Authorial stance and rhetorical structure in English research articles in tourism: a comparative study of international and national Thai journals

Submitted by Piyawan Jaroenchaiwat to the University of Exeter

as a thesis for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy in Education

In July 2022

I certify that all material in this thesis which is not my own work has been identified and that no material has previously been submitted and approved for the award of a degree by this or any other University.

Signature…….

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to Rajamangala University of Technology Krungthep for awarding me a full scholarship to conduct this research.

I would like to thank my supervisor, Associate Professor Dr Philip Durrant for his invaluable advice and support. I truly appreciate that he provided me with constructive feedback and guidance throughout the whole process.

Finally, I would like to express my gratitude to my beloved family in Bangkok, especially my sister, for their unfailing support and love over the years.

Abstract

This study is a comparative analysis of the authorial stance in English language research articles, written in L2, by Thai researchers and published in Thai journals, with those published in international journals in terms of rhetorical structure and linguistic devices used to express authorial stance. The corpus consisted of 50 articles from international journals and 50 from Thai journals, in the research interest of Tourism, utilizing Swales' (2004) and Pho's (2013), Move analysis of a 23-Move structure from Abstract to Discussion-Conclusion. The findings revealed a greater number of Moves and steps occur in international articles than in Thai articles. Based on Hyland's (2005a) interactional metadiscourse framework, hedges are the most common device used by both groups of writers to express their stances. When comparing both groups of texts, hedges and self-mentions are more common in international articles whereas boosters and attitude markers are more common in Thai articles. There are statistically significant differences between texts in the number of occurrences of all four types of stance markers. The differences in the use of Moves and stance markers between the two groups may be attributed to reader types (national and international), competition in the discourse community, and socio-cultural aspects. This is an area worthy of further research. The findings have both practical and pedagogical implications for academic writing, especially writing for publication.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title 1

Acknowledgements 2

Abstract 3

Table of contents 4

List of Tables 10

List of figures 13

Abbreviations 14

Chapter 1 Introduction

1.1 Rationale and background 15

1.2 Types of research articles 21

1.3 Importance of tourism in Thailand 22

1.4 Characteristics of tourism research 23

1.5 Objectives of the study 25

1.6 Significance of the study 26

1.7 Summary of the chapter 27

1.8 The structure of the thesis 28

Chapter 2 Literature review

2.1 Introduction 30

2.2 Concepts and review of theoretical frameworks of authorial stance 30

2.2.1 Concept and review of evaluation framework 30

2.2.2 Concept and review of metadiscourse framework 31

2.2.3 Concept and review of appraisal framework 33

2.2.4 Concept and review of stance framework 34

2.2.5 Rationale for choosing Hyland's theoretical framework as an analytical framework 41

2.3 Contrastive text linguistic studies 42

2.4 Academic discourse 43
2.4.1 Textual approaches 44
2.4.2 Genre analysis 44
2.4.2.1 The New Rhetoric (NR) approach……46
2.4.2.2 The Systematic Function Linguistics (SFL) approach…… 46
2.4.2.3 English for Specific Purposes (ESP) approach ……47
2.4.3 Corpus analysis 55
2.4.4 Multimodal analysis 57
2.5 Research article discourse 58
2.5.1 Review and revision 58
2.5.2 Novelty and relevance 59
2.5.3 Stance and engagement 61
2.6 Writer-responsible versus reader-responsible languages..... 64
2.7 Cross-cultural studies of authorial stance in research articles ……65
2.8 Summary of the chapter 80
Chapter 3 Methodology
3.1 Introduction..... 82
3.2 Research questions..... 82
3.3 Theoretical framework of the study: metadiscourse in academic writing. 82
3.3.1 Interactive metadiscourse..... 83
3.4 An overview of the approach of this study: corpus linguistics..... 84
3.4.1 Concordances 84
3.4.2 Frequency 85
3.5 An overview of the research design 86
3.5.1 Description of the corpora 86
3.5.2 Criteria of research articles..... 87
3.5.3 General descriptions of the four internal sections ……88

3.5.3.1 The Introduction section ……89

3.5.3.2 The Methods section ……..90

3.5.3.3 The Results section ……91

3.5.3.4 The Discusssion-Conclusions section ……91

3.5.4 Data analysis ……92

3.5.5 The analysis of Move structure..... 92

3.5.5.1 Selection of the second coder ……..96

3.5.5.2 Coder training and establishing an agreement between coders.. 96

3.5.6 The analysis of authorial stance 97

3.6 Ethical considerations..... 98

3.6.1 Copyright issue ……98

3.6.2 Ethics in the context of corpus linguistics ……99

3.6.2.1 Ethical issues affecting respondents in a spoken corpus ……..100

3.6.2.2 Ethical issues affecting corpus builders ……100

3.6.2.3 Ethical issues affecting corpus distributors ……..100

3.6.2.4 Ethical issues affecting corpus users ……100

3.7 Summary of the chapter 101

Chapter 4 Findings

4.1 Introduction..... 102

4.2 Characteristics of Move structure 102

4.2.1 The Abstract of the article..... 103

4.2.2 The Introduction section 108

4.2.2.1 Steps realising Moves in the introduction section 118

4.2.2.1.1 Steps in Move 6 (Establishing a territory) 118

4.2.2.1.2 Steps in Move 7 (Establishing a niche)..... 121

4.2.2.1.3 Steps in Move 8 (Presenting the present work) 124

4.2.3 The Methods Section..... 127
4.2.3.1 Steps realising Moves in the Methods section..... 134
4.2.3.1.1 Steps in Move 9 (Contextualizing study methods)..... 134
4.2.3.1.2 Steps in Move 10 (Describing the data and data collection procedure)..... 136
4.2.3.1.3 Steps in Move 11 (Describing the data analysis procedure) 139
4.2.4 The Results section..... 142
4.2.4.1 Steps realising Moves in the Results section 148
4.2.4.1.1 Steps in Move 13 (Preparing for the presentation of the Results section)..... 148
4.2.4.1.2 Steps in Move 15 (Commenting on specific results)..... 150
4.2.5 The Discussion-Conclusions section..... 152
4.2.5.1 Steps realising Moves in the Discussion-Conclusions section ……...160
4.2.5.1.1 Steps in Move 17 (Preparing for the presentation of the discussion section)..... 160
4.2.5.1.2 Steps in Move 20 (Discussing the findings of the study) .. 163
4.2.5.1.3 Steps in Move 22 (Evaluating the study)..... 165
4.2.5.1.4 Steps in Move 23 (Deductions from the research)..... 168
4.3 The findings of stance markers 171
4.3.1 Overall results of stance markers across moves..... 171
4.3.2 Hedges..... 174
4.3.2.1 Sub-categories of Hedges (Modal verbs) 178
4.3.2.2 Sub-categories of Hedges (Verbs) 182
4.3.2.3 Sub-categories of Hedges (Adverbs)..... 187
4.3.2.4 Sub-categories of Hedges (Adjectives) 196
4.3.2.5 Sub-categories of Hedges (Nouns) 200

4.3.2.6 Sub-categories of Hedges (Others) 203
4.3.3 Boosters 206
4.3.3.1 Sub-categories of Boosters (Verbs) 208
4.3.3.2 Sub-categories of Boosters (Adverbs) 213
4.3.3.3 Sub-categories of Boosters (Adjectives) 216
4.3.3.4 Sub-categories of Boosters (Modal verbs) 219
4.3.4 Attitude Markers 221
4.3.4.1 Sub-categories of Attitude Markers (Adjectives) 224
4.3.4.2 Sub-categories of Attitude Markers (Adverbs) 230
4.3.4.3 Sub-categories of Attitude Markers (Verbs) 234
4.3.5 Self-mentions 236
4.3.5.1 Sub-categories of self-mentions (First-person singular pronouns) 240
4.3.5.2 Sub-categories of self-mentions (First-person plural pronouns) 243
4.3.5.3 Sub-categories of self-mentions (Possessive determiners) 247
4.3.5.4 Sub-categories of self-mentions (Others) 250
4.4 Summary of the chapter 255
Chapter5 Discussion
5.1 Introduction 256
5.2 Characteristics of Move structure (researcher question 1) 256
5.2.1 The Abstract of the article 256
5.2.1.2 The Introduction section 259
5.2.1.3 The Methods section 264
5.2.1.4 The Results section 268
5.2.1.5 The Discussion-Conclusions section 270
5.3 Overall results of stance devices (Research question 2) 275
5.3.1Hedges 278

5.3.2 Boosters 281
5.3.3 Attitude markers 283
5.3.4 Self-mentions 284
5.4 Summary of the chapter 286
Chapter 6 Conclusions
6.1 Introduction..... 287
6.2 Summary of findings..... 287
6.2.1 How are English research articles in Tourism written by Thai writers and published in Thai journals similar to and different from those published in international journals in terms of rhetorical structure? 287
6.2.2 How are English research articles in Tourism written by Thai writers and published in Thai journals similar to and different from those published in international journals in terms of linguistic features to express writers' stance? 291
6.3. Significance of the study..... 295
6.4. Research implications 303
6.4.1 Pedagogical implications for second language teachers 303
6.4.2 Practical implications for non-native learners and scholars 304
6.5. Limitations of the study and recommendations for future research 305
6.6 Summary of the chapter 307
Appendices.....
Appendix A: Hyland's (2005a) stance markers..... 309
Appendix B: List of articles in the international corpus 311
Appendix C: List of articles in the Thai corpus..... 315
Appendix D: Coding scheme for the analysis of the rhetorical structure of research articles in tourism discipline ……319
References..... 335

Lists of Tables

Table 2.1: List of interpersonal metadiscourse by Chrismore et al. (1993) ……32

Table 2.2: Stance types by Biber and Finegan (1988) 34

Table 2.3: List of stance markers by Biber et al. (1999) 35

Table 2.4: List of stance features by Biber (2006) 38

Table 2.5: Swales' (2004) revised *CARS* model for the Introduction section ... 49

Table 4.1: Move structure of the Abstract 104

Table 4.2: Distribution of Moves and mean sentences in the Abstract 106

Table 4.3: Move structure of the Introduction section 110

Table 4.4: Summary of Move occurrences and mean sentences in the Introduction section 116

Table 4.5: Distribution of steps and mean sentences in Move 6 120

Table 4.6: Distribution of steps and mean sentences in Move 7 123

Table 4.7: Distribution of steps and mean sentences in Move 8 126

Table 4.8: Move structure of the Methods section 129

Table 4.9: Summary of Move occurrences and mean sentences in the Methods section 132

Table 4.10: Distribution of steps and mean sentences in Move 9 135

Table 4.11: Distribution of steps and mean sentences in Move 10 138

Table 4.12: Distribution of steps and mean sentences in Move 11 141

Table 4.13: Move structure of the Results section 143

Table 4.14: Summary of Move occurrences and mean sentences in the Results section 146

Table 4.15: Distribution of steps and mean sentences in Move 13 149

Table 4.16: Distribution of steps and mean sentences in Move 15 151

Table 4.17: Move structure of the Discussion-Conclusions section 153

Table 4.18: Distribution of Moves and mean sentences in the Discussion-Conclusions section 157

Table 4.19: Distribution of steps and mean sentences in Move 17 162

Table 4.20: Distribution of steps and mean sentences in Move 20 164

Table 4.21: Distribution of steps and mean sentences in Move 22 167

Table 4.22: Distribution of steps and mean sentences in Move 23 170

Table 4.23: Number of occurrences of stance types across Moves 172

Table 4.24: Number of Moves including stance markers..... 172
Table 4.25: Number of occurrences of hedging devices across Moves 175
Table 4.26: Number of Moves including hedging devices 176
Table 4.27: Number of occurrences of modal verbs (hedges) across Moves. 180
Table 4.28: Number of Moves including modal verbs (hedges)..... 181
Table 4.29: Number of occurrences of verbs (hedges) across Moves 184
Table 4.30: Number of Moves including verbs (hedges) 185
Table 4.31: Number of occurrences of adverbs (hedges) across Moves 191
Table 4.32: Number of Moves including adverbs (hedges) 193
Table 4.33: Number of occurrences of adjectives (hedges) across Moves 198
Table 4.34: Number of Moves including adjectives (hedges) 199
Table 4.35: Number of occurrences of nouns (hedges) across Moves 202
Table 4.36: Number of Moves including nouns (hedges) 202
Table 4.37: Number of occurrences of others (hedges) across Moves 204
Table 4.38: Number of Moves including others (hedges) 205
Table 4.39: Number of occurrences of boosting devices across Moves..... 207
Table 4.40: Number of Moves including boosting devices 207
Table 4.41: Number of occurrences of verbs (boosters) across Moves 211
Table 4.42: Number of Moves including verbs (boosters) 212
Table 4.43: Number of occurrences of adverbs (boosters) across Moves 214
Table 4.44: Number of Moves including adverbs (boosters) 215
Table 4.45: Number of occurrences of adjectives (boosters) across Moves . 217
Table 4.46: Number of Moves including adjectives (boosters) 218
Table 4.47: Number of occurrences of modal verbs (boosters) across Moves220
Table 4.48: Number of Moves including modal verbs (boosters)..... 220
Table 4.49: Number of occurrences of attitude markers across Moves..... 223
Table 4.50: Number of Moves including attitude markers 223
Table 4.51: Number of occurrences of adjectives (attitude markers) across Moves..... 226
Table 4.52: Number of Moves including adjectives (attitude markers) 228
Table 4.53: Number of occurrences of adverbs (attitude markers) across Moves 232

Table 4.54: Number of Moves including adverbs (attitude markers) 233

Table 4.55: Number of occurrences of verbs (attitude markers) across Moves 235

Table 4.56: Number of Moves including verbs (attitude markers) 235

Table 4.57: Number of occurrences of self-mentions across Moves 238

Table 4.58: Number of Moves including self-mentions 239

Table 4.59: Number of occurrences of first-person singular pronouns (self-mention) across Moves 242

Table 4.60: Number of Moves including first-person singular pronouns (self-mention) 242

4.61: Number of occurrences of first-person plural pronouns (self-mention) across Moves 246

Table 4.62: Number of Moves including first-person plural pronouns (self-mention) 246

Table 4.63: Number of occurrences of possessive determiners (self-mention) across Moves 249

Table 4.64: Number of Moves including possessive determiners (self-mention) 249

Table 4.65: Number of occurrences of others (self-mention) across Moves .. 253

Table 4.66: Number of Moves including others (self-mention) 254

Table 6.1: Summary of the proposed model of rhetorical structure for the tourism research article 297

List of Figure

Figure 2.1: Pho's (2013) model of Moves structures of the Abstract and the main research article 52

Abbreviations

EFL	English as a Foreign Language
CARS	Create a Research Space
CR	Contrastive Rhetoric
IMRD	Introduction, Methods, Results and Discussion
L1	First language
L2	Second language
NR	New Rhetoric
SFL	Systemic functional linguistics
ESP	English for specific purposes
ESL	English as a second language

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Rationale and background

There has been a great deal of interest in authorial stance in academic writing, evident by the substantial amount of research conducted over the last two decades (e.g., Alotaibi, 2019; Alramadan, 2020; Baratta, 2009; Chang & Schleppegrell, 2011; Charles, 2003; Hashemi & Hosseini, 2019; Hyland, 2005b; Hyland & Tse, 2005a, 2005b). Authorial stance is an "attitudinal dimension and includes features which refer to the way writers present themselves and convey their judgements, opinions, and commitments" (Hyland, 2005b, p. 176). Traditionally, it was held that information presented in an academic text was and should be objective and impersonal. However, it has been argued that to be successful in writing an academic text, a writer needs to express his/her stance by making a proposition, expressing an attitude, evaluating materials, and persuading readers to agree to their arguments (Ahmad & Mehrjooseresht, 2012; Gil-Salom & Soler-Monreal, 2014; Hyland, 2005b; Hyland & Tse, 2005a, 2005b; McGrath & Kuteeva, 2012; Neff, Ballesteros, & Dafouz, 2004). Hyland (2002a) also makes the further claim that authors who can project themselves in the text, and demonstrate confidence in their evaluation and judgments, will obtain credibility and be regarded as proficient authors.

Studies have indicated that for English as a second language (L2) writers, expressing authorial stance or perspectives in an academic text is a demanding task (e.g., Chang & Schleppegrell, 2011; Hyland, 2002a; Lee & Casal, 2014; Monreal & Salom, 2011; Mur Dueñas, 2011; Neff et al., 2004). A number of researchers have reported L2 writers' problems in relation to presenting their stance in academic texts, in terms of types of stance and linguistic devices. For example, Hyland and Milton (1997) demonstrate that Hong Kong students faced difficulties in expressing an epistemic stance in essays, with much reliance on a limited range of devices of modal verbs and adverbs. With regard to non-native professional writing, Mur Dueñas (2007) and Lorés-Sanz (2011) report that Spanish writers showed less use of the self-mentions features (e.g., *I* and *we*) in research articles in business management, resulting in downplaying their roles in

research. As argued by Lorés-Sanz (2011, p. 190), self-mention features, which are markers of writer visibility in the text, can allow writers to "project a firm, confident self in the increasingly competitive academic world".

Understanding the nature of authorial stance in academic texts, has generated a wide range of studies on aspects of the topic. Examples include examining stance markers (e.g., Biber & Finegan, 1989; Charles, 2003; Hyland & Tse, 2005a; Kim & Lim, 2015; McGrath & Kuteeva, 2012; Pho, 2008, 2013; Yang, 2014); offering a taxonomy of stance features (e.g., Hyland, 1999, 2005a, 2005b); comparing the use of stance markers in the top-ranked and non-ranked journals (e.g., Alotaibi, 2019); and comparing the use of stance features by experienced and novice writers (e.g., Hood, 2004; Hyland and Tse, 2005b; Koutsantoni, 2006).

However, only a few studies have focused on the authorial stance in academic texts produced by L2 writers (Hyland, 2004b; McCrostie, 2008). Previous studies of L2 writers fall into two broad groups. One set of studies has compared the degree of use of stance markers by L1 and L2 writers. These studies have revealed a significant difference in the level of use of these stance markers between the two groups (e.g., Alramadan, 2020; Atai & Sadr, 2006; Hashemi & Hosseini, 2019; Hyland & Milton, 1997; Lee, 2015; Lorés-Sanz, 2011; Monreal & Salom, 2011; Mur Dueñas, 2007, 2011). The second set of studies has investigated specific markers signalling authorial stance, such as personal pronouns (Cheung & Lau, 2020; Fazilatfar & Naseri, 2014; Hyland, 2002a), adverbials (Ahmad & Mehrjooseresht, 2012), and the evaluative *that-clause* (Hyland & Tse, 2005b). These studies attempt to discover which linguistic features or patterns of use are overused or underused by different groups of L2 (McCrostie, 2008), and how cultural differences have an effect on the writers' use of rhetorical strategies and "pragmatic discourse practices" (Hyland, 2002a, p. 1110).

As English is the international language in academic research, researchers from non-native English-speaking countries endeavor to publish their research articles in English language journals. However, extensive research has shown that a number of L2 writers face difficulties in international publication (e.g., Flowerdew, 1999; Li, 2006; Lillis & Curry, 2006). Numerous studies also examine L2 writers'

problems in writing academic articles. An interview study with editors of twelve international journals in applied linguistics and English language teaching conducted by Flowerdew (2001) revealed that surface language errors, such as the use of the article or subject-verb agreement, were not the most problematic errors made by nonnative English-speaking writers. Most editors in the study viewed major problems for non-native English-speaking writers as being lack of authorial voice and a particular rhetorical stance, the inappropriate structure of the Introduction/Literature Review and the Discussion/Conclusion sections of the research article, and failure to show the relevance of the study to the international community. Constructing a critical stance poses a challenge not only for L2 authors but also for L1 novice authors (Flowerdew, 2001; Neff et al., 2004). Thus, examining how authors express their authorial stances in all sections of the research article including the Abstract can offer a fruitful resource for both L1 and L2 novice authors (Pho, 2013).

This study focuses on the "research article", an academic genre, as it is pointed out by scholars, such as Bazerman (1988) and Swales (1990) and that one of the major roles of this genre is presenting new knowledge, and is used as a major means of scientific or scholarly communication (Holmes, 1997). Swales defines the research article as:

> A written text (although often containing non-verbal elements), usually limited to a few thousand words, that reports on some investigation carried out by its author or authors. In addition, the research article will usually relate the findings within it to those of others, and may also examine issues of theory and/or methodology. It is to appear or has appeared in a research journal or, less typically, in an edited book-length collection of papers. (Swales, 1990, p. 93)

A large number of studies focusing on research articles have been carried out in two areas of analysis. Analysis of the rhetorical structure and analysis of linguistic features. Following the approach of English for Specific Purposes (ESP), inspired by Swales (1990), language analysts of the structure of research articles focus on specific sections of the research article, such as Discussion (Holmes, 1997; Peacock, 2002), Methods (Lim, 2006), Results (Brett, 1994), and with a great deal of attention on the Introduction (Hirano, 2009; Samraj, 2002b). Nevertheless, it appears that there has been little analysis of the research article as a whole, apart from a study by Kanoksilapatham (2005, 2007), who argued

that it is essential to fully grasp how research articles are created. Regarding studies of linguistic features, there have been more numerous studies of linguistic devices in general or linguistic devices of stance (e.g., the writer's identity and the writer's expression of attitudes, feelings, or judgement) in research articles, such as the use of reporting verbs (Thompson & Yiyun, 1991), personal pronouns (Kuo, 1999), tense (Malcolm, 1987), first-person pronouns/writer's identity (Lorés-Sanz, 2011) and writer's attitude, certainty and common knowledge markers (Koutsantoni, 2004). Although these studies enable us to understand how linguistic devices are used in the research articles, it has been suggested that in order to deepen an understanding of authorial stance, studies should be conducted integrating an analysis of linguistic and rhetorical structures or Moves (Chang & Schleppegrell, 2011; Hyland, 2005b; McGrath & Kuteeva, 2012). Such a combined study would be able to provide fine-grained detail about the different ways of demonstrating authorial stance and specify where these features are likely to cluster (Hyland, 2005b).

There are some studies that connect linguistic features of authorial stance to rhetorical structures in research articles (Pho, 2013). However, those integrated studies investigated one or two individual sections rather than the complete research article. Apart from the generic structure of the Conclusion section, Loi et al. (2016) examine linguistic choices demonstrating the writer's attitude, based on Martin and Rose's (2003) model. Similarly, Milagros del Saz Rubio (2011) investigates the distribution of expressions of the writer's stance across the different Moves of the Introductory section. This demonstrated gap in the research and published data on rhetorical structures over the entirety of research articles and their linguistical characteristics, particularly in Thai L2 texts. The focus of the present study is not only the rhetorical structures of the English research articles written by Thai writers but also how they use linguistic devices to construct their authorial stance throughout the research article, from the Abstract to the Conclusions and compare them with those published in international journals in terms of rhetorical structure and linguistic devices used to express authorial stance.

The writing of research articles in English is challenging for Thai academics (Jaroongkhongdach, Watson Todd, Keyuravong, & Hall, 2012; Kanoksilapatham,

2007b; Pupipat, 1998). In a study carried out by Pupipat (1998), the findings revealed that Thai scientists faced difficulties in writing, the Abstract, the Introduction and the Discussion. In interviews Thai scientists admitted that they were unable to convincingly argue and discuss their information, and also perceived themselves as having little skill in making a comparison and contrasting their work to that of other researchers. However, studies on research articles in the Thai context have tended to focus on rhetorical or Move structure analysis, such as Amnuai, 2017, 2019; Kanoksilapatham, 2005, 2007b; Wannaruk & Amnuai, 2016. Those studies of research articles do not analyse the writer's stance. There are only two studies relevant to the analysis of the writer's stance. One study was undertaken by Amornrattanasirichok and Jaroongkhongdach (2017) which partially related to writers' stance. However, the study focused on the aspect of reader engagement rather than writers' stance. Based on Martin and White's (2005) appraisal framework, Amornrattanasirichok and Jaroongkhongdach (2017) analysed how Thai journal authors and authors in international journals in applied linguistics present their authorial stance to engage readers in the Literature review section. The findings revealed that the use of engagement by scholars from each community is slightly different. The researchers assert that the variations might be explained by several factors, such as norms and conventions of the academic communities and readers' expectations. However, this research is relatively small-scaled; a total of 20 papers were included (10 from one Thai journal and 10 from one international journal). Moreover, the main focus of the study is on the engagement dimension rather than writers' attitudes or judgements. Another study was conducted by Yotimart & Abd Aziz (2017). Based on Hyland's (2002c, 2005b, 2005a) and Pho's (2013) stance models, the study compared 30 English research articles written by native English and Thai scholars in applied linguistics (15 research articles from each corpus). The results demonstrated that hedges, epistemic stance words (e.g., *really*, *indeed*), boosters and self-mentions were more likely to be used by native English researchers than Thai researchers. By contrast, Thai researchers tended to use more attitude markers than native English writers. Further contextual analysis revealed that native English authors showed their authorial involvement in texts more overtly than Thai authors. According to the researchers, this difference could be attributed to different cultural-oriented

background, i.e., collectivism versus individualism. Although this study investigates research articles in terms of the authorial stance, it does not include the analysis of rhetorical structure in the study. Because of such gaps in the extant literature, this study proposes to compare the use of linguistic features signalling authorial stance with the support of rhetorical structure analysis in English research articles written by Thai writers and those written by international authors. The analysis of rhetorical structures in this study uses Swales (2004) and Pho's (2013) model as the points of departure, while the analysis of authorial stance is based on (Hyland, 2005a) stance taxonomy.

This research will pay particular attention to articles published in Thai journals in the discipline of tourism and those published in international journals in the same discipline, regardless of authors' nationalities. There are three main reasons why the discipline of tourism, an example of 'soft disciplines' (Hyland, 1999), is selected. Firstly, research has suggested that the rhetorical structure of the research article and the use of linguistic features are different according to academic disciplines. These distinctions are exemplified in the work undertaken by Hyland (1999), who reported that there were marked differences between soft (humanities/ social science) and hard (sciences) disciplines in terms of use of stance types and frequency of their occurrences. To illustrate, there was greater use of stance features in journals in social sciences, such as applied linguistics, marketing, sociology, and philosophy, compared to those from sciences and engineering. While authors in the scientific fields tended to reduce their apparent presence in the texts, authors in the soft disciplines create their authorial presence in the texts. Hyland (1990) asserts that the social practices of a writers' academic discipline influence choices of rhetorical strategy as well as expressions of writer's stance. The social sciences "give greater importance to explicit interpretation", compared to the hard sciences (Hyland, 2006, p. 240). This means that the author's interpretive role and discursive performance are required to communicate with readers (Hyland, 2003, 2004a). Writing research articles in a soft discipline, therefore, tends to pose a challenge for novice L2 research writers. Therefore, it would be invaluable for a study to offer a comprehensive description of the rhetorical structures and use of linguistic features of stance in research articles of a particular field in the soft disciplines, the aim of this research.

Secondly, with regard to previous studies of the research article genre, researchers have paid more attention to the hard sciences than the soft sciences (Holmes, 1997; Pho, 2013). Existing research in natural sciences or hard sciences includes biochemistry (Kanoksilapatham, 2005, 2007), environmental science (Samraj, 2002a, 2002b), medical (Nwogu, 1997), mathematics (McGrath and Kuteeva, 2012), computer science (Posteguillo, 1999) and engineering (Koutsantoni, 2006). Previous studies in the soft sciences or social sciences and humanities, which have been examined to a lesser extent, include applied linguistics (Pho, 2008, 2013; Wannaruk & Amnuai, 2016), sociology (Brett, 1994), business management (Mur Dueñas, 2007, 2011; Lorés-Sanz, 2011), education (Chang & Schleppegrell, 2011) and history (Holmes, 1997). Hence, it can be argued that it is vital to develop studies of linguistic realizations of rhetorical functions in research articles in the social sciences.

Finally, the discipline of tourism has been chosen because this is under represented, compared to other soft disciplines mentioned above. Previously published studies of the research article in tourism are limited to the rhetorical structure of individual sections of the research articles, such as the Abstract (Ahmed, 2015; Sabila & Kurniawan, 2020), much less is known about linguistic markers of stance. The current study, thus, intends to explore not only the linguistic features signalling authorial stance but also the rhetorical structures of all sections of research articles in this field.

1.2 Types of research articles

As this study examines research articles, this section addresses the types of research articles, and how the term “research articles” is defined in this study.

Conducting a cross-disciplinary study, Lin & Evans (2012) broadly classified research articles into three main types: empirical, theoretical, and review. Empirical research articles are papers written by researchers based on actual observations or experiments (Weissberg & Buker, 1990). The purpose of the paper is to clarify what the objectives, methods, and results of the study were. Theoretical articles involve analysing the existing theories or ideas in relation to the authors’ subject areas (Stallman, 2012). The theories are discussed in terms of implementation to certain contexts, thinking in a new different way, and effects of new ideas or theories on the theories. According to Lin & Evans (2012),

reviews can be in a form of a literature review on a specific topic or a review of literary work. The review of literature involves analysis and discussion of previously published research on a topic. Therefore, the primary data is not presented. The review of literary work refers to a critique or an evaluation of literature. In this study, research articles refer to empirical research articles in which the writers report their observations or experiments based on primary data.

With regard to the structure of empirical research articles, Lin & Evans (2012) argue that although IMRD (Introduction-Methods-Results-Discussions) structure is a conventional structure in empirical research articles, especially in scientific research, this structure does not seem to be a default structure. They further contend that there is an increase in the employment of an independent Literature Review (L) section occurring between the Introduction and Methods sections in modern research writing. An independent L section seems to be a major component in empirical research articles in social sciences (Lin & Evans, 2012). This appears to be the case in empirical research articles in the tourism discipline. The articles in both Thai and international journals in this study usually contain this section.

1.3 Importance of tourism in Thailand

To gain a better understanding of the importance of tourism in the Thai context, this section provides the background of the tourism industry in Thailand concerning its contributions to the Thai economy, and the growth of tourism education in Thailand.

The tourism sector has played an important role in the growth of Thai economy (Pongsakornrungsilp et al., 2021; Siraphatthada et al., 2021). Thailand is one of the world's leading tourist destinations. It attracted the highest number of international visitation of the 10 ASEAN countries with 35.38 million international visitors and was the ninth most visited country in the world by 2017 (Beirman, 2018). The number of tourists visiting Thailand rose to 38.18 million and 39.92 million in 2018 and 2019 respectively (Tourism Authority of Thailand, 2020). The growth of the tourism industry has generated high income and provided opportunities for employment for the country. In 2019, the arrival of international tourists generated a revenue of approximately THB 2 trillion (11% of GDP) and

more than 7 million persons (20% of total employment) were employed (Bank of Thailand, 2021).

