 2013). Therefore, they could basically be separated into two categories, namely *integral* and *non-integral citations*.

Integral citations:

Verb controlling: it is the evidential acts as the agent of the verb in an active or passive voice which writers intended to indicate the names of other scholars. For example,

- *Sadeghi (2010) claims that EFL/ESL learners tend to encode and decode language through their native language...*(TS4)
- *The widespread introduction of languages in primary schools **has been described by Johnstone (2009)** as “possibly the world’s biggest policy development in education” (p. 33) (IS17)*

Naming: it is the use of citation which includes the names of other scholars as part of a noun or prepositional phrase in a sentence. For example,

- *According to Douglas (2000), English for tourism is considered to be one area of language for specific purposes (ESP). (TS18)*
- *The aim of the current study was to investigate how L1 and L2 speakers’ fluency differs in terms of Segalowitz’s (2010) constructs of utterance vis-`a-vis cognitive fluency, ... (IS18)*

Non-citation: this citation was provided only when the scholar’s name was given without a year or page reference. For example,

- *Widdowson concludes that linguistic knowledge of teachers should not be more highly regarded than pedagogical expertise. (IS27)*

The second main type of citation can be classified as *non-integral citations*. This group of citations refers to the exclusion of academicians’ names and year references from a sentence element in academic texts by putting them in parentheses. There are four sub-types of the non-integral citations found in the RAI corpora as follows.

Non-integral citations

Source: this indicates where the paraphrased or summarized idea information from other scholars is taken from. The referred scholar names and years are put in parentheses. For example,

- *In Thai universities, students that choose to take English as their language subject are usually required to study at least four compulsory English courses (Wiryachitra, 2002). (TS7)*
- *Driven by the hope that investments in private tutoring may help children achieve educational successes and social mobility, enthusiastic parents have made private tutoring a major industry across the globe (Bray & Kwo, 2014; Bray & Lykins, 2012; Bray, Mazawi, & Sultana, 2013; Buchmann, Condrón, & Roscigno, 2010; Dawson, 2010; Forsey, 2013). (IS8)*

Identification: This citation identifies scholars or researchers within the sentence it refers to. It is usually used when writers want to relate to previous studies of other scholars in relevant topics. For example,

- *The model has been tested in a number of studies in both ESL and EFL contexts (Hashimoto, 2002; MacIntyre & Charos, 1996; Yashima, 2002; Yashima et al., 2004). (TS1)*

- *Many studies have been published on the topic of foreign language anxiety (e.g., Horwitz, 1986) and study abroad (e.g., Davidson, 2010; Kinginger, 2008), ... (IS1)*

Reference: this is basically signaled by the use of the directive "see" to guide readers to relevant information from other sources. For example,

- *LM learners in the United States demonstrate difficulties with English reading comprehension at higher rates than their native English-speaking counterparts (for a review, see Lesaux, Koda, Siegel, & Shanahan, 2006). (IS21)*

Origin: this citation indicates the pioneer of a concept, technique or theory of other scholars. For example,

- *Although clarity is prioritized, there is also an opposing preference for economy (Levinson, 2000), which promotes the use of briefer and less informative referring expressions (REs), providing that the referent remains unambiguous. (IS4)*

Comparison of academic citations within the main rhetorical move structures

The TS and IS corpora exhibited salient similarities and differences in the citation practices as shown below.

Table 5. Types of academic citations in *Move 1: Establishing a Territory*

Citations		TS Corpus	IS Corpus
Integral	Verb controlling	44 (16.54%)	14 (3.78%)
	Naming	16 (6.01%)	19 (5.13%)
	Non-citation	-	1 (0.27%)
Non-integral	Source	132 (49.62%)	212 (57.29%)
	Identification	72 (27.06%)	99 (26.75%)
	Reference	-	18 (4.86%)
	Origin	2 (0.75%)	7 (1.89%)
Total		266	370