To correspond to the growth of tourism, 297 programmes of study in tourism have been currently offered by 99 universities (both private and public universities) in Thailand (Ministry of Higher Education, Science, Research and Innovations, 2022) Some universities also offer a similar programme of study in different faculties in the same university. For example, a public university, Kasetsart University has offered programmes in tourism innovation, and hotel and tourism management in the Faculty of Liberal Arts and Science, as well as a programme in tourism and service industry, and in service creation for tourism business in the Faculty of Hospitality Industry. This demonstrates that tourism education gains popularity among Thai students. Because of the rapid growth of the sector, the tourism subject appears to receive attention from scholars including linguistics (Luo & Huang, 2015). Due to being a newly developing research area (Ahmed, 2015; Airey, 2015), and contributions to the Thai economy, tourism research articles should be examined to keep pace with other disciplines. Investigating both rhetorical structure and linguistic features of stance in tourism research articles can exhibit comprehensive characteristics of tourism discourse. This contributes to both local researchers and their foreign peers as well as the body of knowledge in the existing literature.

1.4 Characteristics of tourism research

One of the major characteristics of tourism research is that it has been conducted from several disciplinary perspectives (Butler, 2015; Cheng et al., 2011; Kirilenko & Stepchenkova, 2018). Scholars have proposed a number of tourism-related disciplines. For instance, Butler (2015) suggested that disciplines contributing to tourism research may include anthropology, business (management), economics, geography, history, political science and sociology, leisure (and recreation), development studies, international studies, architecture, urban studies and, agriculture and rural development. Investigating 59 tourism academic journals published from 1946 to 2004, Cheng et al., (2011) identified twenty-nine disciplinary focuses: (1) hotel and restaurant administration, (2) economics, (3) marketing, (4) sociology, (5) parks and recreation, (6) cultural/heritage study, (7) management and administration, (8) psychology, (9)

environmental studies, (10) anthropology, (11) education, (12) geography, (13) urban and regional planning, (14) business, (15) kinesiology, (16) history, (17) law, (18) finance, (19) gaming, (20) transportation, (21) computer science/technology, (22) gerontology, (23) political science, (24) entrepreneurship, (25) architecture, (26) agriculture, (27) literature, (28) medicine, (29) philosophy/religion. In addition, to further provide more insight into the characteristics of tourism research, scholars have analysed topics of tourism studies published in academic journals on tourism.

To illuminate trends in tourism research, studies have been carried out to explore the topics of research articles in tourism journals. For example, Kirilenko & Stepchenkova (2018) explored 7,427 article abstracts with publication dates ranging from 1974 until August 2017 in three leading journals on tourism: *Annals of Tourism Research*, *Journal of Travel Research*, and *Tourism Management*. Fourteen topics were identified as follows: (1) tourism as a social phenomenon, (2) image and risk, (3) attractions, (4) tourism industry, (5) service quality and satisfaction, (6) modelling and forecasting, (7) conferences, (8) tourist experience and motivation, (9) market segmentation, (10) decision making process, (11) tourism demand, (12) governing tourism development, (13) sustainable tourism, (14) local communities. Similarly, Ballantyne, Packer, & Axelsen (2009) examined approximately 200 articles from twelve major tourism journals published from 1994 to 2004. The contents of the journal were classified into 21 topics: (1) tourist/visitor studies, (2) destinations, (3) tourism planning, (4) marketing, (5) cultural tourism, (6) economic issues, (7) tourism impacts, (8) tourism trends, (9) tourism research issues and methods, (10) hospitality, (11) ecotourism, (12) sustainable development, (13) special events, (14) transport, (15) management, (16) human resource management, (17) environmental interpretation, (18) tourism policy, (19) tourism education & training, (20) business tourism, and (21) sport and leisure. The researchers also revealed that the most frequently published topic areas were tourist/visitor studies (articles that focus on the behaviours, preferences, and perspectives of tourists/visitors), tourism planning (tourism development, strategies, predicting and forecasting); destinations (destination image, management and development) and marketing (marketing, segmentation and promotion). In the same vein, Strandberg et al. (2018) reviewed 292 articles published from 2010-2014 in the journal, *Tourism*

and Hospitality Research. They categorised the articles into 19 topic areas as follows: (1) marketing and consumer behavior, (2) strategic implications, (3) HR management, (4) environment aspects, (5) hospitality and tourism operations, (6) planning and development, (7) research methodologies, (8) forecasting and prediction, (9) performance and financial management, (10) impact assessment and mitigation, (11) technology, (12) leisure and culture, (13) education, (14) risk management, (15) policy, (16) change management, (17) globalization, (18) etourism, (19) revenue management. Among these areas, the most prevalent topics were marketing and consumer behaviors, strategic implications, HR management, and environment aspect respectively. However, after the pandemic of COVID-19, many studies included topics concerning the effect of the pandemic on tourism.

Studies have shown that many scholars in tourism perceive the impacts of COVID-19 on tourism. To illustrate, from the perspective of sustainability tourism, a study conducted by Persson-Fischer & Liu (2021) identified six leading themes associated with the pandemic in 87 tourism research articles, namely (1) government crisis management; (2) tourist perception and decision-making; (3) tourism service provider; (4) new normal; (5) tourism research; and (6) inequality. Similarly, Casado-Aranda, Sánchez-Fernández, & Bastidas-Manzano (2021) revealed nine main themes regarding the topic of COVID-19 published in 1,303 tourism research articles: (1) tourism, (2) social media, (3) public health, (4) economic impact, (5) smart cities/tourism, (6) COVID-19, (7) risk perception, (8) sustainable tourism, and (9) consumer behavior. The aforementioned studies have illustrated the coverage of tourism knowledge by academic journals.

Another characteristic of tourism research is that it appears to be empirical research, compares to review or theoretical articles. Studies such as Ballantyne et al., (2009), and Svensson et al., (2009) have suggested that research articles published in tourism journals tend to be based on direct observations or primary data. In terms of research approaches, quantitative approaches seem to be more pervasive than other approaches such as qualitative, mixed method, and triangular approaches (Ballantyne et al., 2009; Strandberg et al., 2018; Svensson et al., 2009). Strandberg et al., (2018) also revealed that many tourism studies tended to be based on direct surveys regarding the quantitative approaches.

1.5 Objectives of the study

Many studies attempt to illuminate how stance markers are used in L2 writing. Given the difficulties that L2 writers encounter in international publication, and Thai researchers in particular, the primary aim of this study is to compare the use of linguistic devices of stance in English research articles in the field of tourism written by Thai researchers and published in Thai journals with those written by researchers and published in international journals. Because of a paucity of studies that connect the aspect of rhetorical or Move structure analysis to linguistic features of stance in the research article, this thesis intends to determine not only the sequencing and structure of Moves but also the patterns of use and functions of these linguistic features in different Moves throughout the research articles. In addition, as noted above, scholars have claimed that rhetorical structure, as well as the use of linguistic features, vary across disciplines, genres, and contexts (e.g., Hyland, 1999, 2004a; Swales, 1990). Part of the aim of this study is to explore the context of the writing of Thai researchers in the tourism field, which has an effect on their use of those linguistic markers of stance.

1.6 Significance of the study

In this study, two distinctive frameworks, namely Move analysis and expressions of writers' stance are combined to analyse research articles in tourism. In this way, this study is able to provide deeper insight into how tourism research articles are constructed. It reveals the characteristics of the genres and provides detailed data about how writers accomplish authoritative stance throughout the research articles, as all sections of the texts are examined. As pointed out by Chang and Schleppegrell (2011, p. 140), "each rhetorical Move has a specific purpose that needs to be realized by appropriate linguistic expressions". Hyland's (2005a) model of stance provides a systematic means for fulfilling the purposes of the rhetorical structures. Specifically, this study employed Hyland's (2005a) model to discover the collections of linguistic markers of stance in each Move. In doing so, the study offers a much finer-grained and more subtle level of textual analysis than previous studies employing only a single approach, as it uncovers how Moves are characterized linguistically. Additionally, as contexts of use of stance markers are analysed in the present study, it provides a more detailed and more precise description of a particular type of social sciences text, which could be

used as a baseline against which further rhetorical and linguistic comparisons can be made across cultures and academic disciplines (Kanoksilapatham, 2003).

Simultaneously, the detailed description produced by the integration of the two approaches provides both practical and pedagogical implications. For the former, a detailed study of the Move structure of the research article as a whole and how each Move is characterized linguistically can offer some guidelines for novice research writers, aiming to be members of the tourism discourse community. By focusing on the EFL context in Thailand, the findings of the study can help not only Thai researchers but also other L2 researchers deal with difficulties in publishing their articles in an international journal, particularly in the field of tourism. Apart from understanding the structure of the research article, they can understand how to construct their knowledge claims in the research articles as well as how to present, support, and argue their information and how to position themselves in the text.

As pointed out by Wang (2012), differences in authorial presences are one of the major differences in L1 and L2 academic writing. By comparing the use of linguistic features of authorial stance in English research articles written by Thai researchers to those published in international journals, the study highlights problems of use of specific features Thai writers encounter in expressing their authorial stance. The findings demonstrate specific features and patterns, which are overused or underused by each community. In this way, Thai and other L2 researchers can be aware of the use of those features when composing their research articles, and use these findings to help them conform to the norms and conventions of academic writing in the international context.

With regard to pedagogical implications, the findings of this study enable academic writing instructors to develop teaching materials and courses on academic writing or writing for publication. For example, findings of the linguistic features or patterns of overuse and underuse can be addressed in the materials and raise students' awareness about the use of these features. In addition, findings on Move structure can be fruitful for teachers in terms of teaching the communicative purpose of each Move.

1.7 Summary of the chapter

This chapter has discussed the rationale and background of the study. It has highlighted the significance of authorial stance in academic texts, and the difficulties that non-native English-speaking writers face in expressing their stance in academic texts. Particular attention has been paid to the research article genre by discussing the difficulties that L2 writers encounter in international publications as well as the insufficiency of research linking the aspect of rhetorical structure to linguistic features of stance. The reasons for the selection of tourism discipline have also been provided. Then types of research articles and the definition of the research articles in the study are discussed, followed by the significance of tourism in Thailand. Tourism has supported the Thai economy by generating high income and job opportunities. Then the chapter proceeds by presenting the objectives and the significance of the study.

1.8 The structure of the thesis

The thesis consists of six chapters. Chapter 2 provides the theoretical background relating to concepts of authorial stance, contrastive text linguistic studies, academic discourse, and research article discourse. The three traditional genre theories namely NR, SFL, and ESP are discussed. Reviews of research article discourse, characteristics of writer and reader responsible languages, and cross-cultural studies of authorial stance are also provided. Chapter 3 accounts for the methodology of the study. Research questions, theoretical framework, an overview of the approach of the study, and corpus linguistics, are presented. It also describes the corpora as well as the criteria for research article selection in the study. Research articles were investigated in terms of rhetorical structure and linguistic features used to express authorial stance. The chapter also explains how the coding scheme was developed and the procedures for the analyses of rhetorical structure and stance markers. Chapter 4 presents the findings of the analyses of the rhetorical structure of research articles and stance markers. The similarities and differences of the use of Moves and Steps in both corpora and examples of each move and step are presented. It also presents the similarities and differences in the use of stance markers in both corpora. Chapter 5 focuses on the interpretation of the analyses of the rhetorical structure and stance markers. Chapter 6 summarises the major findings of the study. It discusses the significance of the study, the implications

of the study in terms of practical and limitations of the study, and recommendations for future studies.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

This chapter deals with the relevant literature to the study. It begins with the concept and review of theoretical frameworks of authorial stance (section 2.2). Then contrastive text linguistic studies, academic discourse, research article discourse, writer-responsible versus reader-responsible languages, and cross-cultural studies on authorial stance in research articles are discussed in sections 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, and 2.7 respectively. The last section (2.8) deals with a summary of the chapter.

2.2 Concept and review of theoretical frameworks of authorial stance

Authorial stance has been examined under various terms such as *attitude* (Halliday, 1994), *epistemic modality* (Hyland, 1998b), *evaluation* (Hunston & Thompson, 2000; Stotesbury, 2003; Thompson & Yiyun, 1991) *metadiscourse* (Crismore, 1984; Hyland, 2004b, 2005a; Hyland & Tse, 2004b), *appraisal* (Martin, 2000; Martin & White, 2005; White, 2003), and *stance* (Alotaibi, 2019; Alramadan, 2020; Arsyad, 2018; Baratta, 2009; Biber, 2006; Biber & Finegan, 1989; Biber, Johansson, Leech, Conrad, & Finegan, 1999; Charles, 2003; Hashemi & Hosseini, 2019; Hyland, 2005b; Loi et al., 2016; Neff et al., 2004; Pho, 2008, 2013). All of these terms relate to the expression of attitude, feeling, or judgment in the writing appraised. As several terms of authorial stance have been proposed, I now review some theoretical frameworks of authorial stance as well as their conceptual limitations.

2.2.1 Concept and review of evaluation framework

Evaluation is one of the most popular terms used by researchers to investigate writers' stance. However, according to Mauranen & Bondi (2003, p. 269), *evaluation* "is an elusive concept". This is because we recognize evaluation in academic texts, but it is not stated clearly how it is achieved, and academic discourse held to the concept of objectivity until Susan Hunston addressed the issue of evaluation in her doctoral work (Mauranen & Bondi, 2003).

One of the most influential concepts of *evaluation* is defined by Thompson and Hunston (2000, p. 5). They describe *evaluation* as an "expression of the speaker or writer's attitude or stance towards, viewpoint on, or feelings about the entities or propositions that he or she is talking about". They provide four parameters of evaluation, namely good-bad, certainty, expectedness, and importance. They also suggest that goodness and certainty are two key parameters of evaluation because they exhibit "the writer/ speaker's view of the status of propositions and entities" (Thompson & Hunston, 2000, p. 24). However, they accept that the term *evaluation* is "slippery" (p.5) because it can be understood in different ways. For instance, traditionally, it is used to refer to elements of textual patterns or the expression of an author's emotional attitude.

Hunston (2000) developed the framework of evaluation by investigating evaluative linguistic features in several genres including research articles, political and social commentary articles from The Times and The Guardian newspapers, and book reviews from those newspapers. However, her framework has some limitations. Firstly, she includes several types of text in her research and it is clear that her framework does not emerge from exclusively academic genres. Therefore, typical features in scholarly writing cannot be claimed (Hyland, 2005b). In addition, self-mention features, the use of first-person pronouns is perhaps the most powerful way of self-representation in the text (Ivanič, 1998), are not included in her model. Although she gives a lot of examples of evaluative markers in her study, a list of evaluative features is not provided in the framework.

2.2.2 Concept and review of metadiscourse framework

Matadiscourse is a broad term frequently used in studies on writers 'stance but its definition is rather elusive. It refers to "the author's discoursing about the discourse; it is the author's intrusion into the discourse either explicitly or non-explicitly, to direct rather than inform the readers" (Crismore, 1984, p. 280). It involves linguistic devices in spoken or written texts that are aimed to help the listener or reader organise, interpret, and evaluate the given information (Crismore, Markkanen and Steffensen,1993). However, the term is fuzzy in that analysts understand the term in a different way (Hyland, 2004; 2005a; Hyland and Tse, 2004). To illustrate, some writers pay their attention to features of

textual organization, whereas others limit their focus on what Hyland (2005a, p. 17) calls “explicit illocutionary predicates”, such as *I believe that* and *we demonstrate that*.

Investigating metadiscourse in university texts in two different cultural contexts, Crismore, Markkanen and Steffensen (1993) proposed two groups of stance markers: textual metadiscourse and interpersonal metadiscourse. According to Crismore, Markkanen and Steffensen (1993), the interpersonal metadiscourse, which is the focus of this study, consists of five categories as in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1: List of interpersonal metadiscourse by Chrismore et al. (1993)

Category	Function	Examples
Hedges	Express uncertainty to truth-value of the proposition	*Can, could, may, might, would, must, should, I think, I feel, I guess, I suppose, in my opinion, seem, perhaps, maybe, it is possible*
Certainty markers	Express full commitment to proposition	*Absolutely, certainly, I know, sure, it is clear, it is really*
Attributors	Give source of information	*claim*
Attitude markers	Display writer’s affective values	*I hope, I agree/disagree, unfortunately, most importantly, hopefully, doubtfully, by hearsay, even*
Commentary	Create relationship with reader	*You may not agree that, think about it, let’s, we*

However, there are several limitations of this framework. One of the weaknesses is that the linguistic features in interpersonal metadiscourse are quite limited, compared to other frameworks such as Hyland's (2005a, 2005b) framework. For instance, as shown in Table 2.1, attitude markers in Crismore, Markkanen and Steffensen (1993) comprise solely nine features while Hyland's model provides thirty attitude markers. Another example is that there are only seven certainty markers in Crismore, Markkanen and Steffensen's (1993) framework; other words, such as *of course*, *definitely,* and *obvious* which show writers' full commitment should be included. Furthermore, this framework fails to consider the use of the first-person pronoun *I*. Moreover, Uba (2017) suggested that the word *claim*, which is categorized under the category of *attributors* should be classified under *hedges*, as this feature demonstrates the writers 'degree of commitment to the reliability of the informational content.

2.2.3 Concept and review of appraisal framework

The term *appraisal* introduced by Martin (2000) has been used to describe the writers' attitudinal positions. He defines the term as having three aspects: affect, judgement, and appreciation. They are used to deal with emotion, moral evaluations of behaviour, and aesthetic assessment. The term was extended by Martin and White (2005) by incorporating *engagement* and *graduation* into the term and coining the term *attitude* for those three areas in Martin (2000). Therefore, *appraisal* proposed by Martin and White (2005) involves discourse, semantic resources, interpreting interpersonal meaning in three areas, attitude, engagement, and graduation. Attitude consists of the three aspects of feeling. Engagement deals with how the speaker/writer uses linguistic resources to develop authorial voice and engage other voices. Graduation involves gradeability and deals with altering the extent of an evaluation. According to Martin & White (2005), the concept of *appraisal* in their framework is probably most closely connected to the concept of stance, as proposed by Biber and his colleagues in their corpus-based studies (e.g., Conrad & Biber, 2000).

Based on Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), Martin and White's (2005) framework has some limitations. Although the framework places an emphasis on the relationship of language choices to semantic functions, this framework focuses on print media discourse rather than academic discourse, evident in the

examples provided of evaluative resources in newspapers, such as The Times, The New York Times and The Guardian. Moreover, though a variety of linguistics resources is provided in the framework, features of explicit writer's presence, such as the first-person pronoun *I*, are not taken into account.

2.2.4 Concept and review of stance framework

Biber and Finegan's (1988) study is one of the earliest studies of stance. Defined by Biber and Finegan (1988, p.1), stance is "the overt expression of an author's or speaker's attitudes, feelings, judgements, or commitment concerning the message". In their study, stance markers were examined in written registers by focusing on adverbial clauses and prepositional phrases. Based on semantic content, they divided stance markers into six categories as shown in Table 2.2.

Table 2.2: Stance types by Biber and Finegan (1988: 7-8)

Types of stance	Function	Examples
1. Honestly adverbials	Communicating manner of speaking	*Personally, strictly speaking*
2. Generally adverbials	Communicating approximation, generalization, typical or usual case approximation,	*In general, roughly*
3. Surely adverbials	Communicating conviction/certainty	*Unquestionably, of course, no doubt*
4. Actually adverbials	Communicating actuality, emphasis, greater/certainty truth than anticipated	*In fact, really, as a matter of fact, actually*
5. Maybe adverbials	Communicating possibility, likelihood,	*Apparently, perhaps, maybe, presumably*

	questionable assertions, hedging	
6. Amazingly adverbials	Communicating attitudes towards the content independent of its epistemological status	*Fortunately, funnily enough, ironically, naturally*

One of the limitations of this study is that it does not take into account lexical features which can be used to express attitudes and is in need of revision. Consequently, Biber *et al.*, (1999) revised the previous framework by incorporating linguistic features of stance expressing semantic distinctions. Biber *et al.*, (1999) noted that in some cases, it is possible that the meaning of stance markers can be vague. To illustrate, the verb *hope* in the following sentence expresses both a personal attitude and epistemic stance (lack of complete certainty). "I hope there's enough there" (Biber *et al.*, 1999, p. 972). Thus, in their revised framework, stance markers are categorised into three broad groups, namely attitudinal, epistemological stance, and style of stance, as shown in Table 2.3. Attitudinal relates to "the speakers' attitudes or the evaluation of the content" (Biber et al., 1999, p. 764). While epistemological stance involves certainty, limitations, and trustworthiness of the informational content as well as the source of information, style of stance clarifies how the writer writes or how the message or information should be understood. Simultaneously, Biber *et al.*, (1999) proposed a slightly different definition by including assessment in the term. The new definition of stance, proposed by Biber *et al.*, (1999), refers to the expression of "personal feelings, attitudes, value judgements, or assessments" (p.966).

Table 2.3: List of stance markers by Biber et al. (Biber et al., 1999, pp. 972–979)

Number of stance markers	Epistemic stance	Attitudinal stance	Style of speaking stance
1.	*Probably*	*Fortunately*	*Honestly*

2.	*I think*	*Interestingly*	*Quite frankly*
3.	*Definitely*	*Happy*	*With all due respect*
4.	*Possibly*	*Love*	*To tell you the truth*
5.	*Typically*	*Hope*	*To put it bluntly*
6.	*In fact*	*Expect*	*Strictly speaking*
7.	*Without doubt*	*As anticipated*	*To be honest*
8.	*I know*	*Sadly*	*Swear*
9.	*I doubt*	*I wish*	*Argue*
10.	*Seems*	*I prefer*	
11.	*Tend*	*Curious*	
12.	*Possible*	*Angry*	
13.	*Sure*	*Essential*	
14.	*Certain*	*An expectation*	
15.	*Suggestion*	*A fear*	
16.	*Fact*	*Ought to*	
17.	*Real possibility*	*Honestly*	
18.	*Might*	*Quite frankly*	
19.	*Must*	*With all due respect*	

20.	*Could*	*Argue*	
21.	*May*	*More likely*	
22.	*According to*		
23.	*From the perspective outlined above*		
24.	*Are reported*		
25.	*Claim*		
26.	*The rumour*		

From Table 2.3, it is clear although stance markers conveying attitudes are incorporated in this revised framework, there are still weaknesses. Firstly, it fails to distinguish between what Hyland (2005a, 2005b) calls *hedges* and *boosters*, which can be employed to express tentative possibility and certainty respectively. The stance features of hedges and boosters are combined into one category. In addition, the range of epistemic stance is quite limited; there are only 26 stance markers. As pointed out by Uba (2017), other examples of epistemic features such as *clearly*, *confirm*, *indicate* and *review*, should be included. Apart from that, a particular phrase, *more likely*, is categorized incorrectly. It is suggested that this phrase should be classified as a hedge rather than an attitudinal stance because it is employed to show possibility (Uba, 2017). Another weakness of this study is that self-mention features are excluded.

However, Biber (2006) broadened the previous framework of Biber *et al.*, (1999) by including modal and semi-modal verbs, stance adverbs, and complement clauses controlled by stance verbs, adjectives, or nouns, as in Table 2.4. This framework deals with the lexico-grammatical features used for the expression of stance in both spoken and written university registers. In this revised model, although the epistemic stance used for conveying certainty and tentative possibility or likelihood are clearly distinguished, this revised approach places an emphasis on form rather than meaning. That is, some stance features which could converge on the same meaning or function are classified into different

grammatical categories (Uba, 2017). For instance, verbs: *know*, *believe*; adverbs: *certainly*, *in fact*; noun: *fact* and adjectives of certainty: *clear*, *obvious*, *certain*, all these markers could have the same meaning in a particular context. Nevertheless, he still classified such words under different grammatical classifications. In addition, some words are repetitive in different categories such as possible/possibly or conclude/conclusion. Finally, in the same way, this framework does not account for self-mention features.

Table 2.4: List of stance features by Biber (Biber, 2006, pp. 101–102)

1. Modal and semi-modal verbs • possibility/ permission/ ability: *can, could, may, might* • necessity/ obligation: *must, should, (had) better, have to, got to, ought to* • prediction/ volition: *will, would, shall, be going to*
2. Stance adverbs • Epistemic Certainty: *actually, certainty, in fact* Likelihood: *apparently, perhaps, possibly* • Attitude: *amazingly, importantly, surprisingly* • Style/Perspective: *according to, generally, typically*
3. Complement clauses controlled by stance verbs, adjectives, or nouns 3.1 Stance complement clauses controlled by verbs 3.1a. Stance verb + that-clause • Epistemic verbs: Certainty: *conclude, determine, know* Likelihood: *believe, doubt, think* • Attitude verbs: *expect, hope, worry* • Speech act and other communication verbs (non-factual): *argue, claim, report, say* 3.1b. Stance verb + to-clause • probability (likelihood) verbs: *appear, happen, seem, tend*

- Mental (cognition/ perception) verbs (likelihood): *believe, consider*
- Desire/ intention/ decision verbs: *intend, need, want*
- Verbs of effort/ facilitation: *attempt, help, try*
- Speech act and other communication verbs: *advise, remind, request*

3.2 Stance complement clauses controlled by adjectives

3.2a. Stance adjective + that-clause (often extraposed constructions)

- Epistemic adjectives:
  Certainty: *certain, clear, obvious*
  Likelihood: *(un)likely, possible, probable*
- Attitude/ Emotion adjectives: *amazed, shocked, surprised*
- Evaluation adjectives: *essential, interesting, noteworthy*

3.2b. Stance adjective + to-clause (often extraposed constructions)

- Epistemic (certainty/likelihood) adjectives: *certain, likely, sure*
- Attitude/emotion adjectives: *happy, pleased, surprised*
- Evaluation adjectives: *essential, important, necessary*
- Ability or willingness adjectives: *able, eager, willing*
- Ease or difficulty adjectives: *difficult, easy, hard*

3.3 Stance complement clauses controlled by nouns

3.3a. Stance noun + that-clause

- Epistemic nouns:
  Certainty: *conclusion, fact, observation*
  Likelihood: *assumption, claim, hypothesis*
- Attitude/perspective nouns: *hope, view*
- Communication (non-factual) nouns: *comment, proposal, report*

3.3b. Stance noun + to-clause: *failure, obligation, tendency*

Hyland (2005a, 2005b) also used the term *stance*. He proposes a more comprehensive and broader definition of the term. His definition subsumes the definitions mentioned above. That is, it includes the author's intrusion into the discourse (Crismore, 1984) and what Biber *et al.*, (1999) and Martin and White (2005) refer to writers' feelings, attitudes, or judgement. Moreover, it includes what some writers call writer visibility (McCrostie, 2008), writer identity (Dobakhti

& Hassan, 2017; Fazilatfar & Naseri, 2014; Ouellette, 2008; Wu & Buripakdi, 2021), or authorial voice (Cheung & Lau, 2020; Ivanič & Camps, 2001; Kapranov, 2021), which means the use of self-reference or self-mention words to claim the writer's authority or identity (Pho, 2013). Furthermore, Hyland's first two categories of stance components, shown in the following paragraph, parallel Thompson and Hunston's (2000) *certainty* and *likelihood* parameter and the third category corresponds to the *desirability/goodness*, *obviousness/expectedness*, and *importance/relevance* parameters (Pho, 2013). In this study, the term *stance* is adopted and the definition of stance is also based on Hyland's definition. According to Hyland (2005b), stance refers to an:

> attitudinal dimension and includes features which refer to the ways writers present themselves and convey their judgments, opinions, and commitments. It is the ways that writers intrude to stamp their personal authority onto their arguments or step back and disguise their involvement. (p. 176)

Hyland developed his framework from academic texts by investigating 240 research articles across eight disciplines and informant interviews. From his perspective, three major components should be taken into account in the concept of stance. These are evidentiality, affect, and presence*. Evidentiality* means the way writers express their commitment to the "reliability of propositions" they present as well as "their potential impact on the reader" (Hyland, 2005b, p.178). *Affect* refers to the way writers express their personal or professional attitudes towards their statements as well as emotions, perspectives, and beliefs. *Presence* is concerned with the degree to which writers' project themselves into the text. Thus, his stance framework consists of four elements:

1. Hedge, linguistic devices such as *possible*, *may*, *might,* and *perhaps* which refuse to give complete commitment to a proposition.
2. Boosters, linguistic devices such as *definitely*, *demonstrate*, *clearly*, and *obviously* which allow writers to convey their certainty in their statement and to mark engagement with the topic and solidarity with their audience.
3. Attitude markers, linguistic devices such as *agree, remarkable, important,* and *unfortunately* which show the writer's affective, rather than epistemic, attitude to propositions, conveying surprise, importance, frustration, and so on, rather than commitment.

4. Self-mention, the use of first-person pronouns and possessive adjectives such as *I, we,* and *our* to express propositional, affective, and interpersonal information

(Summarized from Hyland, 2005b, p. 178–181)

Hyland also noted that both hedges and boosters can be used to balance objective information, and subjective evaluation, resulting in “a powerful factor in gaining acceptance for claims” (p. 180). The analysis of the authorial stance in this study will be based on Hyland’s (2005a) framework.

2.2.5 Rationale for choosing Hyland’s theoretical framework as an analytical framework

There are a number of reasons why Hyland’s (2005a) framework is chosen as an analytical framework for the analysis of authorial stance in this study. Firstly, the model offers a wider range of stance markers, compared to the frameworks discussed above. It has been suggested that to be effective and convincing, a variety of linguistic features should be employed to convey an authorial stance (Chang, 2016). Secondly, Hyland’s framework is more comprehensive and integrated. Apart from a greater range of linguistic features in hedges, boosters, and attitude markers, the features of explicit authorial presence, the use of first-person pronouns and possessive determiners which previous frameworks failed to incorporate are provided. Finally, the framework is developed from academic writing, based on an analysis of published research articles and informant interviews. Thus, typical features of scholarly writing can be established. By contrast, most previous work on evaluation and stance focused on public genres, journalism, politics, and media discourse, allowing writers to position themselves more freely than in academic genres (Hyland, 2005b). I, therefore, would argue that to investigate stance markers in research articles, giving rise to a framework based on academic writing itself, should be employed.

This section has discussed significant frameworks, which are widely used to examine authorial stance. It has also discussed concepts, limitations of those frameworks, and reasons why Hyland's (2005a) framework is adopted as an analytical framework in this study. The paper moves on to discuss contrastive text linguistic studies, specific to a study of metadiscourse.

2.3 Contrastive text linguistic studies

Text linguistics is described as “written discourse analysis, and analysis of texts that goes beyond the sentence level” (Connor, 1996, p. 19). The major aims of contrastive text linguistic studies are to investigate and look for differences and similarities in how text is formed and interpreted in different languages and cultures using approaches of written discourse analysis (Connor, 2002). A number of text linguistic studies have been carried out looking at contrasted coherence and discourse patterns of several kinds in different languages (e.g., Hinds, 1983, 1990; Connor and Kaplan, 1987). According to Connor (1996), studies of contrastive text linguistics can be classified into three major categories, namely paragraph development (e.g., Bickner and Peyasantiwong, 1988), discourse development (e.g., Indrasuta, 1988; Hinds, 1990), and metadiscourse (e.g., Crismore, Markkanen and Steffensen, 1993). As this study investigates, how writers express their personal attitudes, feelings, and judgements, and position themselves throughout the research articles, the study of metadiscourse, conducted by Crismore, Markkanen and Steffensen, (1993) is relevant.

Crismore, Markkanen and Steffensen (1993) investigated metadiscourse strategies in persuasive essays written by Finnish and American undergraduate students. In this ground-breaking study, the use of metadiscourse features, allowing writers to show their personal feeling and attitude and to interact with the readers, was compared. Building on Vande Kopple's (1985, 1986) framework, Crismore, Markkanen and Steffensen (1993) proposed two categories of metadiscourse, namely textual metadiscourse and interpersonal metadiscourse. The findings revealed that the persuasive essays written by both groups of student writers contained both textual and interpersonal metadiscourse, with a higher degree of use of interpersonal metadiscourse. Specific to the use of interpersonal metadiscourse, the Finnish students took hedging the propositional content and showing their attitudes towards it into consideration more significantly than the American students. That is, the American students considered showing “certainty and attributing ideas to sources more important than the Finnish students” (Crismore et al., 1993, p. 63).

In the present study, emphasis is on interpersonal metadiscourse, a summary of this feature is provided in Table 2.1, section 2.2.2. Several studies have shown

that there is a higher degree of use of hedging markers in research articles written by L1 writers than in those written by L2 writers (e.g., Behnam, Mirzapour, & Mozaheb, 2014; Mur Dueñas, 2011; Yang, 2013). This finding is contrary to that of Crismore, Markkanen and Steffensen (1993). Although the analysed texts in this study are different academic genres from those of Crismore, Markkanen and Steffensen (1993), it is still interesting to see if Thai and non-Thai writers demonstrate similar tendencies in the use of certainty and hedging markers in this study.

This section has attempted to provide a summary of contrastive text linguistics, regarding interpersonal metadiscourse. Now I will turn to academic discourse.

2.4. Academic discourse

It is important to understand the term *academic discourse* and its importance in education. According to Hyland (2009a, p. 1), *academic discourse* is described as "the ways of thinking and using language which exist in the academy". Due to the fact that complicated social activities, such as educating students, constructing knowledge, and circulating ideas, need language to achieve its goal (Hyland, 2009a), academic discourse is vital for education. It is significant for both universities and individuals. Hyland (2009a) asserts that academic discourse not only enables universities to continue teaching and conducting research but also construct social roles and relationships which help maintain the educational institutions, the disciplines and the creation of knowledge itself. For individuals, they need language to write, address problems and gain insight into issues in particular ways, according to their particular social groups. For these functional reasons, we may conclude that academic discourse is the basis of university activities.

There has been an increase in research in academic discourse in the last few decades (e.g., Biber, 2006; Biber et al., 1999; Cheung & Lau, 2020; Crismore, 1984; Crismore et al., 1993; Hyland, 2004b; Morton & Storch, 2019; Swales, 1990, 2004; Thompson, 2012; Wu & Buripakdi, 2021). These studies have analysed both qualitative and quantitative dimensions in written and spoken texts. One of the main reasons why academic discourse has recently become such a developing research area is the emergence of English as the international lingua

franca of research and scholarship (Hyland, 2009a). This results in an increase in English medium publications, and this growth is occurring in both contexts where English is used as an official language and where English is used as a foreign language. Between 2005 and 2010, submissions to the English journals in the U.S. and Japan increased by 177% and 127% respectively (Hyland, 2016). It is apparent that academics across the world are now compelled to publish in English, as it helps increase career opportunities and promotion.

According to Hyland (2009a), there are three broad approaches employed in the study of academic discourse, namely textual, contextual and critical approaches. Textual approaches deal with language choices, meanings, and patterns in texts including genre corpora and multimodal analyses. Contextual approaches are concerned with wider situational aspects, such as the sociology of science, ethnography, and sociohistorical viewpoints. Critical approaches involve an attitude of criticality, such as *Critical Discourse Analysis* and *Academic Literacies*. Because this study investigates research articles in terms of stance markers, textual approaches will be discussed in the following section.

2.4.1 Textual approaches

There is a connection between text and discourse. Kress (1989) argues that the meanings of texts lie in the meanings of discourse, as texts are regarded as material forms of language and give material realization to discourse. Text can be “seen as a spoken or written examples of systems of the general communicative resources which are available to a particular community” (Hyland, 2009a, p. 25). Hyland (2009a, p.2) posits that discourse is the essence of “academic enterprise"; it refers to “the way that individuals collaborate and compete with others, to create knowledge, to educate neophytes, to reveal learning and define academic allegiances”. The objective of describing academic discourse is to include both language and context in analyses to display how individuals use language to structure and express their ideas, communities, and identities. To achieve this goal, the analyses in textual approaches are classified into three broad groups: genre analysis, corpus analysis and multimodal analysis.

2.4.2 Genre analysis

Due to an increase in interest in writing in English for several purposes, and in many contexts for ESL learners, genre studies have been paid more attention (Connor, 1996). Genre analysis includes the context, in a broader sense, by considering not only the way the text is composed but also the way it is often interpreted, employed, and exploited in particular institutional or more narrowly professional contexts to accomplish specific disciplinary objectives (Bhatia, 2004). According to Hyon (1996), genre analysis is influenced by three distinctive approaches: New Rhetoric (NR), Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), and English for Specific Purposes (ESP). Before discussing them in more details, the concept of the genre will be elucidated. The concept of genre is considered to be “fuzzy” (Swales, 1990, P. 33), as it can be understood in different ways (Cope & Kalantzis, 1993; Hyon, 1996). For instance, from the view of systemic functional framework, Martin et al. (1987, p. 59) interpreted genre as “a staged, goal oriented social process”, while for New Rhetoric perspective, Miller (1984) viewed genre as a social action. In the area of English for Specific Purpose, Swales’ (1990) definition, developed for pedagogical purposes in ESP, is “best known" (Connor, 1996, p. 126) and “extremely influential” (Paltridge, 2013, p. 347). As the current research is carried out in the area of ESP, the concept of genre in this research is based on Swales' (1990) definition. According to Swales, genre refers to:

> A class of communicative events, the members of which share some set of communicative purposes. These purposes are recognized by the expert members of the parent discourse community, and thereby constitute the rationale for the genre. This rationale shapes the schematic structure of the discourse and influences and constrains choice of content and style. (p. 58)

Swales focuses on the communicative purpose of discourse, which he asserts is a vital factor in identifying genre categories. Another significant concept in Swales’ definition is discourse community, which is described as “sociorhetorical networks that form in order to work towards sets of common goals” (Swales, 1990, p.9). Therefore, the style of writing will vary according to communicative purpose and discourse community to which writers belong. It should be noted that communicative purpose can change, expand or shrink over time (Swales, 2004).

Genre analysis can be conducted using both qualitative and quantitative analyses. That is researchers are able to investigate the actions of individuals as they generate particular texts, or investigate the distribution of various features of genres to identify patterns across texts (Hyland, 2009a). The former places an emphasis on the decisions of particular writers, whereas the latter pays attention to collections of rhetorical choices rather than specific encounters. The following section accounts for the three approaches in genre analysis.

2.4.2.1 The New Rhetoric (NR) approach

The NR approach is an alternative approach used in studies in genre analysis. Initiated by Miller (1984, p.163), the genre is described as "a conventional category of discourse based in large-scale typification of rhetorical action; as action, it acquires meaning from its situation and from the social context in which that situation arose". The NR approach is concerned more with "socio-contextual aspects of the genre and the action a particular genre aims to accomplish, as well as how these aspects might change through time" than with "formal characteristics of the texts in isolation" (Paltridge, 1997, p. 16). Therefore, this approach is more appropriate for studies of genres grounded on a social or sociolinguistic perspective, such as Bazerman (1988) and Bizzell (1992) than those grounded on a linguistic perspective, such as Flowerdew (2002) and Hyland (2002b). With regard to methodologies, researchers in the NR tend to utilize ethnographic rather than linguistic methods for analysing texts (Hyon, 1996). However, linguistic features are still studied in the NR approach but they are not the primary focus of studies in that tradition (Pho, 2013). Despite providing a rich description of the genre, the NR approach seems inappropriate for the current study because the major aim of this study is to investigate linguistic features in research articles; the attention is given to the text itself as the final product rather than the process of writing or reasons behind the use of certain linguistic features. Another reason why the NR approach is not suitable for this study is that the approach places an emphasis on composition studies and professional writing in an L1 context (Flowerdew, 2005), but this study largely involves academic writing in an L2 context.

2.4.2.2 The Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) approach

One of the most well-known approaches for genre analysis is the SFL approach. Although it was proposed by M.A.K. Halliday, the theory was connected to genre analysis by Ruqaiya Hasan and Jim Martin (Pho, 2013). Based on Halliday's (1978) model of social context, Hasan and Martin developed frameworks for genre analysis with the analysis of *field* (what is going on), *tenor* (what is the relationship between the participants), and *mode* (what is the method of communication, such as spoken or written). Hasan (1985) proposed the term *generic structure potential*, which is described as a set of obligatory and optional elements in texts, while Martin (1985) offered the term *schematic structure*, which is described as various segments of text. This approach has highlighted the significance of the social purposes of genres and of explaining the rhetorical structures that have developed to serve these purposes, and is concerned with language and literacy education, specifically in the contexts of primary and secondary schools, and nonprofessional workplaces (Callaghan et al., 1993; Hyon, 1996). In the view of the SFL framework, the genre is seen as "a staged, oriented, purposeful activity in which speakers engage as members of our culture" (Martin, 1984, p. 25). To a certain extent, the SFL approach is similar to the NR approach in that it seeks to describe why writers write in a particular way, rather than what linguistic features are employed by writers to demonstrate their communicative purpose (Pho, 2013). For this reason, the SFL approach appears to be inappropriate for the current study.

With regard to objectives of studies in genre analysis, Hyland (2009b) asserts that researchers of genre analysis aim to (1) identify the structure of texts in terms of functional moves, (2) identify the features which characterise texts and help grasp their objectives, (3) examine the understanding of both writers and readers of the genre, (4) uncover the way the genre associates with users' activities, (5) elucidate language choices in relation to social, psychological and cultural contexts, and (6) offer understandings of teaching language.

2.4.2.3 English for Specific Purposes (ESP) approach

The primary focus of the ESP approach is on an analysis of the structural patterns of texts, representing the writer's communicative purposes (Pho, 2013), an analysis of which has been widely conducted in both academic and professional genres (e.g., Amnuai, 2017; Badger, 2003; Bhatia, 1993; Jenkins & Hinds, 1987;

Kurniawan & Sabila, 2021; Posteguillo, 1999; Swales, 1990; Vathanalaoha & Tangkiengsirisin, 2018). The genre includes research articles, business reports, letters of application, grant proposals and editorials (Connor, 2002). However, only the academic genre, specific to research articles will be discussed in the following section because it is the focus of the present study. What follows is an account of Swales' genre analysis. In the current study, Swales' (2004) model is adopted to analyse the rhetorical structures in the Introduction of the research articles.

The ESP approach seems to be the most widely used approach in the studies of genre analysis. It focuses on a context of Non-Native English Speaking (NNS) or L2 writing (Flowerdew, 2005). Initiated by Swales (1981), genre analysis of the ESP approach was developed in order to offer writing courses on the use of English in scientific research reports to non-native English speakers. This approach pays attention to both the social function and form of spoken and written language in academic and research settings, particularly research introductions and grant proposals (Flowerdew, 2005). As the major aim of this approach is to identify the structural patterns of texts, representing the writer's communicative purpose (Pho, 2013), it helps understand the characteristics of research articles (Basthomi, 2007; Connor, 1996). Swales (1990) proposed the *CARS* (Create a Research Space) model for studying the Introduction section of research articles through the notion of Move structures. A Move refers to "segments of text according to their prototypical communicative propose for a particular genre"; it is the key idea of the concept of genre in this approach (Flowerdew, 2005, p. 322). The model contains three major Moves: Move 1 *establishing a territory*, Move 2 *establishing a niche,* and Move 3 *occupying a niche*. In Move 1, Swales suggests three strategies or steps that the author can use in order to establish a territory: claim centrality (step 1), make a generalization (step 2) and cite previous studies (step 3). In Move 2, the writer has four options or strategies to establish a niche: counter-claiming (step 1A), indicating a gap (step 1B), raising a question (step 1C), and continuing a tradition (Step 1D). In Move 3, the author is able to occupy a niche by either outlining the purposes (step 1A) or announcing the present study (step 1B); announcing major findings (step 2); or indicating the structure of the article (step 3). The *CARS* model has been extensively applied to examine the discourse structure of research articles in various disciplines, but

many researchers, such as Holmes (1997) and Samraj (2002b) have highlighted variations across disciplines, resulting in nonconformity to the model. As a result, Swales (2004) revised the original *CARS* model to cope with the weaknesses reported by those studies, as in Table 2.5.

Table 2.5: Swales' revised *CARS* model for the Introduction section (Swales, 2004, p. 230,232)

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: Presenting positive justification (optional)
Move 3: Presenting the present work via
Step 1: Announcing present research descriptively and/or purposively (obligatory)
Step 2: Presenting research questions or hypotheses* (optional)
Step 3: Definitional clarifications (optional)*
Step 4: Summarizing methods (optional)*
Step 5: Announcing principal outcomes (PISF) **
Step 6: Stating the value of the present research (PISF) **
Step 7: Outlining of the structure of the paper (PISF) **
* Optional and less fixed in order

**Probable in some academic disciplines (PISF)

***Possible cyclical patterning of Moves particularly in longer Introductions

Swales (2004) revisited the previous model in a number of ways. Firstly, in Move 1, Step 1 and Step 2 were reduced to a single step (topic generalizations of increasing specificity). Secondly, in Move 2, all previous steps (Step 1A-1D) were reduced to Step 1A (indicating a gap), 1B (adding to what is known, and a new optional Step 2 (presenting positive justification was incorporated). Finally, in Move 3, the writer can occupy the niche or present the present work through seven possible steps, as opposed to the three steps in the previous model. In this expanded version, there is merely one obligatory Step 1 (announcing present research descriptively and/or purposively). Moreover, three new optional steps, namely Step 2 (presenting research questions or hypotheses), Step 3 (definitional clarifications), and Step 4 (summarizing methods), as well as three "*PISF* (probably in some field)" steps, are added (Swales, 2004, p. 232). The three PISF steps are as follows: Step 5 (announcing principal outcomes), Step 6 (stating the value of the present research) and Step 7 (outlining the structure of the paper).

Swales' (1990, 2004) Move analysis is one of the most influential approaches to illuminate not only the components of the Introduction section but also other sections of a journal article (Kanoksilapatham, 2007b; Pho, 2013), such as the Discussion section (Hopkins & Dudley-Evans, 1988), Abstract (Samraj, 2002a), Results section (Brett, 1994), Conclusions section (Yang & Allison, 2003), and complete research articles (Nwogu, 1997; Posteguillo, 1999). Swales' (2004) approach is adopted as an analytical framework in the present study for two main reasons. Firstly, this study aims to examine the structural patterns of research articles, which is the main aim of the approach. Secondly, as the research articles analyzed in this study are mostly written by Thai writers and writers of different nationalities, the focus of this study is on the L2 context, the same focus. The following paragraphs will review contrastive studies of rhetorical structures in

research articles written in Thai and English by Thai research writers, compared to L1 English research articles. These studies are based on Swales' model.

Jogthong, (2001) investigated forty research article introductions written in Thai by Thai writers in educational and medical journals. Based on Swales' (1990) *CARS* model, the findings revealed that overall, the structure of research article introductions in Thai journals fit the *CARS* model but specific steps in the introductions are inconsistent with the model. To illustrate, regarding the reviewing items of previous studies, Thai research writers were less likely to evaluate the work of others; they merely summarised it. Thai writers did not indicate the results of their research and the research structure in the Introduction section. Jogthong (2001) noted that several factors, such as Thai culture, cultural linguistic aspects, a local discourse community, and local research environments contributed to those discrepancies. In comparison between the two disciplines, the study showed the use of similar strategies.

Employing Swales' (2004) model, Kanoksilapatham (2007) compared Move structures between Thai and English in biochemistry research articles. The study demonstrated that there were distinct variations to a certain extent because of several factors, such as the close-knit nature of Thai research communities, reflecting the size and expectations of the community members, and the specific characteristics of Thai community members. Similar to Jogthong's (2001) study, Kanoksilapatham reported that Thai writers preferred to state the implications of the study rather than to report findings in the Introduction section. In terms of commenting on previous studies, there was no instance of negative evaluation of previous studies in Thai articles. On the other hand, English articles pointed out the weaknesses of previous studies.

Similarly, Wannaruk and Amnuai (2016), compared the rhetorical Moves of 60 English research articles in Applied Linguistics written by Thai writers and published in national Thai journals with those published in international journals, regardless of nationalities. Based on Swales' (2004) framework for analysing Introduction, Peacock's (2011) framework for the Methods section, and Ruiying and Allison's (2003) model for the Results and Discussion section, the study demonstrated that although the two corpora were quite similar in terms of the

frequency of rhetorical Move occurrences, there were some differences in terms of establishing gaps in research and gaining credibility for data analysis. Thai writers did not announce principal outcomes and did not comment on other research studies in the Introduction. These findings are consistent with those of Jogthong (2001) and Kanoksilapatham (2007). They claimed that socio-cultural aspects, expectations, and the perceived creativity of the writers may result in these differences.

Although the studies reveal that there are some differences between Thai and English writing in the rhetorical structures of the research articles, particularly in terms of commenting on previous studies and announcing the principal results of research, it is noticeable that they do not cover the aspect of authorial stance, which is an important feature in an academic text (Chang & Schleppegrell, 2011; Hyland, 2002a; Neff et al., 2004). In order to gain a better understanding of the research article genre, I would argue that a study should analyse both the structure of the text and linguistic features of the authorial stance together. It is expected that the combination of both approaches will enable us to comprehend academic discourse more accurately and more profoundly. In addition, the present study will examine whether Thai research writers downplay their negative comments on previous studies, and announcement of the research findings in the Introductions, as found in the above studies.

As this study analyses the rhetorical structure of the whole research articles, ranging from the Abstract to the Discussion-Conclusions section, Swales' (2004) Move structure is used to examine the rhetorical structure in the Introduction sections of research articles. The other sections of research articles are investigated based on Pho's (2013) model. Pho (2013) developed the model from previous studies of the Abstract and various sections of the main research articles, such as Santos (1996), Kanoksilapatham (2003), Swales (2004), and Lim (2006). Details of Pho's (2013) model are in Figure 2.1.

Figure 2.1: Pho's (2013) model of Move structures of the Abstract and the main research article

Abstract

Move 1: Situating the research

Move 2: Presenting the research

Move 3: Describing the methodology

Move 4: Summarizing the findings

Move 5: Discussing the research

Introduction

Move 6: Establishing a territory

- Step 1: Summarizing existing studies
- Step 2: Drawing inferences from previous studies
- Step 3: Raising questions/Generating preliminary hypotheses
- Step 4: Referring to context of present study
- Step 5: Foreshadowing aim of present study
- Step 6: Outlining structure of the section

Move 7: Establishing a niche

- Step 1: Indicating a gap
- Step 2: Explaining reason for gap
- Step 3: Presenting positive justification

Move 8: Presenting the present work

- Step1: Indicating a gap
- Step 2: Presenting research questions or hypotheses
- Step 3: Defining terms
- Step 4: Summarizing methods
- Step 5: Announcing principal outcomes
- Step 6: Stating the value of the present research
- Step 7: Outlining the structure of the paper

Methods

Move 9: Describing the data and data collection procedure

Step 1: Describing the sample

Step 2: Describing research instruments

Step 3: Recounting steps in data collection

Step 4: Justifying the data collection procedure.

Move 10: Describing the data analysis procedure

Step 1: Recounting data analysis procedure

Step 2: Justifying the data analysis procedure

Results

Move 11: Preparing for the presentation of the Results section

Step 1: (Re)stating data collection and analysis procedure

Step 2: Restating research questions or hypotheses

Step 3: Giving background knowledge

Step 4: Indicating structure of the section

Move 12: Reporting specific/individual results

Move 13: Commenting on specific results

Step 1: Interpreting results

Step 2: Comparing results with literature

Step 3: Accounting for results

Step 4: Evaluating results

Move 14: Summarizing results

Discussion-Conclusions

Move 15: Preparing for the presentation of the Discussion section

Step 1: (Re)stating data collection and analysis procedure

Step 2: Restating research questions or hypotheses

Step 3: Giving background knowledge

Step 4: Indicating structure of the section

Move 16: Summarizing the study

Move 17: Highlighting overall research outcome

Move 18: Discussing the findings of the study

Step 1: Interpreting/discussing results

Step 2: Comparing results with literature

Step 3: Accounting for results

Move 19: Drawing conclusions of the study/stating research conclusion

Move 20: Evaluating the study

Step 1: Indicating limitations

Step 2: Indicating significance

Move 21: Deductions from the research

Step 1: Making suggestions/drawing implications

Step 2: Recommending further research

Pho's (2013) model is appropriate for analysing the other sections of the research article, namely the Abstract, Methods, Results, and Discussion because the model was developed from the analysis of all sections of the research articles, ranging from the Abstract to the Discussion-Conclusions sections from two different fields in social sciences: applied linguistics and education technology.

Overall, genre analysis helps us understand how language is used in a particular context. It is a major approach to analysing texts.

2.4.3 Corpus analysis

An alternative schema for the textual approach is using corpus analysis. It has been employed to add a quantitative dimension to research in discourse analysis. It refers to “the study of language based on real life language use” (McEnery & Wilson, 2001, p. 1). In corpus analysis, statistical techniques are used to identify

a pattern in the data being analysed (Cameron & Panović, 2014), enabling researchers to explain what is usual rather than what is grammatically possible and helping to suggest explanations for why language is employed as it is, in academic domains and genres (Hyland, 2009a). A corpus refers to a collection of texts (McEnery & Wilson, 2001). It provides evidence of language in use, demanded in most linguistic research (Tognini-Bonelli, 2001), as well as a new understanding of familiar, "but maybe unnoticed, features of language use" (Hyland, 2006, p. 58).

A corpus-based approach is also an ideal approach for studying the linguistic features of academic discourse (Gilquin, Granger, & Paquot, 2007; Hyland, 2006) because a corpus reveals most typical words, phrases, and structures of the genre and how those features are employed (Gilquin et al., 2007). Learners would then be able to learn to use them more effectively. In addition, Conrad (1996, p. 299) insists that by encompassing a corpus-based technique in her investigation, the findings reveal the "complex relationships existing among academic texts, providing multiple perspectives on differences and similarities in language use" that other approaches cannot offer.

Due to the fact that corpus studies utilize evidence of frequency and association for interpretation, frequency is an important idea in corpus studies. Hyland (2009a) points out that a word or grammatical pattern occurring frequently in a particular genre can elucidate how a genre is usually constructed by users. For instance, Coxhead (2000) demonstrated that a list of 570-word families makes up approximately 10 per cent of running words in academic texts, whereas it is relatively rare in other types of texts, such as fiction. For example, it would not be uncommon for academic readers including university students to meet words, such as *analyse*, *concept,* and *data*. It should be noted that these semi-technical words are not equally dispersed across the academic register (Hyland, 2009a). Using electronic corpora, researchers have been able to gain more insight into the frequencies of grammatical categories, such as part of speech codes or socio-cultural characteristics of speakers. For example, Biber (1988) reveals how bundles of grammatical features, such as frequent nouns, prepositional phrases, and attributive adjectives are used in academic prose.

Furthermore, a qualitative dimension could be added to corpus studies to provide a better grasp of the use of language. By analysing the way features connect with each other in collocational patterns, researchers are able to reveal patterns in the "surrounding co-text', giving clues to 'the use of target words" (Hyland, 2009a, p. 29). This analysis enables researchers to illuminate certain patterns, which Stubbs (2001) called semantic preferences. To illustrate, the adjective *massive* is employed in science writing with a meaning of "large in mass", modifying nouns, such as *black hole*, *star,* and *planet*. On the other hand, it is used to convey the meaning of "very big" in journalism, modifying words, such as *profits*, *gamble*, *boost* and *blow* (Lee, 1999 cited in Hunston, 2002, p. 162).

In summary, a benefit of corpus analysis is that it enables analysts to uncover unseen patterns and minimize the influence of personal bias in research. To provide a fuller picture of academic discourse, qualitative analysis is included in the research.

2.4.4 Multimodal analysis

The multimodal analysis is another approach for text analysis. From multimodal analysts' perspective, such as Blommaert (2005), Kress (1997), and Kress & Leeuwen (1996) discourse should not be restricted to solely linguistic forms of representation but meaningful semiotic activity should be incorporated as well. In other words, researchers, who are in favour of this perspective, view that visuals are as significant as verbal elements in academic genres. They focus on the particular ways of configuring the world that various modes offer and consequent shifts in authority, forms of meaning, and forms of human engagement with the social and natural world (Kress, 2003). Kress (2003) also contends that writing and image are ruled by different logics; that is, writing is governed by time, and the image is governed by space. Thus, in writing, meaning is adhered to being first and last in a sentence, whereas for a visual, the position is significant. To illustrate, placing something in the centre gives it a different significance from placing it at the edge; placing something above makes it superior to what is below. In recent years multimodal analysis has been adopted in a wide range of genres from advertisements to journalism, including research and education.

In relation to academic written texts, such as textbooks and articles, they are becoming increasingly multimodal. At present, we can see that tables, figures, and photographs are increasingly incorporated in research articles in science, while providing coloured maps, photographs and graphical representation in textbooks represents an objective world and introduces disciplinary ways of viewing (Hyland, 2009a).

In this study, two approaches, namely genre analysis and corpus analysis are employed. With regard to genre analysis, the study will compare the structure of tourism research articles written in English and published in journals in the Thai database with research articles in international journals in the same discipline, based on Swales' (2004) Move model. Simultaneously, a corpus-based approach will be used to examine the statistical frequency of stance markers and patterns of use of those stance features in research articles. The next section will review the discourse of research articles.

2.5 Research article discourse

Research articles (RA) are crucial to academia as staff in universities around the world are now required to publish in major, high-impact, peer-reviewed journals. In the following sections, I will present the main characteristics of research article discourse. According to Hyland (2009a), there are three major characteristics of research article discourse: review and revision, novelty and relevance, and stance and engagement.

2.5.1 Review and revision

One distinctive characteristic of the RA is that it is the result of a lengthened, and often complicated, writing and peer-review process. That is, to be published, a text develops gradually through several drafts with the involvement of colleagues, language specialists, proofreaders, reviewers and editors (Hyland, 2009a). Although this frustrates authors, it is beneficial to the final polished text, shaped to the cognitive and rhetorical frameworks of a disciplinary community. Hyland notes that the process not only helps writers meet the standard quality of published research but also functions as a tool of community control, controlling appropriate topics, methodologies, and the boundaries within which they can be

negotiated. This is a significant learning experience for newcomers to a discipline on the path to become full members of the discipline.

Writing for publication poses a challenge for academics, especially novice writers and non-native English scholars. This is evident in rejection rates of over 90 per cent in journals in some fields (Hyland, 2009a). Hyland points out that one of the major causes of difficulty for novice writers is their isolation from existing literature and the requirement that they locate their work in a rhetorical tradition, while lack of language abilities is considered a major problem for non-native English scholars. In addition, in an investigation into problems in writing for scholarly publication in English, Flowerdew (1999) reported that half of 585 Hong Kong scholars felt at a disadvantage compared to native English speakers.

Several studies have suggested that writing for publication is a laborious task for novice non-native English speakers. That is, extra time, patience, and effort are required to publish an article. For example, Li (2006) showed that before the paper was accepted, a Chinese Doctoral student had written six drafts and gone through several resubmissions according to supervisors, a journal editor, and reviewers' comments. Another example is a study carried out by Gosden (1996). The study demonstrated that nearly half of the Japanese postgraduate students in the study revised their texts several times; according to reviewers' feedback, over 320 changes were made from the first draft until the text was published. However, Gosden viewed these changes as the development of mature writing.

To conclude, it is clear that participation in the publication process helps novice writers reinforce the knowledge required when learning to conform to the practices of a discipline. Having to write to meet the needs of two major groups of readers: the journal gatekeepers and the community of scholars enables the writers to learn the norm and conventions of the discipline. The journal gatekeepers will make a decision on whether the paper is ready for publication, whereas the community of scholars will read the finished paper and hopefully use it in their research (Hyland, 2009a).

2.5.2 Novelty and relevance

Another feature of an RA is that it has to persuade readers to read on by demonstrating that they have both something new and valuable to cite. Hyland

(2009a) suggests that to be new, work must recognize the knowledge which has been accepted and against which it makes a claim for revolution. Thus, novelty admits what has gone before and builds on the field's organisational structures, beliefs, and current hot topics. Hyland argues that choosing a topic and arguing for its novelty and relevance is necessary for securing colleagues' interest and exhibiting membership credentials.

To convince readers that an RA is worthwhile, there are certain strategies. The marketing of an RA starts with the abstract where writers emphasize the importance and draw readers into the paper. It should be noted that there are disciplinary differences at this stage (Hyland, 2004a). Abstracts in hard science, such as Biology, Physics, and Electrical Engineering, are likely to place an emphasis on novelty and benefit. By contrast, abstracts in social science, such as Sociology, Marketing, and Linguistics, tend to focus on the notion of significance to promote their work. A great deal of rhetorical effort can be found in the Introduction of an RA where writers seek to construct a research space to justify the significance of their work. With regard to a model of RA Introductions, Swales' (1990) model seems to be the ascendant. To succeed in attracting readers, Introductions have to foreground what is already known, then establish an opening for the current work by demonstrating that this prior knowledge is relatively incomplete, as shown in the following example:

> Research into public drinking in natural settings has been conducted for many decades since the early observational study of a public house in an English industrial town (Mass Observation: 1943). However, few studies have focused specifically on violence (Hyland, 2009a, pp. 71–72).