As illustrated in the table, the IS used considerably more citations than the TS. Source was the most frequently used in both corpora, 132 occurrences (49.62%) for the TS corpus and 212 occurrences (57.29%) for the IS corpus. This was followed by identification, 72 (27.06%) and 99 (26.75%) occurrences of which were used in the TS and IS corpora respectively. Although used in small numbers, the approximate number of namings was found to be similar in both corpora, 16 occurrences (6.01%) in the TS corpus and 19 occurrences (5.13%) in the IS corpus. We can see that the trend of the percentages of these three citations in both corpora was more or less the same. However, the noticeable difference between the two corpora was that the TS tended to emphasize the use of verb controlling (44 occurrences or 16.54%) over those found in the IS corpus (14 occurrences or 3.78%). Also, there was no reference found in the TS corpus, while, on the other hand, it was found up to 18 (4.86%) in the IS corpus. The use of origin was found in 7 occurrences (1.89%) in the IS corpus, where this citation was found with merely 2 occurrences (0.75%) in the TS corpus. From the data, the IS made use of all kinds of citations for

establishing a territory in *Move 1*, while the TS completely omitted the use of non-citation and reference in their RAIs.

Table 6. Types of academic citations in *Move 2: Establishing a Niche*

Citations		TS Corpus	IS Corpus
Integral	Verb controlling	5 (8.92%)	1 (1.23%)
	Naming	-	-
	Non-citation	-	3 (3.70%)
Non-integral	Source	6 (10.71%)	18 (22.22%)
	Identification	43 (76.78%)	39 (48.15%)
	Reference	2 (3.57%)	19 (23.45%)
	Origin	-	1 (1.23%)
Total		56	81

As shown in Table 6, the TS clearly used fewer citations than the IS in this move as well. Nonetheless, a prominent role of citations in both corpora was heavily given to identification instead of source as found in *Move 1*, that is, 43 occurrences (73.78%) for the TS corpus and 39 occurrences (48.15%) for the IS corpus. Verb controlling in the TS corpus seemed to receive attention by its academicians as 5 items (8.92%) of verb controlling were found, while there was only one (1.23%) found in the IS corpus. Source still gained some prominence in the IS corpus since 18 occurrences (22.22%) of it could be counted. Anyhow, just about half that percentage (10.71%) were respectively found in the TS counterparts. Non-citation and origin were omitted in the TS corpus also, but they still had a place in the IS corpus although few of them were spotted. Lastly, we can see that reference was used quite a lot in the IS corpus as 19 occurrences (23.45%) of it were found; yet, there were only 2 occurrences (3.57%) of this non-integral evidential found in the TS corpus.

Table 7. Types of academic citations in *Move 3: Presenting the Present Work*

Citations		TS Corpus	IS Corpus
Integral	Verb controlling	-	3 (7.89%)
	Naming	-	3 (7.89%)
	Non-citation	-	-
Non-integral	Source	4 (80%)	16 (42.10%)
	Identification	1 (20%)	-
	Reference	-	11 (28.94%)
	Origin	-	5 (13.16%)
Total		5	38

The finding from the table obviously displays the fact that the TS scarcely addressed academic citations in *Move 3*. There were only 5 occurrences of citations were found. However, when compared to the IS corpus, almost all the kinds of citations were employed in the RAIs. 16

occurrences (42.10%) of source and 11 occurrences (28.94%) of reference, together with some of other citations were found in the IS corpus.

From all of the results, it could be said that even though academic citations were expressed through all the primary moves of the two corpora, the number of them was most frequently used in *Move 1*, and then they were likely to occur less in *Move 2* and *Move 3* respectively. Moreover, the IS seemed to use a variety of citations in every move, while the TS omitted the use of non-citation, and used very few items of reference and origin in their corpus. That is to say, the TS tended to use far fewer citations than the IS in every move and every aspect, especially in *Move 3*.

Discussion

Academic attribution of the two corpora yielded differences rather than similarities in a variety of aspects. Regarding *Move 1: Establishing a Territory*, the number of citation practices is the most abundant among all main moves. This move is initially aimed to present a generalization or the general layout or background of the target topic and addresses the establishment of the academic field being discussed. Swales (1990, p.144) clearly maintained that this very move is created as “appeals to the discourse community whereby members are asked to accept that the research to be reported is part of a lively, significant or well-established research area”. That is, when writers initially introduce readers to the current study, they need to create the rhetorical discourse unit showing that it is important, relevant, interesting or problematic. This usually includes some related literature to lay some basic knowledge foundation to assure readers that the study is well-grounded and worth exploring. This is the main reason why the majority of citations were extensively employed in the primary *move 1*.