In relation to claims for novelty, they are gathered by reference to what social communities know and what they believe is worth knowing. This is more attentively extended in the Literature Review, seeking to explain the value of the current study and demonstrate why it is distinct from previous studies (Kwan, 2006). In this process, writers create a story for their research, which persuades the readers that some organizing principle associates their research with a coherent chain of disciplinary activity. In the same way, the Results of the study play a crucial role in persuading the reader by promoting the value of the research through a series of rhetorical Moves, which are designed to justify the methodology and evaluate the results. This is exemplified in the work undertaken

by Ruiying and Allison (2003), who investigated rhetorical choices in the Results, Results and Discussion, Discussion, Conclusion, and Pedagogic Implications sections in research articles in Applied Linguistics. With regard to the Methods section, it is presented in a way that can challenge noticeable replication in order to be taken on trust, as in the following example in Physics RA:

> Each FID was baseline corrected and apodized with a 750-Hz exponential before being Fourier transformed. In order to perform the curve fitting, the spectra were fitted with a Caussian lineshape, and the peak intensity was recorded. The spectral processing and analysis were performed with the routines of NMRI. The curve fitting was performed using the Levenberg-Marquardt method (Hyland, 2009a, p. 72).

In the Discussion section, treated as background, previous studies are introduced to compare, support, or invigorate the new claim with opposition because the writers ward off counterclaims to praise the new claim (Lewin, Fine, & Young, 2001). The use of argumentation, personal involvement, and evaluative commentary tends to be found in Discussions. Gosden (1993) posited that themes in Discussion sections show the writer's effort to persuade readers by having a great number of interpersonal themes realized by mood and comment adjuncts. For instance, "it is thus clear that the formation of central bursting in the extrusion process is controlled by the growth of voids" (Hyland, 2009a, p. 73).

In conclusion, authors are able to persuade readers by claiming novelty and relevance through structures. These structures enable an author to emphasise authority and evaluations in support of their arguments by moving from a relatively low degree of interpersonal engagement in earlier stages of the text to a higher degree of writer intervention in Discussions (Hyland, 2009a).

2.5.3 Stance and engagement

To succeed in academic persuasion, writers should embrace elements than other establishing claims for novelty and relevance. Hyland (2005b, 2009a) suggests that establishing claims for novelty and relevance is only a part of successful academic persuasion; writers should provide readers with a credible representation of themselves and their work by claiming solidarity with readers, assessing their material, and accepting alternative views in appropriate ways. These interactions are achieved in academic writing through the systems of stance and engagement (Hyland, 2005b). Stance refers to "the writer's textual

voice or community recognized personality" (Hyland, 2009a, p. 74). It deals with the ways writers present themselves and express their judgements, viewpoints, and commitments. Engagement refers to rhetorical strategies that writers use to recognise "the presence of their readers to actively pull them along with the argument, incorporate them as discourse participants, and guide them to interpretations" (Hyland, 2005b, p. 176). As the rhetorical resources employed to convey stance are explained in the previous section (2.2.4), this section will review only the engagement features. According to Hyland (2005a, 2009a), there are five major elements in the engagement framework, namely reader pronouns, personal asides, appeals to shared knowledge, directives and questions.

Reader pronouns are probably the most explicit way that writers use to bring readers into a discourse. However, it should be noted that *you* and *your* are rarely to be found in research articles. This may be that they imply a separation between members of the discourse community. Instead, there is a high use of the inclusive *we* identifying both the writer and the reader as members of the same discipline, who share similar understanding and goals. In addition to expressing peer solidarity, these devices are also employed to introduce a dialogue, by integrating the potential viewpoint of the readers into the discourse, thereby expecting readers' disagreement, revealing their views, and voicing their concerns. For instance:

> Although *we* lack knowledge about a definitive biological function for the transcripts from the 93D locus, their sequences provide us with an ideal system to identify a specific transcriptionally active site in embryonic nuclei (Hyland, 2005b, p. 183).

Personal asides enable authors to address readers directly by momentarily interrupting the argument to provide a comment on what has been said. By interacting with the reader in the mid-flow, the author acknowledges and responds to an active audience, often to begin a brief discussion that is mostly interpersonal. Those comments reinforce the write-reader relationship rather than propositional development, as in the following example: "And - as I believe many TESOL professionals will readily acknowledge - critical thinking has now begun to make its mark, particularly in the area of L2 composition" (Hyland, 2005b, p. 183).

Appeals to share knowledge are signalled by explicit markers where readers are asked to recognize something as familiar or accepted. These solidarity constructions ask readers to identify with particular points of view. In doing so, readers are assigned a role in building the argument and acknowledging their contribution. In this way, the author is able to shape the role of the reader by moving the focus of the discourse away from the writer. For example, "this tendency obviously reflects the preponderance of brand-image advertising in fashion merchandizing" (e.g., Hyland, 2005b, p. 184).

Directives are mainly conveyed through the use of imperatives (e.g., note, consider, imagine), obligation modals (e.g., should, must, ought), and a predicative adjective showing the author's judgement of necessity/importance (e.g., it is important to understand…). They are used to direct readers to participate in three major types of activities: textual acts, physical acts, and cognitive acts. Textual acts are used to guide readers to another section of the text or to another text (e.g., see Swales 1990). Physical acts are employed to guide readers how to perform some action in the real-world (e.g., switch on the power). Cognitive acts are utilized to instruct readers how to interpret an argument, clearly positioning readers by encouraging them to note, concede or consider some argument or claim in the text. To illustrate, "It is important to note that these results do indeed warrant the view that…" (Hyland, 2005b, p. 185).

Questions are the strategy of dialogic involvement. They are used to invite engagement, encourage interest and bring "interlocutors into an arena where they can be led to the writer's viewpoint" (Hyland, 2002d, p. 530). This strategy also enables the writer to encourage the reader as an equal conversational partner to inspect an unresolved issue with the writer, share his or her interest and follow where the argument leads. Hyland suggests that this type of rhetorical positioning of readers is perhaps most noticeable when a question is posed and replied instantly. As a result, the dialogue is initiated and closed simultaneously. To illustrate, "Is it, in fact, necessary to choose between nurture and nature? My contention is that it is not" (Hyland, 2005b, p. 186).

Although expression of stance and engagement are vital features in academic writing, there are other factors that should be taken into account in successful academic writing. Hyland (2004a, p.1) posits that successful academic writing

relies on “the individual writer’s projection of a shared professional context”. That is, to achieve their personal and professional goals, it is necessary for writers to embed their writing in a particular social world which they reflect and produce through a particular approved discourse. This suggests that choices of rhetorical strategy including stance markers are partly influenced by the social practices of the writer’s academic discipline.

This section has attempted to provide a summary of the literature relating to academic discourse by reviewing textual approaches utilized in studies in academic discourse and the characteristics of research article discourse. The following is a review of writer-responsible versus reader-responsible languages.

2.6 Writer-responsible versus reader-responsible languages

Writer-responsible and reader-responsible languages are one of features of differences in L1 and L2 writing. The notion of writer and reader responsibilities is concerned with different expectations in terms of the degree of reader involvement in texts, and this level of involvement will be determined by the language of readers (Hinds, 1987). According to (Hinds, 1987, p. 143), English written discourse is the writer-responsible culture, in which the “person primarily responsible for effective communication is the writer”. In contrast, in some oriental writing such as Japanese, and traditional Chinese, it is the reader. In English texts, writers are responsible for making clear and well-organised statements, while in Japanese texts, it is the responsibility of the readers to understand the message the writer had intended to convey. Furthermore, Limbu, Xiangjuan, & Zeng (2013, p. 61) suggest that the culture of writer responsibility is likely to be connected to “individualistic social relationships, direct communication, deductive pattern, linear AB/BC syntax, connections between old and new information, as well as clear, concise, and concrete writing styles”. The culture of reader responsibility is associated with “collective social relationships, indirect communication, inductive rhetorical patterns, a non-linear AB/CD syntax, details and context, as well as a flowery, abstract, and ornate prose” (Limbu, Xiangjuan, & Zeng, 2013, p. 61). Reader-responsible language does not exist in only oriental writing, but is also displayed in texts written by other western L2 writers, such as German (Clyne, 1987) and Spanish (Valero-Garces, 1996).

A good example of a strategy that experienced writers employ to attain the clarity of English texts to help readers understand their arguments is the implementation of *metadiscourse markers* (Hyland, 2003). In English texts, when shifting from one idea to the next idea, writers need to provide readers with appropriate transitional expressions. By frequently establishing signals in the texts, readers can comprehend the logic of how the writer's ideas are connected to each other. *Metadiscourse markers* help the writer organise the text and comment on it by use of:

- sequencing points (e.g., first, next, last, finally)
- connecting ideas (e.g., however, thus, on the contrary, by contrast)
- showing what the writer is doing (e.g., to conclude, in summary, for instance)
- reviewing and previewing parts of the text (e.g., in the last section we…, here we will address…)
- commenting on content (e.g., you may not agree that…, it is surprising that…, it is interesting that …)

(Summarised from Hyland (2003, p. 48))

Previous research has shown that these features tend to be used more heavily by native English writers than writers from more reader-responsible cultures. For instance, Mauranen (1993a) demonstrated that American writers tended to make more use of metadiscourse markers, and be more concerned with guiding and directing the reader than Finnish writers in economic discourse. It is possible that Finnish schools teach students that metadiscourse is unnecessary, and represent the sign of a poor writer.

This section has attempted to review a notion of writer and reader responsibilities, resulting in the use of metadiscourse markers. In the next section, I will review cross-cultural studies of authorial stance in research articles.

2.7 Cross-cultural studies of authorial stance in research articles

The last two decades have seen a growing trend toward writers' authorial stance in research articles. A number of studies in this line of research have been conducted. This section reviews some cross-cultural studies on the use of linguistic markers in research articles across disciplines. Cross-cultural studies

of authorial stance in research articles are broadly divided into three major groups. The first group of studies investigates one or two individual linguistic features of stance markers. The second group of research is carried out by examining the whole framework of metadiscourse in research articles. The last group of earlier studies combines the investigation of the rhetorical structure of research articles with the analysis of stance features. The following studies are examples of the first set of the previous studies.

Grounded on the Attitude model in Martin & White's (2005) appraisal framework, which there are three elements in the concept of Attitude: affect, judgement, and appreciation, Alramadan (2020) compared the use of the Attitude resources in the Introduction section of research articles in applied linguistics written in English and Modern Standard Arabic by three groups of writers. The corpus consisted of 21 texts: 6 texts written in English by Anglo-American writers, 7 texts written in Modern Standard Arabic by Saudi published scholars, and 8 texts written in EFL by Saudi Master's degree students. The results revealed that the use of attitude markers appeared to be more common in the two Arab groups than in the native English group. This finding suggests that native English authors tend to be more objective than Arab writers when they compose research articles. Regarding the types of Attitude, appreciation resources were the most common type in the English-speaking writers while affect and judgement were the most preferred resources in the Arabic and student EFL writers respectively.

Yang (2013) compared the use of hedges in English scientific journals to those in Chinese scientific journals. The study comprised three groups of corpora: English medium research articles (EM), Chinese-authored Chinese research articles (CC), and Chinese-authored English research articles (CE). The comparisons were made in terms of the frequency and distribution of hedges in different sections of research articles. The results reported were that there was a substantial difference in the overall number and frequency of hedges in all three corpora. The EM corpus had the highest number of hedges, while the CE corpus had the lowest number of hedges. The CC corpus came in the middle position. A similar trend was also shown in the distribution of hedges in various sections of the research articles. The researcher claimed that cultural and linguistic differences as well as traditions and paradigms of scientific inquiry in the scientific communities account for the variations.

Similarly, Hu and Cao (2011) conducted a contrastive study of English and Chinese medium journals. They investigated hedges and boosters in the abstracts of research articles in the discipline of applied linguistics. Their corpus consisted of 649 abstracts from eight journals. The results of the study demonstrated that there was a higher degree of use of hedges in the English medium journals. In contrast, Chinese medium journals contained a higher number of boosters. The researchers claimed that these disparities could be explained by culturally preferred rhetorical strategies, epistemological beliefs as well as deficiencies in the facility in English as a second or foreign language.

In the same vein, Dontcheva-Navratilova (2016) examined the use of hedges and boosters in linguistics research articles published in one specific international journal, Applied Linguistics and the national Czech English-medium journal, Discourse and Interaction. The corpus comprised 24 research articles: 12 articles from the international journal and 12 articles from the Czech journals. The study demonstrated that there were significant differences between the two corpora in the frequencies of both features. The use of hedges and boosters were substantially higher in the international corpus than in the national Czech corpus. The author claimed that this variation could be attributed to a culturally different academic discourse.

Farrokhi & Emami (2008) investigated hedges and boosters in English research articles written by native English and non-native scholars in the two disciplines: applied linguistics and electrical engineering. The corpus consisted of 20 research articles: 10 articles from each discipline. 5 articles from each discipline were written by native English writers, and 5 articles were composed by non-native English researchers. The articles were selected from leading Iranian and international journals. Only the sections of Abstract, Introduction, Discussion, and conclusion were included in the study. The findings revealed that there are significant differences between the two groups of writers in the use of hedges and boosters. English native authors used more hedges than non-native English scholars in electrical engineering articles. English native writers also deployed boosters more extensively than non-native English writers in research articles in applied linguistics.

In the same vein, Mirzapour & Mahand (2012) compared the use of hedges and boosters in research articles written by native English and non-native English writers in two disciplines: library and information and computer science. 20 research articles were taken from leading Iranian and international journals. 5 articles in each discipline were written by native English writers and 5 articles in each discipline were written by non-native English writers. Only the Abstract, Introduction, and Conclusion sections of the articles were included in the analysis. The findings demonstrated that non-native writers used more hedges than native English writers in the library and information research articles. By contrast, research articles in computer science written by native English writers exhibited more hedges than those written by non-native writers. In terms of boosters, they were slightly higher in the native English corpus than in the non-native corpus in library and information research articles.

Prasithrathsint (2015) explored the use of hedges in research articles in the humanities written by three groups of writers: native speakers of English, Filipino speakers of English, and Thai speakers of English. The data was taken from international peer-reviewed journals. The study found that hedges were used most frequently in native English corpus. The use of hedges in the Filipino and Thai corpora were the second and third respectively.

Based on Biber's (2006) stance adverb model, Çakır (2016) compared the use of stance adverbs in the English abstracts written by Turkish and native English authors. The corpus comprised 240 abstracts from six disciplines, namely sociology, psychology, linguistics, physics, chemistry and biology. The comparative use of the adverbs were based on nationalities and disciplines. The results revealed that stance adverbs were more common in the abstracts written by native English authors than in those composed by Turkish writers. Native English authors were more likely than Turkish writers to use stance adverbs to highlight their role as researchers. With regard to disciplinary comparison, writers in the soft sciences (sociology, psychology and linguistics) employed more stance adverbs than writers in the hard sciences (physics, chemistry and biology).

Yağız & Demir (2015) investigated boosting devices in research articles written by three groups of writers, namely Turkish, Japanese, and native English writers. The corpus consisted of 60 English research articles composed by 20 Turkish

authors, 20 Japanese writers, and 20 Anglophonic authors. The research articles were randomly selected from leading journals on English Language Teaching (ELT) subjects. The study revealed that the highest number of occurrences of boosters was found in research articles written by Japanese writers, followed by those written by native English and Turkish authors respectively. Apart from the analysis of the frequency of boosting devices, the study also examined the most common markers used by all three groups of authors in their texts. The findings demonstrated that in the sub-category of modal verbs, *need to* was the most common marker in the Anglophonic group whereas *will* was the most common device in the Turkish and Japanese groups. In the sub-category of lexical verbs, *show* was the most pervasive marker in the English and Turkish groups while *find* was the most preferred marker in the Japanese corpus. Regarding the sub-category of adjectives, *(un)clear* was the most frequent marker used by native English scholars, while *successful* was used most frequently by Japanese and Turkish researchers. For the last sub-category of boosting devices, adverbs, most Anglophonic authors in the study preferred to employ the adverb *highly*, compared to the other adverbs. On the other hand, *especially* was the most pervasive adverb in research articles written by Japanese and Turkish researchers.

In another study, Yağız & Demir (2014) investigated the tendency and preferences of Turkish and native English researchers regarding the use of hedging devices. The corpus included 50 English research articles written by Turkish scholars and 50 English research articles written by native English scholars. The articles were randomly selected from different journals on ELT. Only three main parts of the articles, the Introduction, Discussion, and Conclusion were included in the analysis. The results showed that native English authors employed more hedges in their texts than Turkish writers. According to the researchers, this disparity may be due to culture-specific or pragmatic reasons. Modality verbs were the most common sub-category used by both cohorts of writers. By contrast, the sub-category of vague references, *as we all know*, *as is known*, and *as people say* tended to be avoided by both groups of authors.

Karahan (2013) compared the use of first-person pronouns, particularly the use of *I* and *we* in English research articles written by Turkish and non-Turkish authors. The corpus consisted of 40 articles represented by 20 articles from each

corpus. All articles were randomly selected from one specific journal in English Language Teaching (ELT), namely The Asian EFL Journal. The findings revealed that both groups of authors preferred to use *we* rather than *I* in their articles. Both first person pronouns were more common in research articles produced by non-Turkish writers than in the articles generated by Turkish authors.

Similarly, using Hyland's (2002a) framework, Kafes (2017) investigated the use of self-mention words in 300 applied linguistics research articles written by American academic writers (AWs) and Turkish academic writers (TWs). The research articles in the AWs group were from different international journals, while the research articles in the TWs corpus were from indexed journals produced mostly in universities in Turkey. The findings showed that American writers used more self-reference features than Turkish authors in their articles. The researcher suggested that the difference could be due to culture and the size of the discourse community, where small and homogeneous cultures are likely to be more engaged in collective thinking.

In the same vein, Martínez (2005) compared the use of first-person pronouns in biology, research articles written by native English-speaking writers (NES) with those written by Spanish-speaking writers (NNES) in English. The NES corpus consisted of one million words. The NNES corpus comprised 36,927 words. The results demonstrated that there was a significant difference between the two corpora in the use of first-person pronouns. The native English-speaking scholars used self-reference pronouns more extensively than Spanish writers. The analysis also revealed that a significant difference in use was found across the sections. The difference in use between texts was most apparent in the Results section in which native English-speaking authors employed first-person pronouns generally to show that they assumed responsibility for making the methodological decision that led to the results obtained.

Likewise, Isık-Tas (2018) analysed authorial identity in Turkish language and English language research articles in sociology through the use of first-person pronouns. The corpus comprised 130 research articles which were divided into three sub-corpora. The first sub-corpus consisted of 50 research articles written in Turkish by Turkish scholars and published in national journals. The second

sub-corpus comprised 30 English research articles written by Turkish authors and published in international journals. The last sub-corpus consisted of 50 English research articles written by native English writers and published in international journals. The analysis demonstrated that there were substantial similarities in the frequency and discourse functions of first-person pronouns in English research articles written by native English and Turkish writers in international journals. Both groups of writers employ first-person pronouns to present their knowledge, opinions and claims in their research articles. In contrast, Turkish writers in national journals were likely to avoid the use of first-person pronouns. The publication context could possibly account for the difference.

The following studies are examples of studies in the second category.

Sultan (2011) compared the use of metadiscourse markers in Linguistics research articles composed by native English-speaking and Arabic-speaking researchers. The contrastive corpus consisted of 70 discussion sections of research articles: 36 articles in the Arabic corpus and 34 articles in the English corpus. All articles were selected from international journals. Based on Hyland's (2004b) taxonomy, the study revealed that overall, both Arab and English scholars used more interactive resources than interactional resources. Arabic linguistics research articles employed a higher degree of both interactive and interactional resources than English linguistic research articles. With regard to interactional resources, hedges were the most common markers in both sets of texts. Whereas boosters were the second most frequent in the Arabic corpus, self-mentions were the second most common feature in the English corpus. Attitude markers held the third and fourth position in the Arabic and English research articles respectively. Engagement markers were the least frequent in both groups of texts. When comparing both corpora, hedges, boosters, attitude markers, and engagement markers were more pervasive in Arabic research articles than in English research articles.

In the same vein, Mu et al. (2015) made a comparison between English and Chinese research articles in applied linguistics in terms of the use of metadiscourse. A small corpus consisted of 20 research articles in English and another 20 in Chinese. The findings demonstrated that English research articles utilised more metadiscourse features than Chinese research articles. The study

also reported that scholars from both communities used more interactive metadiscourse features (organising discourse) than interactional metadiscourse features (indicating writers' attitudes and stance to themselves, text, and audience). In addition, there are differences in the employment of metadiscourse features between the two groups of writers. For example, similar to Hu and Cao's (2011) study, while writers of English research articles prefer using hedges, Chinese research writers prefer using boosters and explicit self-mention features.

Similarly, Mur Dueñas (2011) investigated metadiscourse features in English and Spanish research articles. The corpus consisted of 24 research articles in the discipline of business: 12 articles composed in English by scholars at North-American institutions and published in international journals and another 12 articles composed in Spanish and published in national journals. The study found that frequencies of occurrences of metadiscourse features are higher in the English research articles than in the Spanish research articles. With regard to interactional metadiscourse, hedges were the most common feature used by both groups of scholars. English L1 writers tended to use more hedges and self-mention features in their research articles than Spanish writers. The researcher claimed that the particular linguistic and cultural contexts of publication are likely to have an effect on writers' rhetorical choices when writing research articles. That is, due to the competitiveness of getting research articles published in international journals. Self-mentions allow English L1 writers to explicitly establish their credentials and emphasise their specific contributions; the use of hedges enables them to communicate their knowledge more tentatively to leave greater space open for readers' refutation and debate. The researcher also advocated further investigations in other disciplines.

Hashemi & Hosseini (2019) analysed the use of stance markers in applied linguistics research articles written in English by native English-speaking authors and articles written in Persian by Iranian scholars. The corpus was composed of 20 discussion sections of research articles from each group. Based on Hyland's (2005b) stance framework, the analysis revealed that attitude markers and boosters were more pervasive in Persian texts than English texts. By contrast, hedges and self-mention were more common in English articles than in Persian articles. Similar to the aforementioned studies, the writer speculated that the differences could be due to cultural differences.

Combining Hyland's (2005a) and Pho's (2013) stance frameworks, Yotimart & Abd. Aziz (2017) examined authorial stance in English research articles composed by native English and Thai writers in the field of applied linguistics. For the native English corpus, 15 articles were selected from four leading peer-reviewed journals in Scopus, namely Journal of English for Academic Purposes, Language Testing, English for Specific Purposes, and TESOL Quarterly. For the Thai corpus, 15 articles were chosen from five peer-reviewed Thai university-based journals: The PASAA Journal (PASAA), Journal of English Studies, Language Education and Acquisition Research Network Journal (LEARN), Silapakom University Journal of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts, and Journal of Liberal Arts (Prince of Songkla University). The results showed that hedges and epistemic stance words were used more frequently in research articles written by native English scholars. On the contrary, Thai writers used more attitude markers and attitudinal stance words than native English authors. With regard to boosters, they were used twice as much in texts written by native English authors than in texts written by Thai authors. In relation to the use of self-mentions, native English writers used the pronoun *I-we* eight times more than Thai writers. The researchers concluded that native English scholars tended to promote their authorial identity more overtly than Thai writers, who used the stance markers to show rhetorical functions that weaken the degree of authority. The difference in the use of stance markers between the two groups can be related to the writers' socio-cultural background.

Kim & Lim (2013) investigated the use of metadiscourse markers in Chinese and English research article's Introductions. The corpus consisted of 40 introductions of research articles in the field of education psychology: 20 Chinese articles written by Chinese scholars and 20 English research articles written by native English-speaking authors. All articles were selected from a prestigious journal published in their respective country. Grounded on Hyland's (2004b) metadiscourse model as an analytical framework, the study showed that there were similarities and differences between the two cohorts of writers in the use of metadiscourse resources. In terms of similarities, both groups of writers used more interactive than interactional resources in the Introduction sections. Evidentials and transitions were the most common interactive features in both sets of texts. Hedges were the most frequent interactional markers used in both

groups of texts. In terms of differences, overall, Chinese writers were likely to use to a lesser degree both interactive and interactional resources in their texts, compared to native English researchers.

Ahmed, Memon, & Soomro (2016) compared the use of interactional metadiscourse markers in civil engineering research articles written by British writers with those written in Pakistani-by-Pakistani authors. Each sub-corpus consisted of 45 research articles. Based on Hyland & Tse's (2004b) interpersonal model, the study revealed that there was a statistically significant difference between texts in the use of interactional markers. Overall, interactional metadiscourse markers were more pervasive in the British corpus than in the Pakistani corpus. All sub-categories of the markers occurred more frequently in English articles than in Pakistani articles except boosters, which were more frequent in Pakistani texts.

Ebadi, Rawdhan, & Marjal (2015) examined both interactive and interactional resources in both the Discussion and the Conclusions sections in English research articles produced by Iranian and native English scholars in the field of geology. In the native English sub-corpus, 15 research articles were selected from international journals. In the Persian sub-corpus, 15 English research articles written by native Persian authors were taken from peer-reviewed journals in Iran. The results indicated that interactional resources were more dominant than interactive resources in the English corpus. By contrast, interactive markers were more common than interactional markers in the Persian corpus. In relation to sub-categories of interactional resources, hedges were by far the most common markers in both sub-corpora, to a much lesser extent in the Persian corpus. Attitude markers were the least frequent markers in both sets of data although native English authors used more attitude markers than native Persian writers. No Persian writers used attitude markers in their texts. As suggested by the authors, the lower degree of use of attitude markers in both groups of texts may be associated with the nature of the hard science, which appeared to rely on quantitative methods rather personal interpretations. With regard to the other three sub-categories of markers, namely boosters, engagement markers, and self-mentions, they occurred more frequently in the articles written by Persian researchers than in those composed by native English writers.

Likewise, Farzannia & Farnia (2018) investigated metadiscourse markers in the Introduction sections of research articles written in English by native English-speaking authors and Iranian authors in the field of mining engineering. Each sub-corpus was made up of 34 English research articles taken from international journals in mining engineering. The analytical framework was based on Hyland's (2005a) metadiscourse taxonomy. The results indicated that overall, the use of interactional metadiscourse markers was higher in the English corpus than in the Persian corpus. In contrast with Ebadi, Rawdhan, & Marjal's (2015) findings, the occurrences of hedges in this study were higher in the Persian corpus than in the English corpus. By contrast, self-mentions and attitude markers were used more frequently in the English corpus. There was a significant difference in the number of occurrences of self-mentions between the two groups. The use of boosters and engagement markers between the two groups was similar. In terms of interactive markers, they were used more frequently in Iranian group than in English group. However, this difference was not significant.

In the same vein, Salar & Ghonsooly (2016) conducted a contrastive study by examining metadiscourse features in the Introduction sections in research articles written in English and in Persian in the field of knowledge management. 10 introduction sections in English research articles written by English native scholars were taken from international journals, and 10 introduction sections in Persian articles written by Iranian scholars were chosen from national journals. Building on Hyland & Tse's (2004b) metadiscourse framework, the analysis showed that both groups of authors used more interactive than interactional resources. The English texts had a higher number of occurrences of both types of markers than Persian texts. Regarding sub-categories of interactional markers, hedges, boosters and self-mentions were more common in the English corpus than in the Persian corpus. However, a statistically significant difference between texts was found in the frequency of hedges. Both cohorts of writers employed attitude markers to the same degree, and none of the texts in both corpora used engagement markers at all. In addition, both groups of researchers displayed a similar trend in the pattern of use of interactional resources; that is, attitude markers were the most common in both sets of data, followed by boosters, hedges, and self-mentions respectively.

Similarly, a part-genre study conducted by Karimi, Maleki, & Farnia (2017) compared the employment of metadiscourse markers in the English abstracts of law research articles written by American and Iranian native speakers. The corpus consisted of 80 abstracts of research articles: 40 abstracts in each sub-corpus. All abstracts were taken from prestigious journals. Based on Hyland's (2005a) and Hyland & Tse's (2004b) frameworks, the analysis revealed that in general, abstracts written by Persian tended to employ more interactive markers than those written by American writers. By contrast, American scholars used more interactional markers than Persian scholars. All sub-categories of interactional markers were more likely to be common in the American corpus than in the Persian corpus.

Jing & Jing (2018) examined English abstracts written by native Chinese and native English writers in terms of interactive and interaction metadiscourse markers. The Chinese corpus consisted of 60 research abstracts published in prestigious journals in China from three disciplines, namely biology, chemistry, and physics. For the native English corpus, 60 abstracts were selected from prestigious international journals in the same three disciplines. Hyland's (2005a) metadiscourse taxonomy was employed as the analytical framework in the study. The analysis indicated that L1 Chinese researchers employed more interactive markers than interactional resources. By contrast, native English scholars used more interactional markers than interactive markers. There was a significant difference between texts in the use of self-mentions. There was extensive use of self-mentions in L1 English texts, compared to the Chinese corpus.

Compared to the first two groups of previous studies, fewer studies have combined the investigation of the rhetorical structure of research articles with the analysis of stance features. The following studies are examples of studies in this strand.

Loi et al. (2016) compared the Conclusions section of English and Malay research articles in Psychology in terms of rhetorical Moves and evaluative stance, based on (Swales, 1990, 2004) Move model and Martin and Rose's (2003) Appraisal theory. The corpus consisted of 40 research articles (20 English research articles and 20 Malay research articles). The findings demonstrated that English conclusions comprise a subtle balance of assertion and mitigation. By contrast,

Malay conclusions are likely to decrease dialogic space. This could imply that Malay conclusions are less reader-friendly. The findings also suggests that authors from these two different communities experience and value, evaluation and meaning potential of the genre differently. The researchers claim that this variation can be explained by linguistic, contextual and socio-cultural reasons.

Drawing on Swales' (1990, 2004) Move structure and engagement system in Martin & White's (2005) Appraisal framework, Sheldon (2013) examines the Introduction and Discussion sections of applied linguistics research articles in English and Spanish including English articles written by L1 Spanish writers. The corpus was divided into three groups, representing 18 articles in each group. The first group (English L1 group) comprised English articles from international journals, namely *TESOL Quarterly* and *English for Specific Purposes.* The articles in the second (English L2 group) and third (Spanish L1 group) sub-corpora were taken from leading journals in Spain: *RESLA* and *Ibérica.* The findings demonstrated that the English L1 group was more likely than the Spanish groups to follow the conventional structure of the Introduction and Discussion sections. Regarding the use of evaluative stance, the three groups of writers use *contracting* resources to address the need for more research in the Introduction section, and employ *endorsing* resources to validate new knowledge in the Discussion/Conclusions section.

In another study, Sheldon (2018) also employed Swales' (1990, 2004) Move model and engagement system of Martin & White's (2005) Appraisal framework to analyse the Conclusions section of applied linguistics research articles written in English and Spanish by three groups of authors; English L1 group, English L2 group, and Spanish L1 group. The English L1 sub-corpus consisted of 10 research articles written by native speakers of English taken from *TESOL Quarterly* and *English for Specific Purposes*. The English L2 sub-corpus was composed of 10 articles written in English by Spanish researchers, and the Spanish L1 sub-corpus comprised 10 articles written in Spanish. The articles in the English L2 and Spanish L1 groups were selected from *RESLA* and *Ibérica* journals. The results indicated that Move 1 (Consolidation of results) was the most common Move in all three groups, compared to Move 2 (Limitations of the study) and Move 3 (Further research suggested). Regarding the use of engagement markers, all

three groups of writers tended to rely on the heteroglossic to position themselves in the discourse community to make knowledge claims. However, there are differences in the frequency distribution of sub-categories of engagement resources between groups. For example, expanding resources were more likely than contracting resources to be used by English L1, and to a lesser extent in the English L2 group. By contrast, the Spanish L1 group tended to use more contracting resources than expanding resources. These differences could be attributed to ideological positioning, disciplinary norms, and the size of the audience in each language.

El-Dakhs (2020) examined the disparities between the abstracts of research articles written in Arabic and English in terms of rhetorical structure and interactional markers. The corpus comprised 400 abstracts: 200 abstracts written in English and published in prestigious international journals of education, and 200 abstracts written in Arabic and published in prestigious journals of education in the Arab World. Hyland's (2004a) abstract model was employed as the analytical framework for the rhetorical structure of the abstracts, while Hyland's (2005b) stance and engagement model was used as the analytical framework for the interactional features. In terms of rhetorical structure, the results demonstrated that English abstracts appeared to follow the conventional Moves in Hyland's (2004a) five-move model. Arabic abstracts were likely to emphasise the Moves of Purpose, Method, and Findings. In addition, English abstracts had longer Introductions and Conclusions. On the contrary, Arabic methods included longer Methods and Findings. In terms of interactional markers, English abstracts deployed more hedges, attitude markers, and self-mentions features, whereas Arabic abstracts incorporated more boosters. Engagement markers were generally absent in both corpora.

Candarlı (2012) examined differences in lexico-grammatical features and rhetorical structure between Turkish and English research article abstracts in the field of education. The corpus consisted of 20 abstracts written in English by native English scholars, and 20 abstracts written in Turkish by native Turkish scholars. The English abstracts were selected from the most prestigious refereed journals, while the Turkish abstracts were taken from leading national journals. Swales' (2004) CARS model was used to analyse the rhetorical structure of the abstracts. In addition, the study also analysed linguistic markers of hedges,

attitude markers, self-mention, and verb tenses and voice. The findings revealed that English authors showed a stronger tendency to include the Conclusion and state the significance of the study in their abstracts. This was explained by writer/reader responsible languages (Hinds,1987). English writers are likely to use writer-responsible language; as it is the writer's responsibility to present his or her claims clearly to enable readers to understand their points. By contrast, Turkish scholars were regarded as members of the culture of implicitness. Another major difference between the two corpora was that English writers take a critical stance and address a research gap in their abstracts. In contrast, these features were absent in the Turkish abstracts. The absence of a critical stance in the Turkish corpus could be attributed to a face-saving strategy (Loi & Evans, 2010; Martín, 2003). In terms of linguistic features, English abstracts were more likely than Turkish abstracts to include hedges, attitude markers, and self-mentions. Self-mentions were not found in any Turkish abstract. Furthermore, English abstracts also included a variety of use of verb tenses and voices, such as simple present tense and present perfect tense, while Turkish abstracts mainly used simple present tense with passive voice.

Donesch-Jeżo (2016) compared differences in the rhetorical structure and the use of metadiscourse markers in the linguistics abstracts written in English and Polish by these groups of authors. The corpus comprised 3 sub-corpora: Corpus A, Corpus B, and Corpus C. Corpus A consisted of 20 English abstracts produced by native English writers and published in well-established international science journals. Corpus B contained 20 English abstracts written by Polish scholars and published in leading Polish journals. Corpus C was composed of 20 abstracts written in Polish by Polish researchers and published in recognised Polish science journals. Based on Hyland's (2004a) abstract model and Hyland's (2005a) metadiscourse framework, the results demonstrated that all five Moves in the model, namely Introduction, Purpose, Method, Findings and Conclusion appeared to be more common in the abstracts written by native English scholars. Most abstracts written by Polish scholars in corpus B and C tended to include only Purpose and Method moves. With regard to the use of interactional markers writers in corpus A and B use hedges and self-mentions more significantly than writers in corpus C.

Overall, the studies reveal the similarities and differences in the use of stance markers in research articles in different disciplines as well as the features which are overused and underused by different groups of English learners. However, as shown in the above studies, it appears that study in the field of tourism is underrepresented in the literature. As discussed in the previous chapter, most earlier studies of authorial stance in research articles pay more attention to the hard sciences than the soft sciences (Holmes, 1997; Pho, 2013), and among the social sciences, applied linguistics tends to receive a great deal of attention from the researchers in this area, as shown in the above studies. Therefore, to fill the gap in the literature, an investigation of authorial stance in research articles in the tourism area should be conducted. Furthermore, based on the perception that rhetorical structure and strategies may vary according to disciplines, genres and contexts (Hyland, 1999, 2004a; Samraj, 2005; Swales, 1990), an integrated study of move analysis and authorial stance analysis will shed light on the complication of tourism discourse and findings of such study could enable us to comprehend the true characteristics of the tourism discourse. Moreover, as can be seen in the above studies, only one study carried out by Yotimart & Abd. Aziz (2017) compared the use of the entire framework of stance markers in research articles in the international and Thai contexts. Because of the scarcity of contrastive study in the Thai context, this study examines the similarities and differences of English research articles written by Thai writers and published in national Thai journals and those published in international journals in terms of rhetorical structure and the use of linguistic markers to express their authorial stance. Findings from the analysis will elucidate the rhetorical practices at national and international levels and inform us how members of each discourse community construct their research articles.

2.8 Summary of the chapter

This chapter has reviewed different concepts and theoretical frameworks of stance that are widely used in studies of writers' stance. In this study, the concept of stance is based on Hyland's (2005a, 2005b) definition because his definition subsumes definitions in other frameworks. The reasons for adopting Hyland's stance model as an analytical framework have also been provided. The chapter has also presented contrastive text-linguistic studies with respect to metadiscourse analysis, a relevant study to the stance analysis. The chapter

then moved to discuss academic discourse. The textual approach used in academic discourse has also been described. Genre analysis, corpus analysis, and multimodal analysis, three major analyses in the textual approaches have also been discussed in the chapter. The three distinctive approaches, namely New Rhetoric (NR), Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), and English for Specific Purpose (ESP) generally used in genre analysis have been discussed. As this study is conducted in the area of ESP, the term 'genre' in this study is based on Swales' (1990) definition. The chapter also provided details of Swales' (2004) revised *CARS* model and Pho's (2013) framework, used for analysing the rhetorical structure of research articles in this study. The chapter then explained three characteristics of research article discourse: review and revision, novelty and relevance, and stance and engagement. The differences between writer-responsible languages and reader-responsible languages have also been discussed, as they have an impact on the use of metadiscourse markers in written texts. The chapter closed with reviews of previous cross-cultural studies of authorial stance. The previous studies show that there are substantial studies of stance markers in research articles in different disciplines, but very little attention has been paid to the tourism area. In addition, little attempt has been made to combine the analysis of rhetorical structure of research articles with the analysis of stance markers, particularly in the Thai context. Accordingly, a comparison of both rhetorical structure and the use of stance markers in tourism research articles published in national Thai journals and international journals enables this study to fill these research gaps. The next chapter presents the methodology of this study.

Chapter 3

Methodology

3.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the research questions, theoretical framework, an overview of the approach of the study, details of the research design, and ethical issues of this study. The first section of this chapter addresses the research questions. Then the theoretical framework, namely metadiscourse, and an overview of the approach of corpus linguistics are provided in sections 3.3 and 3.4 respectively. Sections 3.5, 3.6 and 3.7 deal with details of research design, ethical issues, and a summary of the chapter.

3.2 Research questions

The research questions addressed in this study are as follows:

How are English research articles in Tourism written by Thai writers and published in national Thai journals similar to and different from those published in international journals in terms of

a. rhetorical structure?
b. linguistic features to express writers' stance?

To answer the first question, move analysis was conducted by employing Swales' (2004) and Pho's (2013) models. The detailed procedure for move analysis was provided in section 3.5.5. With regard to the second question, Hyland's (2005a) stance model was used to look at the use of stance markers in research articles written by both groups of authors. The analysis of stance markers was discussed in more detail in section 3.5.6.

Having provided research questions, I now move to theoretical frameworks relevant to this study. This study is based on two theoretical frameworks, namely genre analysis, and metadiscourse. As genre analysis has been reviewed in Chapter 2 (section 2.4.2), the following section will present the metadiscourse framework.

3.3 Theoretical framework of the study: metadiscourse in academic writing

In Chapter 2 (section 2.2.2), Crismore et al.'s (1993) metadiscourse framework has been reviewed. This section will review Hyland and Tse's (2004b) and Hyland's (2005a) metadiscourse framework, the analytical framework of stance, used in this study. Hyland and Tse (2004b) and Hyland (2005a) added a new perspective to the concept of *metadiscourse* by viewing communication as a social engagement. This means that when communication occurs, the social engagement between participants (speaker-listener/writer-reader) becomes clearly visible through the second level of discourse. Hyland (2005a) also emphasised the function and significance of metadiscourse within discourse as follows:

> Removing these metadiscourse features would make the passage much less personal, less interesting and less easy to follow. By offering a way of looking at these features systematically, metadiscourse provides us with access to the ways that writers and speakers take up positions and align themselves with their readers in a particular context. (p.4)

Based on an investigation of 240 dissertations written by L2 postgraduates, Hyland and Tse (2004b) proposed a framework of metadiscourse, consisting of interactive and interactional resources, the terms being borrowed from Thompson (2001). The linguistic markers used to examine authorial stance in this study are based on interactional resources, previously presented in Chapter 2 (sections 2.2.4 and 2.5.3). Details of linguistic features used as an analytical framework in the current study are shown in Appendix A. The following section examines interactive metadiscourse.

3.3.1 Interactive metadiscourse

Interactive metadiscourse examines the ways of organizing discourse, and assisting and guiding the reader through the text. Hyland and Tse, (2004b) propose five subcategories in these resources, namely *transitions*, *frame markers*, *endophoric markers*, *evidentials,* and *code glosses*.

Transitions are devices employed to mark additive, contrastive and consequential steps in the discourse, such as *in addition*, *and*, *thus*, and *but. Frame markers* are references to text boundaries or elements of schematic text structure, including devices used for sequencing, labelling text stages, announcing discourse goals, and indicating topic shifts. Examples of devices of this category are *to conclude*, *finally* and *my purpose here is to*. *Endophoric markers* are

devices used to refer to information in other parts of the text, such as *noted above*, *see Fig*, *in section 2*. *Evidentials* are devices used to refer to a source of information from other texts, such as *according to X* and *Z states*. *Code glosses* are devices helping readers understand the function of ideational information, such as *namely*, *e.g.,* and *in other words*. This section has reviewed the theoretical framework of interactive metadiscourse in academic writing. In the following section, I will present an overview of the approach of this study, corpus linguistics.

3.4 An overview of the approach of this study: corpus linguistics

Corpus linguistics is "an area which focuses upon a set of procedures, or methods, for studying language" (McEnery & Hardie, 2012, p. 1). A corpus-based approach allows analysts to simultaneously handle a tremendous amount of language and keep track of several contextual factors (Biber, Conrad, & Reppen, 1998). As the general contribution of corpus analysis to the academic discourse is previously explained in Chapter 2 (section 2.4.3), this section establishes the two main forms of results gained from corpora. The results from corpora are displayed in two forms, namely concordances and frequency figures.

3.4.1 Concordances

By reading and analysing concordances, researchers are able to grasp patterns of language use and different meaning of words. A concordance can be defined as "a list of all the contexts in which a word occurs in a particular text" (Lindquist, 2009, p. 5). In linguistics, the data from corpora are usually exhibited in "so-called keyword-in-context (KWIC) concordances with about one line of context and the keyword centred" (Lindquist, 2009, p. 5). These lines provide instances of language use when read "horizontally and evidence of system when read vertically" (Hyland, 2006, p. 61). This allows users to see regularities that could otherwise be missed. In addition, sorting the concordance lines by the first word to the left or to the right of the search word, frequent co-occurrences are made explicit. For example, an investigation carried out by Hyland and Tse (2004a) revealed that by sorting concordance lines on the word *thanks* to the left of this search word, this noun was modified by three adjectives: *special*, *sincere* and *deep*, and *special* accounted for more than two-thirds of all instances. In terms of exploring the meaning of words, Biber, Conrad and Reppen, (1998) suggest

that the surrounding context displayed in a KWIC concordance list reveals different meanings of the search word.

According to Hyland (2006), analysts can search for word combinations that display both frequencies and meanings of key phrases which differ by interrupting words. For instance, utilizing the* wild card by inserting the expression *it* that* will search for the word *it* followed by *that* in the near proximity, generating instances as shown in the following examples in a corpus of abstracts of research papers:

It is likely that	it shows that	it is worth nothing that
It seems that	it is claimed that	it is shown that
It is clear that	it is true that	it is more likely that

(Hyland, 2006, p. 62)

Studied more carefully, these instances reveal that such phrases are often employed by academic writers to show their evaluation of whether the following statement tends to be true or not. Furthermore, the results demonstrate that the frequency of use of expressions of certainty is higher than those of expressions of doubt. Hyland pointed out that this kind of information could benefit student writers in terms of utilizing this collocation in their own writing and in effective ways.

3.4.2 Frequency

Many scholars suggest that frequency is a major concept in corpus studies (e.g. Hyland, 2006, 2009; Lindquist, 2009). This is because corpora focus on what frequently and typically occurs rather than what can occur in a genre or register (Hyland, 2006). In other words, attention is paid to explaining the most common uses of the commonest words on the hypothesis that, if something is observed to occur often enough in the past then it tends to be important in the future as well. This enables investigators to predict the ways that other representative examples of the genre will be organized and the features that they tend to contain. Thus, corpus analysis often starts with counting the frequency of words or grammatical patterns in order to portray the domain under study.

The advent of computers and technology enables researchers to gather more sophisticated information and work with a larger dataset. Software programmes allow language analysts to count not only words but also grammatical features (Hyland, 2006). Through a semi-automatic procedure known as tagging, the analysts can add codes to each word marking its part of speech. To illustrate, the word *research* is tagged as either a noun or a verb each time it occurs, resulting in in-depth analyses of target genres.

Another advantage of frequency counts is that it helps researchers identify the features which are overused or underused in academic writing. This is exemplified in the work undertaken by Hinkel (2002), whose study reported that academic essays written by L2 students are composed of a smaller range of vocabulary than those written by L1 writers, and L2 writers rely heavily on informal speech than written discourse. In the present study, the corpus-based analysis is incorporated to help identify the frequency and patterns of use of stance markers in research articles written by Thai writers and published in Thai nationwide journals and those written by writers of different nationalities and published in international journals. Having discussed the approach of this study, I will now present an overview of the research design.

3.5 An overview of the research design

The present study takes a comparative data-driven approach towards exploring how Thai writers and writers of other nationalities use linguistic features to express authorial stance in research articles published in Thai nationwide journals and international journals. The corpora in this study were divided into two groups: Thai corpus and international corpus, with articles in each corpus selected from Thai and international journals and published between 2014 and 2020. The articles were analysed in terms of move structure and linguistic features used to express authorial stance. The analysis of move structure is based on Swales' (2004) and Pho's (2013) frameworks, whereas the analysis of authorial stance is based on Hyland's (2005a) stance model.

3.5.1 Description of the Corpora

This study is based on the corpora of 100 empirical research articles selected from Thai and international journals in the field of tourism: 50 articles from Thai journals and 50 articles from international journals. In relation to international

journals, they were listed in the 2018 Journal Citation Reports (JCR), which was the latest statistical database information available at the time I started collecting research articles for my study. The listed journals in the JCR are judged to be, by the JCR, that they are high-quality academic journals. The indexed journals in the JCR are evaluated in terms of quality and scholarly citations. Regarding Thai journals, they were approved by the Thai-journal Citation Index Center (TCI) and listed in the TCI database. The TCI database is widely accepted by domestic academic journals, which is evident in editorial sections in various Thai academic journals mentioning that their journals are now indexed in the TCI database (Sombatsompop et al., 2012). Journals in the TCI database are divided into three tiers. Journals categorised into tier 1 have been judged by TCI as being the highest quality. The quality of journals in tier 1 is approved and verified by the TCI (3-year validity), for which the journals remain indexed in the TCI database. Additionally, the journals are chosen for indexing in the ASEAN Citation Index (ACI). The quality of journals in tier 2 is also assessed and verified by the TCI (3-year validity). Although the journals do not meet all requirements of the TCI, they remain indexed in the TCI database and on improving in quality the journals will be transferred to tier 1. Regarding journals in tier 3, the quality of the journals has not yet qualified for approval by the TCI. In this study, only journals from tier 1 and tier 2 were chosen. The fifty research articles in tourism written by Thai writers were selected from the TCI database at http://tci.trf.or.th whereas fifty international journals were gathered from the international databases, namely EBSCO, Web of science, and JSTOR. To ensure that the selected articles were part of the tourism discipline, the articles were examined by a Thai professor, teaching in this field.

3.5.2 Criteria of research articles

To select research articles in both corpora, a number of criteria were considered in this study, namely type of research articles, nationality of authors, sections in research articles, and year of publication.

Firstly, all research articles in this study were empirical research articles. One reason why only empirical research articles were included in this study was that most Thai research articles published in Thai journals were mainly empirical research articles. For reason of comparability, a level of consistency in both

datasets is required. This study, thus, is concerned only with empirical research articles. Furthermore, since the rhetorical structure of empirical research articles may vary from those of theoretical research articles and review articles, the sample articles were restricted to empirical research articles. A list of research articles in both corpora was given in Appendices B and C.

Secondly, nationality of writers was taken into consideration in choosing research articles. In the international corpus, the articles were chosen regardless of the authors' nationalities. However, the first authors of the research articles in Thai journals must be Thai.

Another criterion considered when selecting the articles is that all research articles must have an abstract. Apart from IMRD sections, the Abstracts were also examined in this study. As the Abstract is one of the major parts of the research article for most journals (Pho, 2008, 2013), to give a comprehensive description of the research article, both the research article proper and the Abstract are worth examining.

Finally, only research articles published between 2014 and 2020 were chosen. The selection of research articles recently published between 2014 and 2020 represents the latest rhetorical structure and use of authorial stance markers in research articles.

There was an additional criterion only applied to research articles in the Thai corpus. As the primary aim of this study is to compare the rhetorical structure and linguistic stance markers in English research articles in the field of tourism written by Thai writers and published in Thai journals with those written by writers of different nationalities and published in international journals, only research articles written in English in Thai database were chosen.

3.5.3 General descriptions of the four internal sections

This study examines the rhetorical structure of research articles from the Introduction to Discussion-Conclusions sections, besides the Abstract. As discussed in the Introduction chapter, though the IMRD structure is a conventional pattern in empirical research articles, this pattern does not seem to be a default pattern. This section, thus, provides general descriptions of the four

internal sections, and how the study categorised each section if it was not explicitly labelled ‘Introduction’, ‘Methods’, ‘Results’, or ‘Discussion-Conclusions’.

3.5.3.1 The Introduction section

Most research articles in both corpora have an explicit label of Introduction heading. This is completely true for articles in the international corpus. All international articles have an explicit label of *Introduction* except one article has a label of *Introduction and objectives*. However, other headings were found at the beginning of some Thai articles. The headings include *Significance and origin of the problems*, *Background and significance of the problem*, *Background and significance of the study*, and *Research background*. In these headings, the importance of the study is established by addressing a research problem leading to the need for the study. Therefore, these headings are viewed as alternative headings for the *Introduction* based on their contents and communicative purposes of the sections.

Studies have suggested that there are extra sections between the Introduction and Methods sections, such as *Background* (Holmes,1997), *Theoretical basis* (Yang & Allison, 2004), and *Literature Review* (Lin & Evans, 2012). This appears to be the case in this study. In the international corpus, there are extra sections of *Literature review*, *Theoretical background*, *Theoretical thread*, *Theoretical framework*, *Study background*, *Aims*, *Research context*, *Context*, *Hypothesis*, *Brief description of the case study*, and *Case study*, occurring between the Introduction and Methods sections. To identify these sections, the contents and communicative purposes of the sections were taken into account based on Pho’s (2013) and Swales’(2004) frameworks, the analytical frameworks in this study. As the contents in the sections of *Literature review*, *Theoretical background*, *Theoretical thread*, *Theoretical framework*, and *Study background* are about reviewing the relevant studies and theories, these sections are, thus, counted in the Introduction section. Similarly, *Research context*, *Context*, *Brief description of the case study* and *Case study* are also considered as parts of the Introduction section because they provide background information on the study contexts. According to Pho’s (2013) framework, reviewing the relevant studies and theories, and presenting the context are strategies used for establishing a territory (Move 6) in the Introduction section. The content headings of *Aims* and

Hypothesis are also identified as parts of the Introduction section because the research purposes and hypotheses are described under these sections, which conform to strategies used for presenting the present work (Move8) in the Introduction section, based on Swales's (2004) model.

In the Thai corpus, over half of the articles have a label of *Research objectives* or *Purposes* between the Introduction and Methods sections. Like international articles, some Thai articles also include sections: *Literature Review*, *Related concepts* or *Related theories and Concepts*, *Research Hypothesis, Hypothesis,* and *Research setting*. These sections are considered as parts of the Introduction section based on the contents and communicative purposes of the sections as discussed above. In addition, there are the sections of *Scope of the research*, *Scope of the study*, *Research Scope*, *Significance of the research*, *Research Benefits*, *Definition of terms*, *Expected results*, and *Conceptual framework*. The sections of *Scope of the research*, *Scope of the study*, and *Research Scope* involve research purposes and summarising the methods. *Significance of the research*, *Expected results*, and *Research Benefits* concern the value of the study. *Definition of terms* is about defining the key terms used in the study. These extra sections are viewed as parts of the Introduction section, as the contents conform to the strategies used for presenting the present work (Move 8), as shown in Table 4.3. With regard to the section *Conceptual framework*, it always occurs at the end of the Introduction section but before the Methods section in Thai articles. However, there are some international and Thai articles incorporating this section under the Methods section. As this section mainly describes the relationship between variables in the article, this study, thus, considers the section as a part of the Methods section.

3.5.3.2 The Methods section

All articles in both corpora have a clear heading for the Methods section. However, there are variations in the use of the headings. In this study, the headings that are grouped under the Methods section include *Methodology*, *Method(s)*, *Research method(s)*, *Research Methodology*, *Research design*, *Study area and research methods*, *Material(s) and methods*, *Data and econometric model*, *Methodology and the site information*, and *Research design*

and methodology. All sections under these headings describe the methodology employed in the articles.

3.5.3.3 The Results section

In this study, some articles have separate sections for Results and Discussion, but some combine the two sections as Findings and discussion or Results and discussion. As argued by Yang & Allison (2003), the heading of *Results and discussion* should be regarded as an alternative form of the Results section because there was no significant difference in their analysis of the moves between the two sections. Moreover, an analysis of move structure conducted by Pho (2013) also confirms that the move structure of the Results and discussion section is similar to that of the Results section. This study, thus, views the Results and discussion section as a variant form of the Results section. In this study, there are various forms of headings for the Results section. The headings include *Results*, *Findings*, *Findings and discussion*, *Results and discussion*, *Analysis and discussion of results*, *Data analysis and results*, *Modeling analysis results and discussion*, *Empirical results*, *Data analysis*, Analysis of findings, *Results of the research*, *Results and analyses*, *Research findings*, *Analysis and results*, *Research results*, *The results of the study*, *Research results and discussion*, and *Research finding and discussion*.

3.5.3.4 The Discussion-Conclusions section

In this study, all sections after the Results section are grouped into the Discussion-Conclusions section. The headings for the Discussion-Conclusions section in this study include *Discussion*, *Conclusion(s)*, *Discussion and conclusion(s)*, *Conclusion(s) and implication(s)*, *Conclusions and discussion*, *Theoretical and managerial implications, Discussion and conclusion*, *Implications and limitations*, *Conclusions and limitations*, *Discussion(s) and implications*, *Recommendations and limitations of the study*, *Practical implications*, *Discussion of the results*, *Managerial implications*, *Limitation(s) and future research*, *Limitations and further research*, *Implications and conclusions*, *Limitations and future research directions*, *Limitations of research*, *Conclusion and suggestion*, *Suggestions*, *Recommendations*, *Conclusion(s) and recommendation(s)*, *Suggestion(s) from research*, *Recommendation(s) from research*, *Summary*, *Discussion(s) and recommendation(s)*, *Conclusion and policy implications*, *The*

recommendations gained from the research, *(The) recommendation(s) for future research*, *Research implications*, *Recommendation from this study*, *Theoretical implications for further research*, *Suggestions for future study*, *Discussions and recommendations*, *Conclusion and recommendations*, and *Operational guidelines for sustainable tourism perspective*.

3.5.4 Data analysis

The analysis of the corpora of the current study consists of two major stages, namely Move analysis and authorial stance analysis. The former aims at providing a description of the rhetorical structure of the research articles in the tourism discipline in Thai journals and international journals. The latter aims at providing insight into how research writers use linguistic features to express their stance in research articles. The procedures of the two analyses are described in the following sections.

3.5.5 The analysis of Move structure

Approaches used in studies of Move structure following Swales' (1990) are based on both linguistic features and function, and the content of the text. To identify the rhetorical structures of the main research articles in this study, the analysis of Move structure was examined in terms of type, sequence, and frequency. With regard to Move identification, it is based on the content or function of the text. Then the rhetorical structure of individual sections of research articles was analysed by using Pho's (2013) and Swales' (2004) frameworks as the points of departure. While Moves and steps in the Introductions were identified based on Swales' (2004) framework, those in other sections of the research articles were identified, based on Pho's (2013) model. Swales' revised framework was adopted, as it was initially developed from the Introduction analysis and included previous studies of Move-based analyses. It, therefore, precisely accounts for the features of research article writing (Kanoksilapatham, 2005). Pho's (2013) model is appropriate for analysing the other sections of the research article, namely the Abstract, Methods, Results, and Discussion because the model was developed from the analysis of all sections of the research articles, ranging from the Abstract to the Discussion-Conclusion sections from two different fields in social sciences: applied linguistics and education technology.

In this study, the analysis of move-step structures was based on a function or top-down approach to minimise the issue of cyclical patterns. A cyclical pattern of Moves can occur in the Introduction (Swales, 1990). That is, some Moves may reappear. For example, Move2, establishing a niche, does not appear only at the end of a literature review but may occur in the individual review items. Many studies of research articles have reported the occurrence of cyclical patterns in their studies (e.g., Brett, 1994; Crookes, 1986; Posteguillo, 1999). As pointed out by Pho (2008, 2013), a cyclical pattern tends to occur in studies attempting to distinguish Moves by employing the combination of a bottom-up approach (identifying Moves based on certain linguistic signals) and a top-down approach (identifying Moves based on function or content). Pho suggests that the two analyses of textual function and linguistic realization should be conducted separately. Hence, the identification of Moves in the present study was on the basis of function only. After the stage of Move identification, the typical linguistic markers of stance were analysed.

The basic unit of the identification of Moves and steps was the sentence. However, it is possible that a sentence can present more than one function and the realisation of one of the functions in the form of a clause or phrase. In this case, the clause and phrase were assigned to Moves or steps, according to their functions. Identifying Moves and steps according to a clause or phrase can help elucidate the more detailed rhetorical structure of the research articles. For example, the following sentence was coded as two Moves (as specified in the angle bracket).

> **<Describing the methodology>** The qualitative research conducted in 2015, using an in-depth interview with eight key informants from multiple roles in ASEAN tourism, **<Presenting the research>** aims to examine an overall strategic planning process focusing on formal and informal communication of how ASEAN tourism branding being constructed based on destination tourism and marketing communication through event and leisure activities.
>
> (TH 13, the Abstract section)

As the Swales' Move structure has been criticized as subjective in terms of Move identification; that is, each researcher may assign Move boundaries differently. This may have an impact on the reliability and validity of the study (Kanoksilapatham, 2005, 2007b; Paltridge, 1994). However, this problem is minimised by using another inter-coder as suggested by Crookes (1986).

The identification of Moves/steps in this study followed the iterative process. There are three major stages in the analysis of Move structure. Since there was no complete Move model for all sections of research articles in the discipline of tourism, Pho's (2013) and Swales' (2004) frameworks were employed as a starting point for an analysis of Moves in this study. In the first stage, the researcher read through the first set of texts (40 research articles: 20 articles from the Thai corpus and 20 articles from the international corpus) and applied the frameworks to identify Moves and steps. Throughout the coding process, types of Moves and sequences of steps were modified where necessary, and an adapted version of the coding scheme was finally developed to be used for the inter-coder reliability between the researcher and another coder.

In the second stage, a random subset of 10 research articles (5 articles from the Thai corpus and 5 articles from the international corpus) was read and coded for Moves/steps by the second coder, based on the provided coding scheme. Then, if there were any disagreements on coding, a discussion was had, and the coding scheme was modified where required. The coding process was started again each time the coding scheme was adjusted. The coding process was repeated until the second coder and the researcher had the same results when the adjusted coding scheme was applied.

After that, another set of 40 articles (20 articles from the Thai corpus and 20 articles from the international corpus) was coded by the researcher, and again the second coder was provided with the coding scheme. The second coder then read and coded another 10 articles randomly selected (5 articles from the Thai corpus and 5 articles from the international corpus). A discussion was had if there were any discrepancies. The coding scheme was again adjusted where required and applied to the re-coding process until both coders had the same results. Next, the last set of 20 texts (10 articles from the Thai corpus and 10 articles from the international corpus) was read and coded by the researcher, and a random set of 10 articles (5 articles from the Thai corpus and 5 articles from the international corpus) were coded by the second coder. The same multi-stages of the coding process were also reproduced in the analysis of the last set of texts until the second coder and the researcher produced the same results if the adjusted coding scheme was applied.

At the end of the coding process, some Moves and steps in three sections, namely the Introduction, Methods, and Discussion-Conclusions sections were adjusted. In the Introduction, the three main Moves from Swales' (2004) model still remained. However, scholars such as Adnan (2008) and Sheldon (2013) have criticised only one step, Topic generalization, in Swales' (2004) Move 1 (Establishing a territory) is too broad. The six steps in Pho's (2013) Move model, thus, were adopted in Move 6, which is equal to Move 1 in Swales' (2004) model. The steps in Move 7 (Establishing a niche) were primarily adapted from Pho's (2013) model. Move 7 in Pho's (2013) framework consisted of three steps: Step 1: Indicating a gap, Step 2: Explaining reasons for the gap, and Step 3: Presenting positive justification. In this study, Step 2 was not found; therefore, it was removed from the coding scheme. Instead of Step 2, Step 1B (Indicating problems in research sites or the real world) was added, as it was found in this study. Steps in Move 8 (Presenting the present work) were adopted from Swales' (2004) model.