Despite the substantial existence of citations in both corpora, the far more frequent appearances in the IS corpus over the TS (489 vs 327 occurrences) in every main move (M1-M2-M3) reflected the more academic sophistication of the international writers to engage readers with the relevant, acknowledged theories and frameworks than the Thai counterparts. This could probably imply that the scholar group who produced more academic citations tended to be competent academicians who were seriously immersed in the discipline, while at the same time establishing the credible writer identity in a research tradition.

Another interesting point is that, for example, in *Move 1* where the citations were most extensively found, the IS mainly produced the substantial *non-integral* citations like *source* to assert their claims using their own words. That means they would rather put forward the paraphrased ideas before citing other scholars’ name(s) and year(s) in a parenthesis (XXX, year) at the end of sentences. The TS, on the other hand, preferred to also back up their academic credentials by employing many *integral citations* ‘verb-controlling’ which starts with the names of other scholars before stating the claim “XXX’ (year) study” with either factive verbs that denote an established fact to their object (e.g. emphasize, point out) or non-factive verbs referring to their object which may or may not designate a fact (e.g. claim, indicate, suggest) or with the popular naming citation pattern like “According to...”. For example,

- (M1) *Ye and Jiang (2014) state* the importance of parental involvement as follows: ... (TS26).
- (M1) *According to Douglas (2000)*, English for tourism is considered to be one area of language for specific purposes (ESP) (TS18).

This fact of either higher or lower number of integral and non-integral citation practices among both groups of academicians could be explained from Charles's (2006) view point that these selections tend to be complicatedly based on citation convention in a particular community and individual academic input. This may thus show the fact that the TS preferred to stress the importance of other scholars in the subject position or at the beginning of sentences with the integral citations, which is an indication of their citation habit. They may wish to strongly support their claims by putting names of other well-known authors ahead by simply summarizing the source text and integrating it into their study to create a research space. However, if reporting on such given citation like this is done in a large volume, according to Thompson and Ye (1991), it may not be considered as a good citation practice because a scholar will probably only paraphrase the idea but miss a chance to evaluate the cited text or even misinterpret its purpose while associating such ideas with his or her own thought. Doing so rather than interpreting, discussing or evaluating the cited information may thus lead to an unfavorable citation style in competitive publication judged by the international academic arena which prefers the projection of voice as well as the argumentative nature of academicians' self-promotion rather than the descriptive one.

While the IS corpus contained quite a lot of '*reference*' with 48 occurrences altogether in all main moves, the scarce use of it in the TS corpus, only 2 occurrences in *Move 2*, clearly suggested that this group of scholars were not familiar with this sub-type of academic citation, which is literally intended to guide readers to relevant information from other sources by the use of the directive '*see*'. This emphasized the writing convention influencing citation practices in Thai national journals in the way that when the previous research articles did not sufficiently display this kind of citation, it is less noticeable and then usually omitted as a result.

Besides this, the much fewer citations in *Move 3* of the two corpora supported that fact that the TS were less likely to assert their voices with credible references when they described their current study. They perhaps did not see the necessity to do so since *Move 3* is their own space to elucidate everything on their own. Unlike the IS, many of them tended to create their arguments in this very move using citations especially in the optional move units including *M3S3: Definitional clarifications*, *M3S4: Summarizing methods*, and *M3S5: Announcing principal outcomes*, where the TS infrequently presented these move units, thereby reducing a chance to cite their work academically.

All in all, with regard to the research question concerning the salient similarities and differences of the two corpora, the results revealed the relatively different sociolinguistic identity of how the TS and IS produced their academic citations within each move structure (M1-M2-M3). The evidence could be seen through the occurrences (density) and variations in the citation practices. As van Dijk et al. (1997) maintained, the way scholars guide or engage readers is the same way as when they construct their identity. The influence of human societies in terms of socio-cultural norms could be recognized through communicative discourse based on each speech community which tends to have its own modes of epistemological conventions. This is similar to Matsuda (2015)'s concept of the complex phenomenon of identity in academic written discourse, where he posited that writing does not merely narrate the content but it also conveys the role of authorial self or identity of the writer. Consequently, the identity tends to position writers based on the demographic information of writers' individual characteristics and earlier shared identity which have long been developed through the social interaction and various elements of textual features within their community of any particular context (Ivanič, 1995, 1998; Matsuda & Tardy, 2007; Matsuda, 2015). This emphasizes the fact that, apart from the