In the Methods section, all Moves and steps in Pho's (2013) framework still remained. However, some Moves and steps were added because they were found in the current study. The added Moves and steps are as follows: Move 9 (Contextualizing study methods) and all three steps in the move, Step 3 (Previewing results) in Move 11 (Describing the data analysis), and Move 12 (Previewing the following section(s)). Details of how the new Moves and steps were developed are explained in Chapter 4 (section 4.2.3).

In the Discussion-Conclusions section, Step 3 (Evaluating Methodology) in Move 22 (Evaluating the study), adopted from Yang & Allison's (2003) model was added to Pho's (2013) framework, as it was observed in the present study. Details of the final coding scheme used as the analytical framework of the rhetorical structure in this study are provided in Appendix D.

In the third stage, the raw frequencies of each Move in each corpus were counted and entered into an SPSS file for descriptive and statistical analysis. Then the comparison of the rhetorical structure between the two corpora was drawn in terms of the number of texts containing each Move and step as well as the average number of sentences for each Move and step per text. In order to test statistically significant differences in the frequencies of Moves and mean

sentences, Pearson chi-square and one-way ANOVA tests were performed. As there were several comparisons in this study, a Bonferroni correction was applied to adjust significance thresholds. In addition, the sequence of Moves and Move cycles occurring in both corpora were also analysed and compared.

3.5.5.1 Selection of the second coder

To select the second coder in this study, two factors are concerned: English proficiency and educational background. As this study examines research articles written in English, the second coder should be proficient in reading English research articles. As Crookes (1986) cautioned that graduate students in ESL may not be appropriate for being coders in his study because they may lack understanding of the scientific research topics. Therefore, the second coder in this study is a Thai lecturer, who obtained a doctoral degree in applied linguistics from a public university in Thailand. She has experience in teaching English as a foreign language to Thai students at the tertiary level for almost forty years. Although the coder is not a native speaker of English and not in the field of tourism, obviously, she possesses proper educational background, substantial experience, and expertise in reading academic research articles.

3.5.5.2 Coder training and establishing an agreement between coders

To conduct the analysis of Move structure, the second coder was trained by the researcher for four hours. At the beginning of the training session, the researcher introduced the coding scheme and instruct the second coder how to identify Moves and steps. The units of the identification of Moves and steps were also explained to the second coder. Then the second coder was asked to code the sample text which was not included in the data. When the coder clearly understood how to identify Moves and steps, she was asked to code the data independently.

To be able to classify Moves and Move sequences for all sections of research articles, one hundred percent of agreements between coders are required. The level of agreement was established by comparing the coders' records of Moves and steps for each section of each research article. The comparison was made sentence by sentence. In the case of disagreement, a discussion between the researcher and the second coder was had. Agreements and disagreements on

the presence or absence of each Move and Step, and newly agreed Moves and steps were recorded in an Excel spreadsheet, as shown in the following extract.

Sections	Sentence	My codes	2nd coder's codes	Match	Agreed codes
Abstract	S1	Presenting the research<PTR>M2	M2	1	
	S2	Summarizing the findings<STF>M4	M4	1	
	S3	Describing the methodology<DTM>M3	M3	1	
	S4	Summarizing the findings<STF>M4	M4	1	
	S5	Summarizing the findings<STF>M4	M5	0	M4
	S6	Discussing the research<DTR>M5	M5	1	
	S7	Discussing the research<DTR>M5	M5	1	

3.5.6 The analysis of authorial stance

The analysis of linguistic features signalling authorial stance in this study is based on Hyland's (2005a) stance taxonomy. After the titles, tables, quotations, figures, graphs, captions, appendices, footnotes, acknowledgements, and references were excluded, the two corpora of all Moves in .txt format were uploaded to #Lancsbox (Brezina, McEnery, & Wattam, 2015), a text analysis and concordance program. Then linguistic features of authorial stance were searched electronically. By using the KWIC (Key Words in Context) tool in #Lancsbox, the concordance lines of the list of stance markers (Hyland, 2005a), shown in Appendix A, were extracted. All instances were investigated to ensure that those devices functioned as stance markers. Only examples that function as stance markers were counted. Then, the analysis of stance features was conducted both quantitatively and qualitatively.

With regard to the quantitative dimension, the stance markers were investigated in terms of frequency of occurrences. For descriptive and statistical analysis, SPSS software was used in this study. The total number of tokens of a particular feature in each Move was counted and inserted into an SPSS file. The raw frequencies were normalized at 1000 words for making data comparable. and revealed stance features clustered in each Move. Finally, the comparison of frequencies of linguistic features occurring in each Move in both groups of texts was made. This was achieved by categorising the stance markers in each stance type into sub-categories. Then the number of occurrences of each sub-category of stance types and individual linguistic markers in each sub-category occurring across Moves in both corpora were compared to reveal the most/least common features in both corpora. The comparison was also drawn in terms of number of

Moves including each sub-category of stance types and individual linguistic features in each sub-category. To determine significant differences between the two corpora in the use of stance markers, Pearson chi-square tests were performed. A Bonferroni correction was applied to adjust significance thresholds as well.

In relation to the qualitative dimension, the context and co-text of linguistic features were taken into account. As this study aims to reveal how two groups of writers used linguistic devices to achieve their authorial stance in the texts, all instances were carefully analysed in their co-text and context. In this way, not only patterns of use of stance features in each Move were identified but also the semantic function of those features. Having explained the details of the research design, the next section addresses ethical considerations.

3.6 Ethical considerations

An ethical issue is a significant topic in research involving collecting data from people. In the stage of data collection, researchers need to respect the participants and sites for research (Creswell, 2009). For example, a researcher should recognize the potential for risk that may involve participants in a study, such as physical, psychological, social, economic, or legal harm (Sieber, 2009). Although this study does not involve human participants, some ethical considerations should be taken into account. The following sections discuss the issues of copyright and ethics in the context of corpus linguistics.

3.6.1 Copyright issue

As materials available on web pages could be used in corpora, the basic issue the corpus builder should be concerned in corpus construction is whether or not he/she has the legal right to collect or disseminate the data he/she aims to include in the corpora (McEnery & Hardie, 2012). Posited by McEnery & Hardie (2012), materials in electronic form are protected by copyright laws in the same way as those in printed forms are protected. Thus, to download a text from a website, and redistribute it as part of a corpus, the corpus constructor needs to ask for permission from the web owners. This is the case if the content providers on the web rely on fees for advertising that are paid per visitor. Therefore, if a person looks at a copy in a corpus instead of seeing the original webpage, the original

content provider suffers a financial loss. Redistribution of these local copies can be regarded as breaching the copyright.

There are a number of ways to deal with copyright issues when collecting data from the web. Firstly, text from the web can be treated in the same way as any other text. That is, the corpus creator seeks permission from the copyright holder to redistribute the text within a corpus under the terms of some specified licence. The creators of pre-web corpora such as the BNC and LOB and the creators of the EMILLE corpora followed this process. This method is achievable if one or a small number of websites are to be examined.

Secondly, corpus builders can gather information only from the webs such as Wikipedia that explicitly permit copying and redistributing. However, McEnery & Hardie cautioned that limiting a corpus to such sites could skew its representativeness.

Thirdly, data could be gathered without any permission, and not to disseminate it. However, the data can be available to other researchers through a device that does not permit copyright to be breached. In other words, corpus builders can make the data available through a web-based interface. Because only a few words of context around the node word are displayed on the web-based tool, this counts as 'fair use', and this redistribution is not regarded as violating copyright laws.

Finally, the copyright issue could be tackled by redistributing a list of web addresses where the corpus has been gathered rather than the downloaded data files. This method does not violate the rights of the text producer. Equipped with appropriate software, any researcher can download those web pages and rebuild their own personal copy of the corpus based on the list of those web addresses. However, the existence of a webpage is changeable; thus, this method is not a perfect solution.

3.6.2 Ethics in the context of corpus linguistics

Little attention has been paid to ethical issues in corpus construction, compared to legal issues (McEnery & Hardie, 2012). According to McEnery & Hardie (2012), ethical issues can generally be categorised into four main areas: ethical issues affecting respondents in a spoken corpus, ethical issues affecting corpus

builders, ethical issues affecting corpus distributors and ethical issues affecting corpus users.

3.6.2.1 Ethical issues affecting respondents in a spoken corpus

Ethical issues affecting respondents in a spoken language primarily involve the privacy of personal information of respondents and what is said in conversation. For example, a respondent may disclose his/her career and workplace to enable a corpus compiler to determine his/her social class. Not only the privacy of the respondents should be concerned, but also of the people the respondents spoke to, and of the people the respondents talked about. The privacy of all should be preserved by anonymisation. For example, a name typical of a male should be replaced with another name typical of a male. Besides names, other personal information including home addresses and credit card details should be anonymised. Anonymisation occurring in both audio and video recordings should be treated equally.

3.6.2.2 Ethical issues affecting corpus builders

In the process of corpus construction of a written corpus, corpus compilers should be aware of potentially offensive, immoral or illegal textual data. Corpus builders do not create corpora that are apparently unethical. The offensiveness of the text is the major ethical consideration for corpus builders when they compile texts, as it might have an effect on skewing the balance of the corpus towards a particular view. Furthermore, since corpora are multifunction, they might be employed for several purposes, which are not always ethical.

3.6.2.3 Ethical issues affecting corpus distributors

Corpus distributors have to ensure that the data they distribute is generated in compliance with legal and ethical standards. As discussed above, corpora may be used for a variety of purposes. Corpus distributors are ethically required to consider whether the purposes of the use of data are in agreement with the original corpus donors/collectors. Corpus distributors should inform potential users of the nature and aim of the material. In addition, the corpus distributors should ensure that the data they possess remains intact and available for future use.

3.6.2.4 Ethical issues affecting corpus users

Users of a corpus may face ethical issues when they analyse sensitive areas such as forensic linguistics. Analysts in forensic linguistics must carefully take results of the analysis into consideration, especially in terms of reliability and credibility of the analysis. An error in the analysis could have an adverse effect on someone. For example, somebody may be put in jail unfairly.

In addition, corpus users have an important ethical duty to make sure their analysis is replicable. To achieve this goal, a detailed procedure, as well as the results of the analysis, should be recorded. Finally, corpus users are obliged to ensure that their findings are interpreted correctly, as corpus linguistics could be misinterpreted by the mass media.

The present study is based on text analysis. Because it did not involve human participants, the research did not require ethical approval from the university's ethics committee. Furthermore, all research articles in this study were publicly accessed; hence, permission from the articles' writers was not required. They were used only for research purposes, and not distributed more widely. Thus, this did not breach legal and ethical standards.

3.7 Summary of the chapter

This chapter has attempted to provide the methodological process, adopted in this study. It first addressed the research questions of this study. It then reviewed the theoretical frameworks relevant to this study. It also gave an overview of the research design in this study by describing the corpus and data analysis. Finally, it addressed ethical concerns. The next chapter presents the findings of rhetorical structure and linguistic features used to express writers' stance.

Chapter 4

Findings

4.1 Introduction

This study sought answers to the following questions:

How are English research articles in Tourism written by Thai writers and published in Thai journals similar to and different from those published in international journals in terms of

a. rhetorical structure?
b. linguistic features used to express writers' stance?

This chapter, therefore, presents the results of the analysis of the rhetorical structure and linguistic features used to express the writers' stance. Characteristics of Move structure are presented in section 4.2. Section 4.3 addresses the findings of linguistic features used to express writers' stance. The last section (4.4) is a summary of the chapter.

4.2 Characteristics of Move structure

The characteristics of the Move structure are presented according to the following sections: Abstract, Introduction Methods, Results, and Discussion-Conclusions. The comparisons of Moves in both corpora were made in terms of frequency, the average number of sentences, and sequence. To obtain the number of texts containing each Move/step in each corpus, texts containing each Move/step were recorded in an Excel sheet and counted. The percentages of texts containing Move/step were computed by dividing the number of texts containing each Move/step by the total number of texts in each corpus, which is 50 in each corpus in this study. Then the result was multiplied by 100. For example, there were 29 articles including Move 1 in the international corpus. That is, the percentage of texts containing Move 1 is 58% (29 ÷ 50 = .58 X 100 = 58%).

To provide a precise proportion of content accounted by each Move and step in each section, this study also compares the number of mean sentences for each Move typically spent in each text, as shown in Table 4.2. It is possible that a Move occurring more frequently than other Moves may not account for the higher proportion of content. For example, Move 2 (Presenting the research) is the most

common Move in the Abstract, but has a lower mean number of sentences than Move 1 (Situating the research) and Move 4 (Summarising the findings). This could suggest that the content in the Abstract is mainly about situating the research (Move 1) or summarising the findings (Move 4) rather than presenting the research (Move 2). To obtain the mean number of sentences of each Move/step, the total number of sentences of each Move/step was divided by the number of texts containing each Move/step. For instance, there were 28 Thai articles including Move 1, and the total number of sentences of Move 1 in the Thai corpus is 72. Thus, the mean number of sentences of Move 1 per text is 2.57 (72 ÷ 28 = 2.57).

To test the statistical significance of differences in frequencies of Moves and mean sentences, Pearson chi-square and one-way ANOVA tests were performed by using SPSS. As there were several comparisons in this study, a Bonferroni correction was applied to adjust significance thresholds. This is achieved by dividing the alpha level (.05) by the number of comparisons in each analysis. Applying Bonferroni correction reduces the risk of Type 1 errors (Pallant, 2020).

4.2.1 The Abstract of the article

As discussed in Chapter 3 (section 3.5.5), Swales' (2004) and Pho's (2013) frameworks were used as a preliminary framework for the present study. Details of the reasons why these two frameworks were chosen for the study and how they were developed were explained in Chapter 3 (section 3.5.5). In relation to the Abstract, the articles were analysed according to Pho's (2013) framework, as shown in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1: Move structure of the Abstract (Pho, 2013, p. 46)

Moves	Function/Description	Examples from the corpus
Move 1: Situating the research <STR>	- Setting the scene for the current research (topic generalization)	The relationships between biodiversity conservation and ecosystem services are widely debated. (E4)
Move 2: Presenting the research <PTR>	- Stating the purpose of the study, research questions and/or hypothesis	This study aimed to 1) identify different characteristics of Kew Mae Pan and Pha Mon Nature Trail, 2) investigate the problems of tourism management, and 3) propose the guidelines for managing sustainable tourism in Kew Mae Pan and Pha Mon Nature Trail. (TH6)
Move 3: Describing the methodology <DTM>	- Describing the materials, subjects, variables, procedures, ….	This research is quantitatively and qualitatively conducted. The representative samples are eight key informants from the agency relevant to ancient remains and 400 respondents who are people in the area of ancient remains. (TH12)
Move 4: Summarizing the findings <STF>	- Reporting the main findings of the study	Findings also revealed conditions for success in developing creative tourism in a community-based tourism context. (E19)
Move 5: Discussing the research <DTR>	- Interpreting the results/findings and/or giving recommendations, implications/application of the study	The findings from the current study suggest that perceptions of touristic attractions/activities are different by country although some similarities do exist. (E20)

The majority of the abstracts in both international and Thai corpora consist of three or four Moves. There is one abstract in each corpus that consists of only one Move, namely, Move 1. Both groups of writers include Move 2 and Move 4 in their abstract at a high level, over 80%. On the contrary, Move 1 is less frequently used by both groups of writers. Table 4.2 demonstrates the distribution of Moves and average sentences per text in the abstracts in research articles in each corpus.

Table 4.2: Distribution of Moves and mean sentences in the Abstract

Moves	Number of texts containing move					Mean sentences/text				
	International corpus (N=50)	Thai corpus (N=50)	Pearson Chi-square test			International corpus	Thai corpus	One-way ANOVA test		
			X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side			F	P-value	Eta squared effect side
Move 1: Situating the research<STR>	29 (58%)	28 (56%)	.000	1.00	.020 small effect	2.52	2.57	.013	.909	.000 small effect
Move 2: Presenting the research<PTR>	46 (92%)	48 (96%)	.709	.678	.084 small effect	1.37	1.23	1.087	.300	.012 small effect
Move 3: Describing the methodology <DTM>	30 (60%)	46 (92%)	14.035	< .001	.375 medium effect	1.67	2.50	10.829	.002	.128 medium effect
Move 4: Summarizing the findings<STF>	40 (80%)	42 (84%)	.271	.603	.052 small effect	2.13	4.00	8.752	.004	.099 medium effect
Move 5: Discussing the research<DTR>	38 (76%)	27 (54%)	5.319	.021	.231 small effect	1.50	1.74	1.054	.309	.016 small effect

Table 4.2 shows Move 2 is the most common Move in the abstracts of both corpora. Although this Move tends to occur more frequently in the Thai abstracts than in the international abstracts, a chi-square test shows that the difference between the text types is not significant. In this analysis, an adjusted significance threshold was .01. A significant difference between groups of texts exists in the frequency of Move 3, ($X^2(1) = 14.035$, $p < .001$, medium effect: Cramer's V effect size = .375). Thai writers use Move 3 more frequently than international writers. This Move was found in 92 percent of Thai abstracts but only 60 percent of international abstracts.

There are small differences in the frequencies of Move 1, Move 4 and Move 5. International writers use Move 1 and Move 5 more often than Thai writers while the opposite trend can be seen in the use of Move 4. However, the results of the chi-square tests reveal that these differences are not statistically significant.

Thai articles have higher mean values than international articles for all Moves except Move 2. Move 1 has the highest proportion of content in international abstracts whereas Move 4 accounts for the highest proportion in Thai abstracts. Interestingly, though Move 5 occurs more frequently in international abstracts, the mean value for this Move in international texts appears to be lower than in Thai texts (1.50 in international journals and 1.74 in Thai journals). However, the results of the ANOVA test show that the differences between the two groups in the mean sentences for these five Moves are not significant.

In terms of the sequence of Moves, the general trend of the Moves in both corpora is linear. That is, the Moves are likely to occur in sequential orders (i.e., Move1-Move 2-Move 3-Move 4-Move 5). However, there are six exceptions in international journals and eight exceptions in Thai journals, in which the Moves occur in a non-linear order. In two out of six international abstracts, Move 1 comes after Move 2, Move 3 comes after Move 4 in another two abstracts, and Move 5 comes before Move 3 and/or Move 4 in yet another two abstracts. In five out of eight of the Thai abstracts, Move 2 and/or Move 1 comes after Move 3. Move 1 comes after Move 2 in another three Thai abstracts.

Move cycles were found in both English and Thai abstracts. The cycle of Move 3-Move 4 occurs in two international abstracts. In two Thai abstracts, a Move

cycle was found: one contained a Move cycle from Move 2-Move 1, and the other a Move cycle from Move 4-Move 5. In addition, Move 5 occurs twice in one international abstract, whereas Move 2 occurs twice in one Thai abstract, and Move 4 is also repeated twice in another Thai abstract.

In conclusion, both international and Thai articles share a number of key features in the Move structure of the Abstract. The most common Move in both types of texts is Move 2. There is a statistically significant difference between texts in the number of texts containing Move 3. Thai writers use Move 3 more extensively than international writers. However, there are no significant differences in the number of texts including the other four moves. In terms of the mean number of sentences spent on each Move in the abstracts, no significant differences were found between the two sets of data. Moves tend to occur in linear order, and move cycles were found in both groups of texts.

- The most common Move in both types of texts is Move 2.
- There is a statistically significant difference between texts in the number of texts containing Move 3.
- Thai writers use Move 3 more extensively than international writers.
- There are no significant differences in the number of texts including the other four moves.
- In terms of the mean number of sentences spent on each Move in the abstracts, no significant differences were found between the two sets of data.
- Moves tend to occur in linear order.
- Move cycles were found in both groups of texts.

4.2.2 The Introduction section

As discussed in Chapter 3 (section 3.5.3.1), extra sections such as *Literature review*, and *Theoretical background* occurring between the Introduction and Methods sections were considered as parts of the Introduction section. These extra sections, hence, were combined with the Introduction section. Three moves were identified in the introductions of both international and Thai journals, namely,

Move 6, Move 7 and Move 8. A number of steps were employed to realize these three moves. The framework used to analyse the structure in the Introduction section was adapted from Swales' (2004) and Pho's (2013) frameworks as shown in Table 4.3. The three major moves were from Swales' (2004) framework. The only one step, namely Topic generalization, in Swales' (2004) Move 1(Establishing a territory) has been criticized that it is too broad (Adnan, 2008; Sheldon, 2013). Therefore, steps in Move 6 and Move 7 were mainly adapted from Pho's (2013) framework. Regarding steps in Move 7, there are three steps in Pho's framework, namely Step 1: Indicating a gap, Step 2: Explaining reason for the gap, and Step 3: Presenting positive justification. However, based on the preliminary analysis of the present study, Step 2 was not found in the study. Instead of Step 2, Step 1B was observed, especially in Thai journals. The steps used to realize Move 6 and Move 7 are shown in Table 4.3. Steps in Move 8 were adopted from Swales' (2004) framework, as shown in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3: Move structure of the Introduction section

Moves	Function/Description	Examples from the corpus
Move 6: Establishing a territory <EST> Step 1: Summarizing existing studies <SES>	- Reporting findings from previous studies, presenting background information, reviewing existing theories, frameworks, models and definitions, presenting general knowledge, addressing a topic that is worth investigating to show the field is well-established, indicating the importance of the field	Conflict in tourism involves multiple stakeholders with diverse values and the interaction dynamics can thus be complex (McKercher, Ho, & du Cros, 2005, p. 542). (E2)
Step 2: Drawing inferences from previous studies <DRI>	- Discussing and interpreting previous studies	These findings suggest a potential positive association between motivation and perceived impacts at dark heritage sites. (E23)
Step 3: Raising questions/ Generating preliminary hypotheses <GPH>	- Generating questions and/or tentative hypotheses out of previous studies	In recognizing the importance of networking and sustainability of STEs, how can an STE establish “proper” awareness concerning sustainable tourism development during its development? (E16)
Step 4: Referring to context of present study <RCT>	- Presenting the context or background information of the present study -	The Angkhang Royal Project Agricultural Extension Area was located in Mae Ngon and Mon Pin sub-district, Fang

Moves	Function/Description	Examples from the corpus
		District, Chiang Mai Province, covering 20,312 Rais 2 Ngans. (TH11)
Step 5: Foreshadowing aim of the present study <FAI>	- Mentioning what the present study is going to be about	Whilst the above solutions focus on the destination, this research is interested in exploring solutions focused on the tourist. (E38)
Step 6: Outlining structure of the section <OSS>	- Indicating the outline of the section	The following section explains each dimension in more detail. (E46)
Move 7: Establishing a niche <ESN> Step 1A: Indicating a gap <GAP>	- Indicating a gap in previous research	However, the discussion on the phenomenon of behavioural conflict has not been well investigated. (E2)
Step 1B: Indicating problems in research sites or the real world <PRS>	- Indicating problems in the research sites of the present study or the real world	Even though Chiang Mai has many potential tourism sites that influence toward high service quality, many more tourists were satisfied with tourism activities, the proliferation of tourists, and the continuity of tourism site development by local organization administration, they still lack understanding in

Moves	Function/Description	Examples from the corpus
		good administration and effective management. (TH22)
Step 2: Presenting positive justification <JUS>	- Explaining why the gap has to be filled or why the expansion of previous research is necessary	To better understand the role of psychological and social determinants of ecotourism behaviours, an integrative theoretical framework is needed to overcome the fragmented approach that arises out of the presence of various, often existing theoretical behavioural models. (E18)
Move 8: Presenting the present work <PPW>		
Step 1: Announcing present research descriptively and/or purposively <PRE>	- Announcing the purpose or content of the present study	This paper examines the positive and negative impacts of tourism at Wat Pho, a leading Bangkok religious tourism site, and its heritage value in the eyes of relevant stakeholders. (TH15)
Step 2: Presenting research questions or hypotheses<RQH>	- Formally (and explicitly) presenting the research questions or hypotheses	To achieve these objectives, three questions were proposed: What issues cause conflict; how do these issues evolve and is there any connection among them; and who are the major parties in the

Moves	Function/Description	Examples from the corpus
		conflicts and what roles do they play. (E2)
Step 3: Defining terms <DEF>	- Giving definitions of the key terms and/or clarifying the key concepts used in the present study	Thus, the term “tour leader” discussed in this study refers to two roles, namely, tour leader and local guide. (E5)
Step 4: Summarizing methods <MET>	- Summarizing the methods used in the present study	The eight countries were selected based on their representativeness of different parts of the globe and ethnicities. (E20)
Step 5: Announcing principal outcomes <OUT>	- Announcing some major findings of the study	Drawing on field studies conducted at religious festivals in Bhutan, the research presented in this paper demonstrates that the conflicts and changes experienced by traditional festivals in the contemporary world and possible ways of engaging these conflicts and changes – may be understood in terms of the mechanisms of liquid modernity. (E22)
Step 6: Stating the value of the present research <VAL>	- Stating the value or significance of the present study	It is anticipated that understanding the causes of success or failure of CBT will benefit the process of

Moves	Function/Description	Examples from the corpus
Step 7: Outlining the structure of the paper <OST>	- Giving an overview of the structure of the paper	community tourism development in future. (TH24) The literature review in the next section examines the relevant global and Chinese contexts to more fully justify the research, and this is followed by a description of the Red Beach National Scenic Corridor case study in North-eastern China and the justification for its selection. Subsequent sections describe the method, the results, and the practical and theoretical implications of the findings. (E1)

Most Introductions contained at least two moves. Only one Thai article consisted of one Move, namely Move 6. Table 4.4 shows the statistics for the number of texts including Move and mean sentences in the Introduction of each corpus. A closer inspection of the table reveals that all introductions of international and Thai journals contain Move 6. Based on the adjusted significance threshold (.017), there is a significant difference between texts in the number of texts containing Move 7, ($x^2(1) = 11.422$, $p < .001$, medium effect: Cramer's V effect size = .338). This Move is much more common in international texts than in Thai texts. On the contrary, there is no significant difference between the two sets of data in the number of texts containing Move 8, though the international texts have a marginally higher number of texts containing Move 8. Move 6 accounts for the greater proportion of the introduction in both text types. International introductions have a significantly higher mean number of sentences for all three moves than Thai introductions, (Move 6: $F = 28.946$, $p < .001$, large effect: eta squared = .228; Move 7: $F = 6.365$, $p = .014$, medium effect: eta squared = .077; Move 8: $F = 15.581$, $p < .001$, large effect: eta squared = .142).

Table 4.4: Summary of Move occurrences and mean sentences in the Introduction section

Moves	Number of texts containing moves					Mean sentences/text				
	International corpus (N=50)	Thai corpus (N=50)	Pearson Chi-square test			International corpus	Thai corpus	One-way ANOVA test		
			X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side			F	P-value	Eta squared effect side
Move 6: Establishing a territory <EST>	50 (100%)	50 (100%)	-	-	-	78.24	44.34	28.946	<.001	.228 large effect
Move 7: Establishing a niche <ESN>	46(92%)	32 (64%)	11.422	< .001	.338 medium effect	5.02	2.88	6.365	.014	.077 medium effect
Move 8: Presenting the present work <PPW>	49 (98%)	47 (94%)	1.042	.307	.102 small effect	9.67	5.53	15.581	<.001	.142 large effect

With regard to the sequence of Moves, the most common pattern in research introductions is Move 6-Move 7-Move 8. However, eleven articles in the international corpus and two articles in the Thai corpus do not follow this standard pattern. Ten articles in international introductions begin with Move 6 followed by Move 8 and Move 7 respectively. This pattern is also seen in those two Thai articles. Just one international article begins with Move 7 followed by Move 6 and Move 8.

Cyclical patterns were found in both sets of texts. Based on the analysis, it can be said that the longer an introduction is, the more cyclical patterns tend to occur. Most international articles have cyclical patterns in all three moves, especially in the cycles of Move 6-Move 7, and Move 6-Move 8. These two cyclical patterns are also found in Thai articles but with less frequency. The following extract illustrates the cycle of Move 6-Move 7:

> **<Establishing a territory>**
> Particularly in developing countries, small-sized enterprises are often the face of the tourism industry (hereafter, these enterprises are called small tourism enterprises: STEs), and they represent the local community to communicate with tourists and local government […]
> **<Establishing a niche>**
> To date, existing studies have minimally explored STEs' perceptions regarding sustainable tourism […]
> **<Establishing a territory>**
> A literature review suggests that how social networks may affect the social sustainability of STEs […]
> **<Establishing a niche>**
> Existing studies on network analysis in the tourism literature have further neglected the view of disadvantaged areas, which are far from the popular tourism market […]
> **<Presenting the present work>**
> This study presents a unique case study by illuminating STEs' engagement in public-private networking towards sustainability […]
>
> (E16)

This cycle is repeated twice before the presence of Move 8. The cycle occurs again later in this introduction, where the cyclical pattern of these two Moves is also repeated several times.

In summary, overall, Move 6 is the most common Move in both international and Thai introductions, as it occurs in all articles in both corpora. There is a statistically significant difference between texts in the number of texts containing Move 7. This Move is much more common in international texts than in Thai texts. In contrast, no significant difference between the two groups was evident

in the number of texts incorporating Move 8. With regard to the mean sentences, international articles have a significantly higher mean number of sentences for all three Moves than Thai articles. The general pattern of the Move sequence in the Introductions is M6-M7-M8. The cyclicity of Moves varies according to the length of the introductions.

- Overall, Move 6 is the most common Move in both international and Thai introductions
- There is a statistically significant difference between texts in the number of texts containing Move 7.
- Move 7 is much more common in international texts than in Thai texts.
- No significant difference between the two groups was evident in the number of texts incorporating Move 8.
- With regard to the mean sentences, international articles have a significantly higher mean number of sentences for all three Moves than Thai articles.
- The general pattern of the Move sequence in the Introductions is M6-M7-M8.
- The cyclicity of Moves varies according to the length of the introductions.

4.2.2.1 Steps realising Moves in the Introduction section

4.2.2.1.1 Steps in Move 6 (Establishing a territory)

To establish a territory (Move 6) in the introduction of research articles, six steps or strategies were identified. Table 4.5 presents the distribution of all six steps identified in Move 6 and the mean sentences per text in each corpus.

As shown in Table 4.5, while Step 1 is the most common step in international texts, Step 4 is the most preferred step in Thai texts. According to a Bonferroni correction, the significance threshold was .008. A chi-square test revealed that no significant difference between texts was found in the number of texts including Step 1, but there was a significant difference in the number of texts containing Step 4, ($x^2(1) = 9.543$, $p = .002$, medium effect: Cramer's V effect size = .309). Furthermore, there were also statistically significant differences between texts

containing Step 2 and Step 5. International texts have a significantly higher number of texts including both steps than Thai texts, (Step 2: $x^2(1) = 14.729$, $p < .001$, medium effect: Cramer's V effect size = .384; Step 5: $x^2(1) = 7.111$, $p = .008$, small effect: Cramer's V effect size = .267). Regarding Step 3 and Step 6, no significant differences were found between texts, though these two steps are found more frequently in international articles. In terms of the mean number of sentences per text, international articles have a higher mean number of sentences for all steps except Step 6. Even though Step 1 accounts for the highest proportion of content in the introductions in both text groups, international authors make significantly greater use of Step 1 than Thai authors, ($F = 24.175$, $p < .001$, large effect: eta squared = .208). Although there are differences between texts in the mean number of sentences for the other five steps, no statistically significant differences were found.

Table 4.5: Distribution of steps and mean sentences in Move 6

Steps	Number of texts containing step					Mean sentences/text				
	International corpus (N=50)	Thai corpus (N=50)	Pearson Chi-square test			International corpus	Thai corpus	One-way ANOVA test		
			X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side			F	P-value	Eta squared effect side
1: Summarizing existing studies <SES>	50 (100%)	44 (88%)	6.383	.027	.253 small effect	62.02	33.70	24.175	< .001	.208 large effect
2: Drawing inferences from previous studies <DRI>	38 (76%)	19 (38%)	14.729	< .001	.384 medium effect	6.26	4.84	.800	.375	.014 small effect
3: Raising questions/Generating hypotheses <GPH>	5 (10%)	1 (2%)	2.837	.204	.168 small effect	1.8	1.00	.314	.605	.073 medium effect
4: Referring to context of the present study <RCT	32 (64%)	45 (90%)	9.543	.002	.309 medium effect	16.97	14.16	.799	.374	.011 small effect
5: Foreshadowing aim of the present study <FAI>	9 (18%)	1 (2%)	7.111	.008	.267 small effect	1.22	1.00	.229	.645	.028 small effect
6: Outlining structure of the section <OSS>	7 (14%)	2 (4%)	3.053	.160	.175 small effect	1.43	1.50	.013	.912	.002 small effect

In summary, there are statistically significant differences between texts in the number of texts containing Step 2, Step 4, and Step 5. International writers make significantly greater use of Step 2 and Step 5, while Thai writers make more extensive use of Step 4. There are no significant differences between texts in the mean sentences for all steps except Step 1. International texts are more likely than Thai texts to have a significantly higher number of average sentences for Step 1.

- There are statistically significant differences between texts in the number of texts containing Step 2, Step 4, and Step 5.
- International writers make significantly greater use of Step 2 and Step 5, while Thai writers make more extensive use of Step 4.
- There are no significant differences between texts in the mean sentences for all steps except Step 1.
- International texts are more likely than Thai texts to have a significantly higher number of average sentences for Step 1.

4.2.2.1.2 Steps in Move 7 (Establishing a niche)

Three steps were identified in order to establish a niche (Move 7). Table 4.6 provides the statistics for the distribution of steps and mean sentences per text in Move 7.

What is interesting about the data in Table 4.6 is that the most common step used to realise Move 7 in international articles is Step 1A while Step 1B is the preferred step in Thai articles. Based on the adjusted significance threshold (.017), a chi-square test showed that the difference between texts in the frequency of Step 1A was statistically significant, ($x^2(1) = 41.558$, $p < .001$, large effect: Cramer's V effect size = .645). By contrast, there was no statistically significant difference between texts including Step 1B. Similarly, no significant difference between texts was evident in the number of texts containing Step 2, although this step occurs more frequently in international introductions than in Thai introductions. Whereas Step 1A accounts for the greater proportion of content in Move 7 in international articles, Step 1B accounts for the greater proportion of the content in the Move in Thai articles. International articles have a higher mean number of

sentences for Step 2 as well. Nevertheless, the one-way ANOVA tests did not show any significant differences between texts for the mean sentences for all three steps.

Table 4.6: Distribution of steps and mean sentences in Move 7

Steps	Number of texts containing step					Mean sentences/text				
	International corpus (N=50)	Thai corpus (N=50)	Pearson Chi-square test			International corpus	Thai corpus	One-way ANOVA test		
			X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side			F	P-value	Eta squared effect side
1A: Indicating a gap <GAP>	44 (88%)	12 (24%)	41.558	< .001	.645 large effect	3.80	1.67	3.95	.052	.068 medium effect
1B: Indicating problems in real world or research sites <PRS>	12 (24%)	16 (32%)	.794	.373	.089 small effect	1.75	3.06	3.160	.087	.108 medium effect
2: Presenting positive justification <JUS>	15 (30%)	14 (28%)	.049	.826	.022 small effect	2.87	1.64	5.142	.032	.160 large effect

To conclude, there are no statistically significant differences between texts in the number of texts incorporating all three steps except Step 1A. International writers exhibit a stronger preference for the use of Step 1A than Thai writers. With regard to the mean number of sentences per text, Step 1A accounts for the greater proportion of content in Move 7 in international texts, while the mean number of sentences for Step 1B is the highest in Thai texts. However, no statistically significant differences between texts were found in the mean number of sentences for all three steps.

- There are no statistically significant differences between texts in the number of texts incorporating all three steps except Step 1A.
- International writers exhibit a stronger preference for the use of Step 1A than Thai writers.
- With regard to the mean number of sentences per text, Step 1A accounts for the greater proportion of content in Move 7 in international texts, while the mean number of sentences for Step 1B is the highest in Thai texts.
- No statistically significant differences between texts were found in the mean number of sentences for all three steps.

4.2.2.1.3 Steps in Move 8 (Presenting the present work)

Seven steps were identified to realise Move 8. Table 4.7 provides an overview of the distribution of steps in Move 8 and mean sentences per text in each sub-corpus. The table shows that Step 1 is the most common step in both Thai and international articles, while Step 5 is the least frequent step in both corpora. Despite international texts having a higher number of texts, including both steps, no significant differences between the two groups were evident. The Bonferroni correction in this particular analysis was .007. Statistically significant differences exist in the number of texts incorporating Step 2, Step 3 and Step 4, (Step 2: $x^2(1) = 7.250$, $p = .007$, small effect: Cramer's V effect size = .269; Step 3: $x^2(1) = 9.756$, $p = .004$, medium effect: Cramer's V effect size = .312; Step 4: $x^2(1) = 15.868$, $p = < .001$, medium effect: Cramer's V effect size = .398). Compared to Thai writers, international writers significantly employ these three steps in the introductions. Step 6 is more frequently used in international articles but

statistically significant differences between texts were not found in the number of texts including these two steps.

In reference to mean sentences, overall, Step 2 accounts for the greater proportion of content in both Thai and international articles. Although the mean number of sentences per text for this step is higher in international articles than in Thai articles, there is no statistically significant difference between the two sets of texts. International texts also have a higher mean number for the other six steps, except Step 3. However, these differences were not statistically significant.

Table 4.7: Distribution of steps and mean sentences in Move 8

Steps	Number of texts containing step					Mean sentences/text				
	International corpus (N=50)	Thai corpus (N=50)	Pearson Chi-square test			International corpus	Thai corpus	One-way ANOVA test		
			X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side			F	P-value	Eta squared effect side
1: Announcing present research descriptively and/or purposively <PRE>	49 (98%)	46 (92%)	1.895	.362	.138 small effect	2.86	2.83	.008	.930	.000 small effect
2: Presenting research questions or hypotheses <RQH>	25 (50%)	12 (24%)	7.250	.007	.269 small effect	6.04	4.67	.712	.404	.020 small effect
3: Defining terms <DEF>	15 (30%)	3 (6%)	9.756	.004	.312 medium effect	1.93	2.67	.911	.354	.054 small effect
4: Summarizing methods <MET>	27 (54%)	8 (16%)	15.868	< .001	.398 medium effect	2.07	1.50	.934	.341	.028 small effect
5: Announcing principal outcomes <OUT>	2 (4%)	0 (0%)	2.041	.153	.143 small effect	1.00	0.00	-	-	-
6: Stating the value of the present research <VAL>	28 (56%)	26 (52%)	.161	.688	.040 small effect	2.00	1.96	.009	.923	.000 small effect
7: Outlining the structure of the paper <OST>	10 (20%)	2 (4%)	6.061	.014	.246 small effect	4.00	1.50	3.415	.094	.255 large effect

In summary, compared to Thai writers, international writers make greater use of Step 2, Step 3, and Step 4. In general, Step 2 accounts for the larger proportion of content in Move 8 in both Thai and international introductions. However, the one-way ANOVA results show that no significant differences between the two groups were found in the mean number of sentences for all steps.

- Compared to Thai writers, international writers make greater use of Step 2, Step 3, and Step 4.
- In general, Step 2 accounts for the larger proportion of content in Move 8 in both Thai and international introductions.
- The one-way ANOVA results show that no significant differences between the two groups were found in the mean number of sentences for all steps.

4.2.3 The Methods Section

The analysis was undertaken in accordance with the framework in Table 4.8. The framework was adapted from Lim's (2006), Pho's (2013), and Cotos et al.'s (2017). All three steps in Move 9 were adapted from Cotos et al.'s (2017) framework, which investigated nine hundred research articles Methods section from thirty disciplines, each represented by thirty texts. All steps in Move 10 and Move 11 were adopted from Pho's (2013) except Step 3 (Previewing results) in Move 11, adapted from Lim's (2006). Move 12, appeared in the preliminary analysis of the current study.

From the data in Table 4.9, it is apparent that both international and Thai writers find it necessary to clarify the data and data collection procedure (Move 10) in the Methods section. All writers include this move in the Methods section. Given that the Bonferroni correction was .0125, there is a significant difference between texts in the frequency of Move 9, ($x^2(1) = 8.208$, $p = .004$, small effect: Cramer's V effect size = .286). Thai writers are more likely than international writers to contextualise study methods (Move 9) in the articles. Although Move 11 and Move 12 are found more frequently in international articles, none of these differences were statistically significant. With respect to the average length of each move in the Methods section, Move 10 has the highest mean number of sentences in both corpora. However, when comparing both groups of texts, international articles have a considerably higher mean number of sentences than

Thai articles for Move 9, Move 10 and Move 11. These differences were significant (Move 9: $F = 6.794$, $p = .011$, medium effect: eta squared = .090; Move 10: $F = 29.273$, $p < .001$, large effect: eta squared = .230; Move 11: $F = 26.204$, $p < .001$, large effect: eta squared = .224). As Move 12 was found only in international texts, a one-way ANOVA test could not be performed.

The general trend of occurrences of Moves in the Methods section is in sequential orders; that is: Move 9-Move 10-Move 11-Move 12. The majority of articles begin the Methods section with Move 9, followed by Move 10, and Move 11. Nevertheless, occurrences of a non-linear order were also found. In three international articles and four Thai articles, Move 10 comes before Moves 9, followed by Move 11. In two articles from each corpus Move, 11 came before Move 10; one article from each corpus has a pattern of Move 10-Move11-Move 9. Only one international article and two Thai articles consist of one move, namely Move 10.

There are variations in move cycles between the two groups of articles. The cyclical pattern occurs more frequently in international articles. The most frequent cycle is Move10-Move11. This cycle was repeated more than once in sixteen international articles and seven Thai articles. The cycle of Move 9-Move 10 occurs in the corpora. This cycle was found in two international articles and in five Thai articles.

Table 4.8: Move structure of the Methods section

Moves	Function/Description	Examples from the corpus
Move 9: Contextualizing study methods <CSM> Step 1: Referencing previous works <RPW>	- Situating aspects of the chosen methodology in the breadth of relevant previous works by means of citation, footnotes, and relatively detailed descriptions of methodologies in the representative studies	A review of previous studies (Choi & Sirakaya, 2006; Lee and King, 2008; Graham, 2001; Le Trinh Hai et al, 2009) had shown that the most common research method deriving the effective indicators to evaluate the sustainable CBT is a modified Delphi technique. (TH24)
Step 2: Providing general information <PGI>	- Providing relevant theoretical, empirical, or informational background (e.g., conceptual/theoretical frameworks) - (Re)stating research purposes, hypotheses, gaps in empirical knowledge, and other information that is generally introduced earlier in the paper	This study is based on the constructivist paradigm which views nature of knowledge as subjective, regards truth as context dependent, and is supported by hermeneutics and phenomenology. (E2)
Step 3: Identifying the methodological approach <IMA>	- Specifying the research approach/ methods/research design with brevity or elaboration	A mixed methods research design was adopted, incorporating a quantitative questionnaire survey and qualitative semi-structured interviews. (E6)

Moves	Function/Description	Examples from the corpus
Move 10: Describing the data and data collection procedure <DCP>		
Step 1: Describing the sample <DES>	- Describing the participants of the study (including the context of the study such as location or source of the sample, the size of the population, the characteristics of the sample, sampling technique or selection or grouping criteria) or the data of the study	Ban Tha Chin, located on the Gulf of Thailand, is ideal for trade and fishery and has had a continuous existence while it remains historic evidence of the past. (TH4)
Step 2: Describing research instruments <DEI>	- Describing the questionnaire, interview, or tests used in the study	Questions in the in-depth interview were adapted from previous case studies completed both in Thailand and abroad. (TH3)
Step 3: Recounting steps in data collection <RES>	- Describing the actual steps in data collection	All interviews were digitally recorded, and written notes were taken during the interviews, with interview summary notes also made after the interviews. (E 21)
Step 4: Justifying the data collection procedure <JUC>	- Explaining why particular subjects or instruments were selected or particular steps had to be followed - Highlighting the advantage(s) of using the sample in comparison to other samples used in previous studies - Indicating the extent to which the sample is representative of the population	Yuanjia Village was chosen as the study case because it has successfully used rural tourism as an approach to sustainably revitalize itself. (E25)

Moves	Function/Description	Examples from the corpus
Move 11: Describing data analysis procedure <RED>		
Step 1: Recounting data analysis procedure <RED>	- Describing how the data were dealt with after being collected - Describing the variables including methods of measuring variables - Describing tools used in analysing data (e.g., coding schemes or statistical techniques)	The collected questionnaires were coded and analysed in a statistical program, SPSS. (TH 2)
Step 2: Justifying the data analysis procedure <JUA>	- Explaining why particular analysis tools were used - Justifying with reference to methods, scales, or items used in the study including limitations - Making specific reference to the validity and/or reliability of a method for measuring variables	Thematic analysis is capable of capturing the nuances and deeper meanings from qualitative data and allows a latent (interpretive) rather than semantic (explicit or surface) approach to be taken (Braun & Clarke, 2006). (E21)
Step 3: Previewing results <PRR>	- Reporting results of statistical analysis - Reporting relationships between variables - Describing results of comparisons of models, groups, and categories - Reporting results pertaining to time-related changes - Introducing some data illustrated in tables	The regression results and the diagnostic statistics are summarized in Table 4. (E35)
Move 12: Previewing the following section(s) <PFS>	- Giving an overview of the following section(s)	The following section presents and discusses the key themes that emerged in relation to the participants' leisure tourism experiences. (E21)

Table 4.9: Summary of Move occurrences and mean sentences in the Methods section

Moves	Number of texts containing move					Mean sentences/text				
	International corpus (N=50)	Thai corpus (N=50)	Pearson Chi-square test			International corpus	Thai corpus	One-way ANOVA test		
			X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side			F	P-value	Eta squared effect side
Move 9: Contextualizing study methods <CSM>	29 (58%)	42 (84%)	8.208	.004	.286 small effect	8.38	3.31	6.794	.011	.090 medium effect
Move 10: Describing the data and data collection procedure <DCP>	50 (100%)	50 (100%)	-	-	-	25.34	10.90	29.273	< .001	.230 large effect
Move 11: Describing data analysis procedure <RED>	48 (96%)	45 (90%)	1.382	.436	.118 small effect	16.29	4.24	26.204	< .001	.224 large effect
Move 12: Previewing the following section(s) <PFS>	3 (6%)	0 (0%)	3.093	.242	.176 small effect	1.33	0	-	-	-

To sum up, all four Moves in the Method section are more common in the international corpus than in the Thai corpus. Move 10 is the most common Move and accounts for the highest proportion of content in the Methods sections. Move 9 appears with a greater frequency in Thai articles, compared to international articles. This difference is statistically significant. Furthermore, significant differences also exist in the average length of the content of Move 9, Move 10 and Move 11. International articles have a remarkably higher mean number of sentences per text than Thai articles for these three moves. Move 11 and Move 12 are more common in the international corpus than in the Thai corpus, but there are no significant differences between the two groups. The sequence of moves tends to occur in linear order. Cyclical patterns were found in both groups of texts; the most common cycle in both corpora is Move 10-Move 11.

- All four Moves in the Method section are more common in the international corpus than in the Thai corpus.
- Move 10 is the most common Move and accounts for the highest proportion of content in the Methods sections.
- There is a significant difference in the frequency of Move 9 between the two groups.
- Move 9 appears with a greater frequency in Thai articles, compared to international articles.
- Significant differences also exist in the average length of the content of Move 9, Move 10 and Move 11.
- International articles have a remarkably higher mean number of sentences per text than Thai articles for Move 9, Move 10 and Move 11.
- Move 11 and Move 12 are more common in the international corpus than in the Thai corpus, but there are no significant differences between the two groups.
- The sequence of moves tends to occur in linear order.
- Cyclical patterns were found in both groups of texts.
- The most common cycle in both corpora is Move 10-Move 11.

4.2.3.1 Steps realising Moves in the Methods section

4.2.3.1.1 Steps in Move 9 (Contextualizing study methods)

In order to realize Move 9, three steps were identified. The distribution of all three steps and mean sentences are shown in Table 4.10.

In Table 4.10, the most common step in both sets of data is Step 3. Although the Thai corpus has a higher number of texts consisting of Step 3 than the international corpus, no statistically significant difference between texts was found based on the adjusted significant threshold, .017. Step 1 is avoided by both groups of authors. It was found in only one Thai article and was not found in any international articles. Similar to Step 1 and Step 3, Step 2 is more common in Thai texts than in international texts, but no statistically significant difference between texts was evident. In terms of the mean number of sentences, Step 2 has the greater mean number of sentences per text in the international corpus, while the mean number for Step 1 is greater in the Thai corpus. However, there are no significant differences between texts in the mean number of sentences for these two steps. A significant difference between texts was found in the mean number of sentences for Step 3 ($F = 16.598$, $p < .001$, large effect: eta squared = .246). International texts have a considerably greater mean number of sentences for this step than Thai texts.

Table 4.10: Distribution of steps and mean sentences in Move 9

Steps	Number of texts containing step					Mean sentences/text				
			Pearson Chi-square test			International corpus	Thai corpus	One-way ANOVA test		
	International corpus (N=50)	Thai corpus (N=50)	X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side			F	P-value	Eta squared effect side
Step 1: Referencing previous works <RPW>	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	1.010	1.00	.101 small effect	0.00	5.00	-	-	-
Step 2: Providing general information <PGI>	17 (34%)	26 (52%)	3.305	.069	.182 small effect	10.12	3.23	6.112	.018	.130 medium effect
Step 3: Identifying the methodological approach <IMA>	21 (42%)	32 (64%)	4.857	.028	.220 small effect	3.38	1.56	16.598	< .001	.246 large effect

In conclusion, all three steps used to realise Move 9 are more common in Thai articles. Step 3 is the most common step used in both sets of texts. Nonetheless, there are no significant differences in the number of texts including these three steps between the two groups. With regard to the average sentences per text, international writers make significantly greater use of Step 3 than Thai writers.

- All three steps used to realise Move 9 are more common in Thai articles.
- Step 3 is the most common step used in both sets of texts.
- There are no significant differences in the number of texts including these three steps between the two groups.
- With regard to the average sentences per text, international writers make significantly greater use of Step 3 than Thai writers.

4.2.3.1.2 Steps in Move 10 (Describing the data and data collection procedure)

Four steps were identified in Move 10 of the Methods section. The distribution of these four steps in both corpora and mean sentences per text are summarised in Table 4.11.

In Table 4.11, to realize Move 10, both international and Thai writers find it necessary to describe the sample (Step 1). This step occurs in as many as 96% of both international and Thai articles. Given that the adjusted significance threshold was .0125, there are significant differences between texts in the number of texts employing Step 3 and Step 4. International articles have a considerably higher number of texts including these two steps than Thai articles, (Step 3: $x^2(1) = 21.236$, $p < .001$, medium effect: Cramer's V effect size = .461; Step 4: $x^2(1) = 16.000$, $p < .001$, medium effect: Cramer's V effect size = .400). On the contrary, Step 2 occurs more frequently in Thai articles than in international articles, but this difference is not statistically significant. With reference to mean sentences, unsurprisingly, the average number of sentences for Step 1 is the highest in both groups of texts. However, the mean number of sentences for this step is considerably higher in international articles, ($F = 11.741$, $p < .001$, medium effect: eta squared = .111) when comparing both sets of texts. A statistically significant difference between texts was also found in the mean

number of sentences for Step 2, (F = 10.710, p = .002, medium effect: eta squared = .121). Similar to Step 1, international writers use Step 2 more extensively than Thai writers. The same trend can be seen in the mean numbers of sentences for Step 2 and Step 3 as well, but no significant differences between the two groups were evident.

Table 4.11: Distribution of steps and mean sentences in Move 10

Steps	Number of texts containing step					Mean sentences/text				
			Pearson Chi-square test			International corpus	Thai corpus	One-way ANOVA test		
	International corpus (N=50)	Thai corpus (N=50)	X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side			F	P-value	Eta squared effect side
Step 1: Describing the sample <DES>	48 (96%)	48 (96%)	.000	1.00	.000 small effect	11.79	5.63	11.741	< .001	.111 medium effect
Step 2: Describing research instruments <DEI>	39 (78%)	41(82%)	.250	.617	.050 large effect	9.05	4.61	10.710	.002	.121 medium effect
Step 3: Recounting steps in data collection <RES>	38 (76%)	15 (30%)	21.236	< .001	.461 medium effect	5.95	3.27	5.689	.021	.100 medium effect
Step 4: Justifying the data collection procedure <JUC>	35 (70%)	15 (30%)	16.000	< .001	.400 medium effect	3.49	2.47	1.537	.221	.031 small effect

To sum up, Step 1 is the most common step used by international and Thai writers to realise Move 10, and accounts for the largest proportion of content in both sets of texts. However, when comparing both sets of texts, no significant difference was found in the number of texts including this step, but a difference was found in the average number of sentences for the step. International texts have much more content in Step 1 than Thai texts. With regard to the other three steps, Step 3 and Step 4 occur in international articles at a significantly higher percentage than in Thai articles in terms of the number of texts incorporating these two steps. However, no significant differences between texts were found in relation to the average number of sentences for the two steps. Step 2 is found more often in Thai articles, but there is no significant difference between texts in the number of texts including the step. However, a significant difference between the two groups was noticeable in the mean number of sentences for the step. The international corpus has a considerably higher mean number of sentences for Step 2 than the Thai corpus.

- Step 1 is the most common step used by international and Thai writers to realise Move 10, and accounts for the largest proportion of content in both sets of texts.
- No significant difference between texts was found in the number of texts including Step 1.
- International texts have much more content in Step 1 than Thai texts.
- Step 3 and Step 4 occur in international articles at a significantly higher percentage than in Thai articles in terms of the number of texts incorporating these two steps.
- No significant differences between texts were found in relation to the average number of sentences for Step 3 and Step 4.
- Step 2 is found more often in Thai articles, but there is no significant difference between texts in the number of texts including the step.
- The international corpus has a considerably higher mean number of sentences for Step 2 than the Thai corpus.

4.2.3.1.3 Steps in Move 11 (Describing the data analysis procedure)

In this analysis, four steps were identified in Move 11. Table 4.12 compares the statistics for the distribution of steps between the two groups and the mean sentences.

It is apparent from the table that the most frequently used strategy in both international and Thai articles to realise Move 11 is Step 1. Although it is found more often in international articles than in Thai articles, the difference between texts is not significant, based on the Bonferroni correction, .017. Step 2 and Step 3 are also likely to occur more commonly in the international corpus than in the Thai corpus. The results of chi-square tests revealed that these differences between texts were significant, (Step 2: $x^2(1) = 18.537$, $p < .001$, medium effect: Cramer's V effect size = .431; Step 3: $x^2(1) = 9.490$, $p = .002$, medium effect: Cramer's V effect size = .308). Step 1 has a greater proportion of content in both corpora, compared to the other two steps. Compared to Thai texts, international texts have a greater mean number of sentences for Step 1. This difference is significant, ($F = 19.730$, $p < .001$, large effect: eta squared = .180). A similar tendency can also be seen in the average number of sentences for Step 2 and Step 3, but these differences are non-significant.

Table 4.12: Distribution of steps and mean sentences in Move 11

Steps	Number of texts containing step					Mean sentences/text				
			Pearson Chi-square test			International corpus	Thai corpus	One-way ANOVA test		
	International corpus (N=50)	Thai corpus (N=50)	X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side			F	P-value	Eta squared effect side
Step 1: Recounting data analysis procedure <RED>	48 (96%)	44 (88%)	2.174	.269	.147 small effect	12.33	3.86	19.730	< .001	.180 large effect
Step 2: Justifying the data analysis procedure <JUA>	30 (60%)	9 (18%)	18.537	< .001	.431 medium effect	3.87	2.00	2.554	.119	.065 medium effect
Step 3: Previewing results <PRR>	13 (26%)	2 (4%)	9.490	.002	.308 medium effect	5.69	1.50	.748	.403	.054 small effect

In summary, Step 1 is the most common strategy used by both international and Thai authors to realize Move 11. It also accounts for the greater proportion of content in Move 11. However, the significant difference between texts was not found in the number of texts including the step, but was found in the mean number of sentences for the step. There are significant differences between texts in the number of texts containing Step 2 and Step 3. International texts are characterised by the significant use of these two steps. Regarding the mean number of sentences for these two steps, however, no significant differences between texts were evident.

- Step 1 is the most common strategy used by both international and Thai authors to realize Move 11.
- Step 1 accounts for the greater proportion of content in Move 11.
- The significant difference between texts was not found in the number of texts including Step 1, but was found in the mean number of sentences for the step.
- There are significant differences between texts in the number of texts containing Step 2 and Step 3.
- International texts are characterised by the significant use of Step 2 and Step 3.
- Regarding the mean number of sentences for Step 2 and Step 3, no significant differences between texts were evident.

4.2.4 The Results section

The analysis framework for the Results section is based on Pho's (2013) model, as shown in Table 4.13. Articles with a combined section for Results and Discussion were also analysed according to this framework. According to Pho's (2013) and Yang & Allison's (2003) studies, the structure of the Results and Discussion section was not different from that of the Results section alone. They suggested that the Results and Discussion section can be considered as an alternative heading to the Results section. Table 4.14 provides the statistics for the occurrences of Moves and mean sentences in the Results section.

Table 4.13: Move structure of the Results section

Moves	Function/Description	Examples from the corpus
Move 13: Preparing for the presentation of the results section <PPR>		
Step 1: (Re)stating data collection and analysis procedure <RDA>	- Describing data collection and/or analysis tools, variables, steps in collecting and/or analysing the data	Construct reliability was assessed using both Cronbach's a and CR. (E22)
Step 2: Restating research questions or hypotheses <RRQ>	- Restating research questions or hypotheses of the study	Hypotheses 4 and 5 postulated a direct positive effect of food satisfaction on tourist WOM and revisit intention. (E 41)
Step 3: Giving background knowledge <GBK>	- Giving some background knowledge (e.g., the context of the study, aim and purposes, theoretical or methodology information; referring to literature)	Human capital refers to the skills, knowledge and health that enable people to pursue livelihood strategies (Chen, Shivakoti, Zhu, & Maddox, 2012). (E25)
Step 4: Indicating structure of the section <ISS>	- Indicating how the results are going to be presented	This section presents the results in three main sections. (E39)

Moves	Function/Description	Examples from the corpus
Move 14: Reporting specific/individual results <RER>	- Reporting specific results (e.g., results in relation to a table or figure)	However, the research found that in both villages only small percentage of villagers had alternative tourist-based jobs. (TH24)
Move 15: Commenting on specific results <COR>		
Step 1: Interpreting results <INR>	- Discussing the results	This means the environment is transformed and the irrigation is imbalanced, causing demand and supply of water to move out of equilibrium. (TH112)
Step 2: comparing results with literature <CRL>	- Comparing the results of the present study with previous findings or existing literature	However, our finding confirmed Connell (2016) that personal experiences and recommendations from friends and family (word-of-mouth) were more important than formal accreditation that was of little meaning to the patients. (E37)
Step 3: Accounting for results <ACR>	- Explaining reasons for expected or unexpected results	The result is not surprising since there is a change from fixed exchange rate regime to managed floating exchange rate regime starting from 1994 in China. (E35)
Step 4: Evaluating results <EVR>	- Evaluating individual results	One limitation of this study is that the empirical results are based on the econometric model focusing on the demand side of maternity tourism while no supply factors are included. (E35)

Moves	Function/Description	Examples from the corpus
Move 16: Summarizing results <SUR>	- Summarizing a number of specific results	It can be concluded, that those 2 variables indeed have positive influence on participation in sustainable tourism development, but sense of belonging to a community played no role for participation in sustainable tourism development. (TH2)

Table 4.14: Summary of Move occurrences and mean sentences in the Results section

Moves	Number of texts containing move					Mean sentences/text				
			Pearson Chi-square test			International corpus	Thai corpus	One-way ANOVA test		
	International corpus (N=50)	Thai corpus (N=50)	X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side			F	P-value	Eta squared effect side
Move 13: Preparing for the presentation of the results section <PPR>	47 (94%)	41 (82%)	3.409	.065	.185 small effect	9.36	10.56	.394	.532	.005 small effect
Move 14: Reporting specific/individual results <RER>	50 (100%)	50 (100%)	-	-	-	56.34	45.68	1.892	.172	.019 small effect
Move 15: Commenting on specific results <COR>	39 (78%)	37 (74%)	.219	.640	.047 small effect	13.59	11.86	.249	.619	.003 small effect
Move 16: Summarizing results<SUR>	5 (10%)	9 (18%)	1.329	.249	.115 small effect	5.00	3.11	1.420	.256	.106 medium effect

As in Table 4.14, Move 14 is the most common Move in the Results section, as all international and Thai writers include this move in their texts. Move 13 and Move 15 are more often utilized in the international corpus than in the Thai corpus. By contrast, Move 16 occurs more frequently in Thai articles than in international articles. However, no statistically significant differences between texts were evident in the number of texts containing these three moves, based on the Bonferroni correction, .0125. With regard to mean sentences, unsurprisingly, Move 14 has the highest mean number of sentences in both international and Thai articles, compared to the other three moves. In general, international articles have a higher mean number of sentences for all Moves except Move 13. Nevertheless, no statistically significant differences between texts were found in the mean number of sentences for all four moves.