cognitive factor in terms of linguistic competence, the socio-cultural factor as well as linguistic environment also play indispensable parts of identity construction in academic writing (Spivey, 1997; Canagarajah, 2002). Therefore, different groups of scholars in different regions are most likely to possess and secure the unique discursive construction of identity through the use of metadiscursive resources within their disciplinary community. Nonetheless, while research articles (RAs) of the international journals are much more widely read and exploited by global research communities, the national Thai journals are usually limited in role to a small academic area in Thailand. These different scales of their academic impact may be another reason why the breadth and depth of citation practices of the Thai scholars tended to be thinner in numbers and sub-types than that of the international counterparts.

Conclusion and implications

The objective of this current study was to identify the aspects of variability in academic citations contributed by Thai and international scholars in the rhetorical move structures of the 60 pieces of ELT research article introductions written between the two groups. Rather than showing the similarities, the findings demonstrated the different nature of the citation practices imbedded in the macro-textual organization (rhetorical move patterns M1-M2-M3) within the RAIs of both TS and IS corpora.

As the current study identified both salient rhetorical moves and citation practices between the two corpora, its findings reflected different academic identity of how the TS and IS produced their academic citations within each move structure (M1-M2-M3) found in their own culture-specific discourse community. Instead of focusing only on linguistic and grammatical features and writing organization, the knowledge of such citation practices within the main rhetorical moves additionally helps supervisors or editors to give more valuable advice productively to writers in control. For example, citing names of previous researchers in a subject position may emphasize the credibility of original ideas, but the ignorance of its functional feature and frequent use might, at the same time, reduce a chance to project the evaluative authority and argumentative nature of the real author's self-promotion. In particular, in order to enhance their writing credibility targeting in diverse academic discourse communities, students and novice scholars including professional ones in the field of ELT should be aware of different patterns of citation practices and their functions in an effective way.

As the accurate use of citations is an essential way to prevent plagiarism in all kinds of academic writing, this study thus intends to raise awareness for firmly nailing citation practices in teaching English for academic purposes (EAP), which has still received rather little attention and should seriously be promoted in explicit instructions in the ELT context. As a consequence, it is of paramount importance to educate novice academic writers to realize the different tendencies of the two academic communities as well as be familiar with the functional features of different citations and their sub-types. This is because the places of scholarly publication, whether national or international, may not be assumed to have the same acknowledgement of practices since the different citation norms can determine how they should cite appropriately. In the same vein, EAP practitioners may use the current study as a guideline in building a corpus ranging from reports, academic articles, research articles, theses, and so forth to provide a wide variety of academic citations to teach novice writers. This will be an important call for the improvement of ELT academic writing conventions in local and international settings.

Recommendations for further studies

In this study, the articles written by Thai scholars were collected from the journals in TCI which is at the national level whereas the articles written by international scholars were from the international publishers. Therefore, it would be interesting to compare the citation practices of the articles written by Thai and international scholars from similar international corpus and see if Thai scholars will be able to use the rhetorical move structures and citation strategies to develop their voice and identity in international academic arena. Other parts of research articles (RAs) such as abstract, literature review or discussion parts are also interesting sub-genres which could be analyzed in a new study, whether within the same or across different disciplines. Besides this, examining the ways in which the high-impact factor journals and the low-impact factor counterparts produce citations within different move units could yield another interesting aspect of research finding.

About the Authors

Chanika Gampper earned her Ph.D. in second language acquisition and teaching from the University of Arizona. She is currently a senior lecturer at the Language Institute of Thammasat University (LITU). Her fields of research interest are testing and evaluation, contrastive rhetoric, and discourse analysis.

Natthaphong Sirijanchuen completed his M.A. in Translation and Interpretation from Chulalongkorn University and is currently an M.A. candidate in the English Language Teaching Program at Language Institute, Thammasat University. His areas of interest include academic discourse analysis, translation pedagogy, world Englishes and English as a lingua franca.

References

- Anthony, L. (2014). AntConc (Version 3.4.4) [Computer Software]. Available from <http://www.laurenceanthony.net/software/antconc/>
- Björkman, B. (2011). English as a lingua franca in higher education: Implications for EAP. *Ibérica*, 22, 79-100.
- Björkman, B. (2013). *English as an academic lingua franca: An investigation of form and communicative effectiveness* (Vol. 3). Walter de Gruyter.
- Brett, P. (1994). A genre analysis of the results section of sociology articles. *English for Specific Purposes*, 13(1), 47-59.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2002). *Critical academic writing and multilingual students*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Charles, M. (2006). Phraseological patterns in reporting clauses used in citation: A corpus-based study of theses in two disciplines. *English for Specific Purposes*, 25(3), 310-331.
- Cho, D. W. (2009). Science journal paper writing in an EFL context: The case of Korea. *English for Specific Purposes*, 28(4), 230-239.
- Choi, H., & Hwang, B. H. (2014). Corpus-based genre analysis of establishing a niche in Korean EFL postgraduate students' research articles. *Korean Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 30(1), 3-31.

- Connor, U., Upton, T. A., & Kanoksilapatham, B. (2007). Introduction to move analysis. *Discourse on the move: Using corpus analysis to describe discourse structure*, 23-41.
- Crismore, A., Markkanen, R., & Steffensen, M. S. (1993). Metadiscourse in persuasive writing: a study of texts written by American and Finnish university students. *Written communication*, 10(1), 39-71.
- Damrongmanee, M. (2016). The Artist Statement as a Genre: Move Analysis with Pedagogical Aims. *Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, 9(2), 83-104.
- Del Saz Rubio, M. M. (2011). A pragmatic approach to the macro-structure and metadiscoursal features of research article introductions in the field of Agricultural Sciences. *English for Specific Purposes*, 30(4), 258-271.
- Egbert, J. (2007). Quality analysis of journals in TESOL and applied linguistics. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41(1), 157-171.
- Feak, C. B., & Swales, J. M. (2011). *Creating contexts: Writing introductions across genres*. University of Michigan Press.
- Henry, A., & Rosenberry, R. L. (2001). A narrow-angled corpus analysis of moves and strategies of the genre: 'Letter of Application'. *English for Specific Purposes*, 20, 153-167.
- Hirano, E. (2009). Research article introductions in English for specific purposes: A comparison between Brazilian Portuguese and English. *English for specific purposes*, 28(4), 240-250.
- Hyland, K. (1999). Academic attribution: Citation and the construction of disciplinary knowledge. *Applied linguistics*, 20(3), 341-367.
- Hyland, K. (2002). Authority and invisibility: Authorial identity in academic writing. *Journal of pragmatics*, 34(8), 1091-1112.
- Hyland, K. (2005). *Metadiscourse*. London, UK: Continuum.
- Ivanič, R. (1995). Writer identity. *Prospect*, 10, 8-31.
- Hyland, K., & Tse, P. (2004). Metadiscourse in academic writing: A reappraisal. *Applied linguistics*, 25(2), 156-177.
- Ivanič, R. (1998). *Writing and identity: The discursive construction of identity in academic writing*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Jalilifar, A. (2010). Research article introductions: Sub-disciplinary variations in Applied Linguistics. *The Journal of Teaching Language Skills*, 2(2), 29-55.
- Jalilifar, A. (2012). Academic attribution: Citation analysis in master's theses and research articles in applied linguistics. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 22(1), 23-41.
- Jalilifar, A., & Dabbi, R. (2013). Citation in Applied Linguistics: Analysis of Introduction Sections of Iranian Master's These. *Linguistik online*, 57(7).
- Lee, J. J., Hitchcock, C., & Casal, J. E. (2018). Citation practices of L2 university students in first-year writing: Form, function, and stance. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 33, 1-11.
- Kanoksilapatham, B. (2005). Rhetorical structure of biochemistry research articles. *English for specific purposes*, 24(3), 269-292.
- Kim, L. C., & Lim, J. M. H. (2013). Metadiscourse in English and Chinese research article introductions. *Discourse Studies*, 15(2), 129-146.

- Mansourizadeh, K., & Ahmad, U. K. (2011). Citation practices among non-native expert and novice scientific writers. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 10(3), 152-161.
- Matsuda, P.K. (2015). *Identity in written discourse*. Cambridge university press, pp.140-159.
- Matsuda, P. K., & Tardy, C. M. (2007). Voice in academic writing: The rhetorical construction of author identity in blind manuscript review. *English for Specific Purposes*, 26(2), 235-249.
- Mauranen, A. (2008). English as an Academic Lingua Franca – the ELFA Project. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 7(3).
- Mauranen, A. (2010). Features of English as a lingua franca in academia. *Helsinki English Studies*, 6, 6-28.
- Mauranen, A. (2012). *Exploring ELF: Academic English shaped by non-native speakers*. Cambridge University Press.
- Mauranen, A., Hyninen, N., & Ranta, E. (2010) 'English as an Academic Lingua Franca: The ELFA Project', *English for Specific Purposes* 29(3): 183-90.
- Nwogu, K. N. (1990). Discourse variation in medical texts. *Monographs in Systemic Linguistics*, 2.
- Nwogu, K. N. (1997). The medical research paper :Structure and functions .*English for Specific Purposes*, 16(2), 119-138.
- Ozturk, I. (2007). The textual organization of research article introductions in applied linguistics : Variability within a single discipline .*English for Specific Purposes*, 26(1), 25-38.
- Pho, P. D. (2008). Research article abstracts in applied linguistics and educational technology: A study of linguistic realizations of rhetorical structure and authorial stance. *Discourse studies*, 10(2), 231-250.
- Rattanakul, S. (2017). A study of problem-solution discourse: Examining TED talks through the lens of move analysis. *Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, 10(2), 25-46.
- Samraj, B. (2002). Introductions in research articles: Variations across disciplines. *English for Specific Purposes*, 21(1), 1-17.
- Samraj, B. (2005). An exploration of a genre set: Research article abstracts and introductions in two disciplines. *English for specific purposes*, 24(2), 141-156.
- SCImago. (2014). (SJR-SCImago Journal & Country Rank .Retrieved September 19, 2016, from <http://www.scimagojr.com>
- Sinclair, J. (1991). *Corpus, concordance, collocation* .Oxford University Press.
- Sheldon, E. (2011). Rhetorical differences in RA introductions written by English L1 and L2 and Castilian Spanish L1 writers. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 10(4), 238-251.
- Spivey, N. N. (1997). *The constructivist metaphor: Reading, writing, and the making of meaning*. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Stoller, F. L., & Robinson, M. S. (2013). Chemistry journal articles: An interdisciplinary approach to move analysis with pedagogical aims. *English for Specific Purposes*, 32(1), 45-57.
- Swales, J. (1981). *Aspects of article introductions. ESP Research Report*. Birmingham, England: University of Aston.

- Swales, J. (1984). Research into the structure of introductions to journal articles and its application to the teaching of academic writing. *Common ground: Shared interests in ESP and communication studies*, 77-86.
- Swales, J. (1986). Citation analysis and discourse analysis. *Applied linguistics*, 7, 39.
- Swales, J.M. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Swales, J.M. (2004). *Research genres: Explorations and applications*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Tardy, C. M. (2005). "It's like a story": Rhetorical knowledge development in advanced academic literacy. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 4(4), 325-338.
- Thompson, G., and Ye, Y. (1991). Evaluation in the reporting verbs used in academic papers. *Applied Linguistics*, 12(4), 365-82.
- Thompson, P., & Tribble, C. (2001). Looking at citations: Using corpora in English for academic purposes. *Language Learning and Technology*, 5(3), 91-105.
- Upton, T. A., & Cohen, M. A. (2009). An approach to corpus-based discourse analysis: The move analysis as example. *Discourse Studies*, 11(5), 585-605.
- Van Dijk, T., Ting Toomy, S., Smitherman, G., & Troutman, D. (1997). Discourse, ethnicity, culture, and racism. In van Dijk (Ed), *Discourse as social action*. London: Sage Publications.
- Williams, I. A. (1999). Results sections of medical research articles: Analysis of rhetorical categories for pedagogical purposes. *English for Specific Purposes*, 18(4), 347-366.
- Yang, R., & Allison, D. (2003). Research articles in applied linguistics: Moving from results to conclusions. *English for specific purposes*, 22(4), 365-385.