Analysis determined that there are four common patterns of Move sequence in this section: Move 13-Move 14, Move 14-Move 15, Move 13-Move 14-Move 15, and Move 14-Move 13. These patterns occur repeatedly throughout the section. In the international corpus, twenty articles begin the Results section with Move 13 and the other thirty articles begin with Move 14. Similarly, in the Thai corpus, half of the articles begin the section with Move 13; the other twenty-one articles begin with Move 14, and four of them consisted of only one move, namely Move 14.

To conclude, Move 14 is the most common Move in international and Thai research articles and accounts for the majority of content in the Results section. There are no significant differences in terms of the number of texts containing all four Moves and mean sentences. The Move structure of the Results section can therefore be said to be similar between the two sets of texts. In addition, both groups of texts are more likely to begin the section with Move 13 or Move 14. The cyclicity of Moves was found across the section in both sets of texts.

- Move 14 is the most common Move in international and Thai research articles and accounts for the majority of content in the Results section.
- There are no significant differences in terms of the number of texts containing all four Moves and mean sentences.

- The Move structure of the Results section can therefore be said to be similar between the two sets of texts.
- Both groups of texts are more likely to begin the section with Move 13 or Move 14.
- The cyclicity of Moves was found across the section in both sets of texts.

4.2.4.1 Steps realising Moves in the Results section

4.2.4.1.1 Steps in Move 13 (Preparing for the presentation of the Results section)

To realise Move 13, four steps were identified, as shown in Table 4.15.

Table 4.15 shows that the majority of international writers find it necessary to elaborate data collection and analysis procedure (Step 1) in Move 13, while most Thai writers prefer giving background knowledge (Step 3) to realise this Move. According to the Bonferroni correction, .0125, the chi-square tests did not show any differences between texts in the number of texts containing these two Moves. Similarly, no significant difference between the two corpora was found in the number of texts using Step 4, even though it is found more frequently in the Thai corpus. Both cohorts of authors generally avoid (re)stating research questions or hypotheses (Step 2), as this step occurs in just two articles from each corpus. In terms of the average number of sentences per text, the highest mean number of sentences in international articles is Step 1 whereas the mean number of sentences for Step 3 is the highest in Thai articles. No significant differences between texts were found in the mean number of sentences for these two steps. Additionally, no statistically significant difference between the two corpora was found in the mean number of sentences for Step 4, though the international corpus has a higher mean number of sentences for this step. Both corpora have the same mean number for Step 2.

Table 4.15: Distribution of steps and mean sentences in Move 13

Steps	Number of texts containing step					Mean sentences/text				
	International corpus (N=50)	Thai corpus (N=50)	Pearson Chi-square test			International corpus	Thai corpus	One-way ANOVA test		
			X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side			F	P-value	Eta squared effect side
Step 1: (Re)stating data collection and analysis procedure <RDA>	35 (70%)	23 (46%)	5.911	.015	.243 small effect	7.23	3.65	6.475	.014	.104 medium effect
Step 2: Restating research questions or hypotheses <RRQ>	2 (4%)	2 (4%)	.000	1.000	.000 small effect	1.00	1.00	-	-	-
Step 3: Giving background knowledge <GBK>	27 (54%)	29 (58%)	.162	.687	.040 medium effect	6.56	11.48	4.305	.043	.074 medium effect
Step 4: Indicating structure of the section <ISS>	3 (6%)	8 (16%)	2.554	.110	.160 small effect	2.00	1.63	.199	.666	.022 small effect

In summary, while Step 1 is the most preferred step in international texts, Step 3 is the most common step in Thai texts. These also result in the highest mean number of sentences for Step 1 and Step 3 in international and Thai articles respectively. Step 2 is avoided by both groups of writers, resulting in the lowest mean number of sentences in both corpora. The chi-square and one-way ANOVA tests found no significant differences between the two groups in relation to the number of texts containing all four steps and the mean number of sentences.

- Step 1 is the most preferred step in international texts.
- Step 3 is the most common step in Thai texts.
- Step 1 and Step 3 also have the highest mean numbers of sentences in international and Thai articles respectively.
- Step 2 is avoided by both groups of writers.
- Step 2 has the lowest mean number of sentences in both corpora.
- There are no significant differences between the two groups in relation to the number of texts containing all four steps and the mean number of sentences.

4.2.4.1.2 Steps in Move 15 (Commenting on specific results)

Four steps were identified in Move 15. Table 4.16 provides the statistics for the number of texts containing all four steps in Move 15 and the average sentences.

Table 4.16: Distribution of steps and mean sentences in Move 15

Steps	Number of texts containing step					Mean sentences/text				
			Pearson Chi-square test			International corpus	Thai corpus	One-way ANOVA test		
	International corpus (N=50)	Thai corpus (N=50)	X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side			F	P-value	Eta squared effect side
Step 1: Interpreting results <INR>	36 (72%)	37 (74%)	.051	.822	.023 small effect	12.17	10.14	.396	.531	.006 small effect
Step 2: comparing results with literature <CRL>	12 (24%)	8 (16%)	1.00	.317	.100 small effect	4.67	4.00	.165	.689	.009 small effect
Step 3: Accounting for results <ACR>	17 (34%)	13 (26%)	.762	.383	.087 small effect	2.00	2.31	.248	.622	.009 small effect
Step 4: Evaluating results <EVR>	2 (4%)	2 (4%)	.000	1.000	.000 small effect	1.00	1.00	-	-	-

From the data in Table 4.16, it is apparent that the most common step used by both groups of writers to realise Move 15 is Step 1. Though this move tends to be more frequently found in the Thai corpus than in the international corpus, no statistically significant difference between the two corpora was found, based on the adjusted significance threshold, .0125. By contrast, Step 2 and Step 3 occur more commonly in international articles than in Thai articles, but these differences are non-significant as well. Step 4 is the least common step employed by both groups of authors, as it was found in only 2 articles from each corpus. The average number of sentences per text for Step 1 is the highest in both groups of texts. However, when comparing both sets of texts, the international corpus is more likely than the Thai corpus to have a higher mean number of sentences for Step 1. The same trend could also be seen in the mean number of sentences for Step 2. On the contrary, the average number of sentences for Step 3 in Thai articles is slightly higher than that in international articles. However, the results of the chi-square tests revealed that none of these differences were statistically significant. Both sets of texts have the same mean for Step 4.

In conclusion, Step 1 is the most common step in both corpora and accounts for the largest proportion of content in Move 15. In contrast, both groups of authors avoid using Step 4. However, no statistically significant differences between the two corpora were evident in the number of texts containing all four steps and mean sentences.

- Step 1 is the most common step in both corpora and accounts for the largest proportion of content in Move 15.
- Both groups of authors avoid using Step 4.
- No statistically significant differences between the two corpora were evident in the number of texts containing all four steps and mean sentences.

4.2.5 The Discussion-Conclusions section

The main structure of Moves in the Discussion-Conclusions section is based on Pho's (2013) framework except Step 3 in Move 22, adopted from Yang & Allison's (2003) model. Table 4.17 presents the Move structure used to analyse the Discussion-Conclusions section.

Table 4.17: Move structure of the Discussion-Conclusions section

Moves	Function/Description	Examples from the corpus
Move 17: Preparing for the presentation of the discussion section <PPD>		
Step 1: (Re)stating data collection and analysis procedure <RDA>	- Describing data collection, participants, and/or analysis tools, variables, steps in collecting and/or analysing the data	Integrating the proposed theoretical relationships, a conceptual model was created and tested using empirical data collected from 230 amateur golfers who attended a golf tournament operated by the PGA/LPGA Tour in the US. (E46)
Step 2: Restating research questions or hypotheses <RRQ>	- Restating research questions or hypotheses of the study	By means of a literature review, this study hypothesized that golf involvement plays a moderating role in the relationships between well-being perception and its outcome variables. (E46)
Step 3: Giving background knowledge <GBK>	- Giving some background knowledge (e.g., the context of the study, the existing literature, highlighting gaps, theoretical or methodology information)	This research was based on the idea of tourism in protected areas, which according to Wearing & Neil (2011) is a conflict between preservation and use. (TH 42)
Step 4: Indicating the structure of the section <ISS>	- Indicating how the section is going to be presented	The following two paragraphs summarize how these study's findings about the VFR market to a large urban destination compare to findings of previous research. (E44)

Moves	Function/Description	Examples from the corpus
Move 18: Summarizing the study <STS>	- Restating the aims of the study - Summarizing what the study is about	This paper investigated ways in which travellers' rating patterns in TripAdvisor differed between independent and chain hotels. (E24)
Move 19: Highlighting overall research outcome <ORO>	- Highlighting some interesting findings from the study	The results indicated that the tourists' needs of interpretive tools were at a "moderate" level. (TH115)
M20: Discussing the findings of the study <DFS>		
Step 1: Interpreting/discussing results <IDR>	- Giving general discussion or interpretation of the study	This suggests that in order to minimize chances of receiving negative ratings, hotels should primarily focus on meeting the expectations of business and family travellers. (E24)
Step 2: Comparing results with literature <CRL>	- Comparing the findings with previous findings or existing literature	Similarly, Siri-umpai, (2012) also found similar results, that most tourists preferred to visit local markets because of local products, cheap prices, good promotion and unique culture. (TH46)
Step 3: Accounting for results <ACR>	- Explaining reasons for expected or unexpected results	Another possible explanation is the "rosy view" effect, whereby visitors downgrade negative experiences and focus on positive ones to reinforce their emotional state (Hosany et al., 2017). (E23)
Move 21: Drawing conclusion of the study/Stating research conclusions <CNC>	- Drawing conclusions from the findings	Thus, the first conclusion of this paper is that a main reason why so few examples of successful tourism networks are found, is simply, because most network managers

Moves	Function/Description	Examples from the corpus
		hardly invest in trust-based activities, which, according to the literature are dearly needed to develop and maintain active networks in the tourism sector (Bornhorst et al., 2010; Nunkoo & Ramkissoon, 2012; Pavlovich, 2003; Provan & Kenis, 2008; van der Zee & Vanneste, 2015; Volgger & Pechlaner, 2014; Zehrer et al., 2014). (E26)
Move 22: Evaluating the study <EVS>		
Step 1: Indicating limitations <LIM>	- Stating limitations about the findings, the methodology or the claims made	This approach, however, also comes with inherent limitations, which are at the same time sources of inspiration for further research to test the validity and improve the generalizability of this study's findings. (E 26)
Step 2: Indicating significance/advantage <SIG>	- Indicating the significance or importance of the study	This research has contributed to the literature on cultural heritage tourism and management in Thailand by providing a comprehensive, multi-stakeholder case study of a single site. (TH 15)
Step 3: Evaluating methodology <EVM>	- Justifying research methodology concerning the strengths or weaknesses of the research	The issue of sharing survey codes among M-Turks in order to get paid without completing a survey was detected, but it was relatively minor. (E45)
Moves 23: Deductions from the research <DER>		

Moves	Function/Description	Examples from the corpus
Step 1: Making suggestions/drawing implications <SIM>	- Making suggestions or drawing implications from the study (e.g., pedagogical implications)	Local community in Ban Pong Manao Huai Khunram, Phattananikom, Lopburi should develop their local wisdom according to the finding it does not influence participation in sustainable tourism development. (TH 2)
Step 2: Recommending further research <RFR>	- Pointing out areas that need further research	Repeating the study in different institutional contexts could provide valuable new insights. (E 26)

Table 4.18: Distribution of Moves and mean sentences in the Discussion-Conclusions section

Moves	Number of texts containing move					Mean sentences/text				
			Pearson Chi-square test			International corpus	Thai corpus	One-way ANOVA test		
	International corpus (N=50)	Thai corpus (N=50)	X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side			F	P-value	Eta squared effect side
Move 17: Preparing for the presentation of the discussion section <PPD>	32 (64%)	22 (44%)	4.026	.045	.201 small effect	4.84	4.09	.219	.642	.004 small effect
Move 18: Summarizing the study <STS>	31 (62%)	11 (22%)	16.420	< .001	.405 medium effect	1.58	1.55	.017	.898	.000 small effect
Move 19: Highlighting overall research outcome <ORO>	47 (94%)	45 (90%)	.543	.715	.074 small effect	9.23	7.89	.550	.460	.006 small effect
M20: Discussing the findings of the study <DFS>	47 (94%)	47 (94%)	.000	1.00	.000 small effect	17.79	14.81	.942	.334	.010 small effect
Move 21: Drawing conclusion of the	17 (34%)	5 (10%)	8.392	.004	.290 small effect	3.24	3.00	.027	.872	.001 small effect

Moves	Number of texts containing move					Mean sentences/text				
	International corpus (N=50)	Thai corpus (N=50)	Pearson Chi-square test			International corpus	Thai corpus	One-way ANOVA test		
			X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side			F	P-value	Eta squared effect side
study/Stating research conclusions <CNC>										
Move 22: Evaluating the study <EVS>	44 (88%)	20 (40%)	25.000	< .001	.500 large effect	8.80	3.75	6.037	.017	.089 medium effect
Moves 23: Deductions from the research <DER>	50 (100%)	48 (96%)	2.041	.495	.143 small effect	12.12	10.02	1.493	.225	.015 small effect

What stands out in Table 4.18 is that Move 23 is the most common Move in both corpora. All international articles and 96% of Thai articles contained this Move. Given that the adjusted significance threshold was .007, this difference, however, was non-significant. There were significant differences between the two corpora in the frequencies of Move 18, Move 21 and Move 22, (Move 18: $x^2(1) = 16.420$, $p < .001$, medium effect: Cramer's V effect size = .405; Move 21: $x^2(1) = 8.392$, $p = .004$, small effect: Cramer's V effect size = .290; Move 22: $x^2(1) = 25.000$, $p < .001$, large effect: Cramer's V effect size = .500). These three Moves are much more common in the international corpus than in the Thai corpus. Move 19 also occurs more frequently in international articles than in Thai articles, but no significant difference was established. Likewise, no significant difference between texts was evident in the number of texts including Move 20, as this move was found in approximately 94% of articles in both groups of texts. With regard to the mean number of sentences, Move 20 accounts for the largest proportion of content in the Discussion-Conclusion section. International articles have a higher mean number of sentences than Thai articles for all Moves; however, none of these differences are statistically significant.

There are both differences and similarities in the pattern of move sequence between the two groups. The majority of the Discussion-Conclusions section in international articles begin with either Move 17 or Move 18, followed by Move 19 and/or Move 20, while Thai articles begin with Move 19, followed by Move 20. In other words, there are three common sequences of Moves in international articles: Move 17-Move 19-Move 20, Move 18-Move 19-Move 20, and Move 19-Move 20. The most common pattern of Move sequences in Thai articles is Move 19-Move 20. A non-linear sequence of Move patterns was also found in both corpora. The most common non-linear sequence is Move 20-Move 19. This pattern was found in six international articles and four Thai articles.

Most articles in both corpora end the section with Move 23. If there is Move 22 in the section, it frequently comes before Move 23. In addition, two cyclical patterns: Move 19-Move 20 and Move 22-Move 23 were found in both corpora; they are repeated several times in the section.

To sum up, Move 23 is the most common Move in the Discussion-Conclusions section in both corpora. International writers make more significant use of Move

18, Move 21, and Move 22 than Thai writers, as there are statistically significant differences between texts in the number of texts incorporating these three moves. In terms of the average number of sentences, the mean number of sentences for Move 20 is the highest in both corpora. When comparing the average number of sentences for all Moves between the two sets of texts, no statistically significant differences were found. Whereas the most common pattern of Move sequence in Thai articles is Move 19-Move 20, there are variations in patterns of Move sequence in international articles. However, both international and Thai texts end the Discussion-Conclusion section with Move 23.

- Move 23 is the most common Move in the Discussion-Conclusions section in both corpora.
- International writers make more significant use of Move 18, Move 21, and Move 22 than Thai writers.
- The mean number of sentences for Move 20 is the highest in both corpora.
- No statistically significant differences between the two groups were found in the average number of sentences for all Moves in the Discussion-Conclusions section.
- The most common pattern of Move sequence in Thai articles is Move 19-Move 20.
- There are variations in patterns of Move sequence in international articles.
- Both international and Thai texts end the Discussion-Conclusion section with Move 23.

4.2.5.1 Steps realising Moves in the Discussion-Conclusions section

4.2.5.1.1 Steps in Move 17 (Preparing for the presentation of the discussion section)

Four steps were identified in Move 17. Table 4.19 presents the distribution of all four steps and average sentences per text in both corpora. It is apparent that Step 3 is the most preferred step used by both cohorts of writers. This step more frequently occurs in international articles than in Thai articles. Nevertheless, according to the adjusted significance threshold, .0125, no significant difference

between texts was evident. The significant difference was found in the number of texts containing Step 1, ($x^2(1) = 8.575$, $p = .003$, small effect: Cramer's V effect size = .293). This step is much more common in the international corpus than in the Thai corpus. Similarly, Step 2 and Step 4 are more often found in international texts than in Thai texts. In fact, Step 4 was not found in any Thai articles. However, none of these differences were statistically significant. The number of mean sentences for Step 3 appears to be the highest in both sets of texts, compared to the other three steps. Compared to Thai articles, international articles have a higher mean number of sentences for all four steps except Step 1. However, no significant differences were found between the two groups.

In conclusion, Step 3 is the most common step used by both groups of researchers to realise Move 17. Although these four steps are found more often in international articles than in Thai articles, the significant difference between texts was only found in the number of texts containing Step 1. Moreover, Step 3 accounts for the greater part of content in Move 17. The mean numbers of sentences for all steps, except Step 1, are higher in the international corpus, compared to the Thai corpus. However, these differences are non-significant.

- Step 3 is the most common step used by both groups of researchers to realise Move 17.
- All four steps are found more often in international articles than in Thai articles.
- The significant difference between texts was only found in the number of texts containing Step 1.
- Step 3 also accounts for the greater part of content in Move 17.
- The mean numbers of sentences for all steps, except Step 1, are higher in the international corpus, compared to the Thai corpus, but these differences are non-significant.

Table 4.19: Distribution of steps and mean sentences in Move 17

Steps	Number of texts containing step					Mean sentences/text				
			Pearson Chi-square test			International corpus	Thai corpus	One-way ANOVA test		
	International corpus (N=50)	Thai corpus (N=50)	X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side			F	P-value	Eta squared effect side
Step 1: (Re)stating data collection and analysis procedure <RDA>	14 (28%)	3 (6%)	8.575	.003	.293 small effect	1.86	2.00	.055	.818	.004 small effect
Step 2: Restating research questions or hypotheses <RRQ>	4 (8%)	1 (2%)	1.895	.362	.138 small effect	1.50	1.00	.200	.685	.062 medium effect
Step 3: Giving background knowledge <GBK>	27 (54%)	19 (38%)	2.576	.108	.161 small effect	4.52	4.37	.006	.936	.000 small effect
Step 4: Indicating the structure of the section <ISS>	1(2%)	0 (0%)	1.010	1.00	.101 small effect	1.00	0.00	–	–	–

4.2.5.1.2 Steps in Move 20 (Discussing the findings of the study)

To realize Move 20, three steps were identified. Table 4.20 presents the distribution of steps and the mean numbers of sentences in Move 20.

From Table 4.19, Step 1 is the most common step used in both corpora. This step is found more often in the Thai corpus than in the international corpus. However, based on the adjusted significance threshold, .017, a chi-square test found no significant difference between the two groups in the number of texts employing this step. By contrast. international researchers make more extensive use of Step 2 than Thai researchers, and this difference is statistically significant, ($x^2(1) = 9.091$, $p = .003$, medium effect: Cramer's V effect size = .302). Step 3 is avoided by both groups of authors. Similar to Step 2, Step 3 is employed more frequently in international articles than in Thai articles, but no significant difference between texts was found. The average number of sentences for Step 1 is the largest in both corpora, compared to the other two steps. The international corpus has a higher mean number of sentences than the Thai corpus for all steps except Step 2. However, none of these differences were statistically significant.

Table 4.20: Distribution of steps and mean sentences in Move 20

Steps	Number of texts containing step					Mean sentences/text				
	International corpus (N=50)	Thai corpus (N=50)	Pearson Chi-square test			International corpus	Thai corpus	One-way ANOVA test		
			X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side			F	P-value	Eta squared effect side
Step 1: Interpreting/discussing results <IDR>	45 (90%)	46 (92%)	1.22	1.00	.035 small effect	14.78	12.67	.529	.469	.006 small effect
Step 2: Comparing results with literature <CRL>	35 (70%)	20 (40%)	9.091	.003	.302 medium effect	3.66	5.25	2.201	.144	.040 small effect
Step 3: Accounting for results<ACR>	11 (22%)	6 (12%)	1.772	.183	.133 small effect	3.91	1.33	1.399	.255	.085 medium effect

To conclude, both international and Thai researchers use Step 1 to realise Move 20, over 90% of authors compared to the other two steps. All three steps are used more often in international articles than in Thai articles, but a significant difference between texts was only evident in the frequency of Step 2. In the same way, the average number of sentences for Step 1 was the highest in both sets of texts, and the mean numbers of sentences for all three steps are higher in international texts than in Thai texts, but no significant differences were found between texts.

- Both international and Thai researchers use Step 1 to realise Move 20.
- All three steps are used more often in international articles than in Thai articles, but a significant difference between texts was only evident in the frequency of Step 2.
- The average number of sentences for Step 1 was the highest in both sets of texts.
- The mean numbers of sentences for all three steps are higher in international texts than in Thai texts, but no significant differences were found between texts.

4.2.5.1.3 Steps in Move 22 (Evaluating the study)

Three steps were identified to realise Move 22. Table 4.21 shows the distribution of steps and the average number of sentences for Move 22.

Table 4.20, the occurrences of all three steps are more frequent in international texts than in Thai texts. Step 2 is the most common step in both international and Thai articles. Given that the Bonferroni correction was .017, the chi-square tests found significant differences between the two groups in the number of texts containing Step 1 and Step 2, (Step 1: $x^2(1) = 19.485$, $p < .001$, medium effect: Cramer's V effect size = .441; Step 2: $x^2(1) = 25.010$, $p < .001$, large effect: Cramer's V effect size = .500). International writers make more extensive use of these two steps than Thai writers. Step 3 is the least common step employed by both groups of researchers. No Thai articles included this step. The chi-square test, however, found no statistically significant difference between the two sets of data in the number of texts including Step 3. International articles have the

highest number of mean sentences for Step 3, while Thai articles have the same mean number of sentences for Step 1 and Step 2. Though overall, the international corpus has a higher mean number of sentences for all three steps, none of these differences are statistically significant.

In summary, international writers make greater use of Step 1 and Step 2 than Thai writers. However, no significant differences between texts were found in the number of mean sentences for all three steps.

- International writers make greater use of Step 1 and Step 2 than Thai writers.
- No significant differences between texts were found in the number of mean sentences for all three steps.

Table 4.21: Distribution of steps and mean sentences in Move 22

Steps	Number of texts containing step					Mean sentences/text				
	International corpus (N=50)	Thai corpus (N=50)	Pearson Chi-square test			International corpus	Thai corpus	One-way ANOVA test		
			X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side			F	P-value	Eta squared effect side
Step 1: Indicating limitations <LIM>	34 (68%)	12 (24%)	19.485	< .001	.441 medium effect	3.21	3.00	.075	.785	.002 small effect
Step 2: Indicating significance/advantage <SIG>	38 (76%)	13 (26%)	25.010	< .001	.500 large effect	6.42	3.00	2.735	.105	.053 small effect
Step 3: Evaluating methodology <EVM>	4 (8%)	0 (0%)	4.167	.117	.204 small effect	8.50	0.00	-	-	-

4.2.5.1.4 Steps in Move 23 (Deductions from the research)

Two steps are used to realize Move 23. Table 4.22 provides the statistics for the distribution of two steps in Move 23 and mean sentences.

From Table 4.22, Step 1 is the strategy used in both corpora to realise Move 23. When comparing both groups of texts, Step 1 is found more frequently in the Thai corpus than in the international corpus. However, this difference is non-significant. By contrast, Step 2 is much more common in the international corpus than in the Thai corpus. According to the Bonferroni correction, .025, a chi-square test found a significant difference between texts in the number of texts incorporating this step, ($x^2(1) = 18.919$, $p < .001$, medium effect: Cramer's V effect size = .435). The table shows that overall, the mean number of sentences for Step 1 is higher than Step 2 in both corpora. Thai articles have a higher mean number of sentences for Step 1 than international articles. On the contrary, international articles have a higher mean number of sentences for Step 2 than Thai articles. However, none of these differences were statistically significant.

In conclusion, the two steps are used more consistently in international articles than in Thai articles. Step 1 is the most common step used by both groups of scholars, and it accounts for the greater part of the content of Move 23. A significant difference between texts was not found in the number of texts containing Step 1 but was found in the number of texts including Step 2. No significant differences between the two corpora were evident in the mean number of sentences for both steps.

- The two steps are used more consistently in international articles than in Thai articles.
- Step 1 is the most common step used by both groups of scholars, and it accounts for the greater part of the content of Move 23.
- A significant difference between texts was not found in the number of texts containing Step 1 but was found in the number of texts including Step 2.
- No significant differences between the two corpora were evident in the mean number of sentences for both steps.

This section has presented the characteristics of Move structures. The next section presents the results of stance marker analysis.

Table 4.22: Distribution of steps and mean sentences in Move 23

Steps	Number of texts containing step					Mean sentences/text				
			Pearson Chi-square test			International corpus	Thai corpus	One-way ANOVA test		
	International corpus (N=50)	Thai corpus (N=50)	X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side			F	P-value	Eta squared effect side
Step 1: Making suggestions/drawing implications <SIM>	44 (88%)	46 (92%)	.444	.505	.067 small effect	8.41	9.00	.152	.698	.002 small effect
Step 2: Recommending further research <RFR>	42 (84%)	21 (42%)	18.919	< .001	.435 medium effect	5.62	3.19	3.690	.059	.057 small effect

4.3 The findings of stance markers

In this study, the analysis of authorial stance is based on Hyland's (2005a) interactional metadiscourse framework. Hyland's interactional metadiscourse consists of five subcategories, Hedges, Boosters, Attitude markers, Self-mentions, and Engagement markers. However, to investigate the authorial stance, only the first four sub-categories are relevant. Engagement markers involve features employed to explicitly address or create a relationship with readers (Hyland & Tse, 2004b); therefore, they are irrelevant to the current study. This study analyses the stance markers, Hedges, Boosters, Attitude markers, and Self-mentions. Details of linguistic features in these four sub-categories, based on Hyland's (2005a) framework are shown in Appendix A. With regard to self-mentions, the word *the researcher(s)* and possessive forms: *the researcher's* and *the researchers* were added to the category, as they were found in this study. As the length of Moves is varied, the raw frequencies of each stance types are normalized as per 1000 words to make data comparable. These normalized frequencies were then entered into SPSS and analysed. To test the statistical significance of differences in the number of occurrences of stance markers and in the number of Moves including stance markers between the two corpora, Pearson Chi-square tests were performed. However, it should be noted that raw frequencies were used to perform the Chi-square tests for differences in the number of occurrences of stance markers.

4.3.1 Overall results of stance markers across moves

Table 4.23 provides the statistics for frequencies of all four types of stance markers across Moves. Table 4.24 presents the number of Moves including stance markers.

Table 4.23: Number of occurrences of stance types across Moves

Stance markers	International corpus		Thai corpus		Pearson Chi-square test		
	Total number of occurrences	Freq. per 1,000 words	Total number of occurrences	Freq. per 1,000 words	X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side
Hedges	4,076	11.83	1,789	8.17	173.533	< .001	.018 small effect
Boosters	1,278	3.71	991	4.53	22.398	< .001	.006 small effect
Attitude markers	934	2.71	696	3.18	10.243	< .001	.004 small effect
Self-mentions	721	2.09	100	.46	246.051	< .001	.021 small effect

Table 4.24: Number of Moves including stance markers

Stance markers	Number of Moves including stance markers				
	International corpus (N=23)	Thai corpus (N=23)	Pearson Chi-square test		
			X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side
Hedges	22 (95.7%)	22 (95.7%)	.000	1.00	.000 small effect
Boosters	22 (95.7%)	20 (87%)	1.095	.608	.154 small effect
Attitude markers	20 (87%)	21 (91.3%)	.224	1.00	.070 small effect
Self-mentions	21 (91.3%)	19 (82.6%)	.767	.665	.129 small effect

From Table 4.23, it can be seen that both sets of texts have the same overall trend in the use of stance markers; that is, hedges are the most commonly used stance markers, followed by boosters, attitude markers, and self-mentions respectively. A Bonferroni correction was applied in these comparisons, and the adjusted significance threshold was .0125. Hedges and self-mentions are much more common in international articles (11.83 per 1000 words for hedges and 2.09 per 1000 words for self-mentions) than in Thai articles (8.17 per 1000 words for hedges and .46 per 1000 words for self-mentions). In contrast, boosters and attitude markers are more pervasive in Thai articles (4.53 per 1000 words for boosters and 3.18 per 1000 words for attitude markers) than in international articles (3.71 per 1000 words for boosters and 2.71 per 1000 words for attitude markers). These differences are statistically significant, (hedges: $x^2(1) = 173.533$, $p < .001$, small effect: Cramer's V effect size = .018; boosters: $x^2(1) = 22.398$, $p < .001$, small effect: Cramer's V effect size = .006; attitude markers: $x^2(1) = 10.243$, $p = .001$, small effect: Cramer's V effect size = .004; self-mentions: $x^2(1) = 246.051$, $p < .001$, small effect: Cramer's V effect size = .021).

Table 4.24 shows there is no difference in the number of moves containing hedges between the two corpora. They were found in 22 moves in each corpus. Boosters and Self-mentions are more pervasive in international texts than in Thai texts. Nevertheless, given that the significance threshold is .0125, no significant differences were found in the number of Moves including them. By contrast, Thai articles have a higher number of Moves including attitude markers than international articles. However, there are no significant differences between texts in the number of Moves incorporating this stance feature.

In conclusion, hedges are the most preferred stance markers employed by both bodies of writers to express their stance. On the contrary, both groups of writers avoid using self-mentions in their research articles. When comparing both sets of texts, hedges and self-mentions are more common in international texts than in Thai texts. Boosters and attitude markers are more common in Thai articles than in international articles. The following sections will present the results of the analysis of each stance type.

- Hedges are the most preferred stance markers employed by both bodies of writers to express their stance.

- Both groups of writers avoid using self-mentions in their research articles.
- Hedges and self-mentions are more common in international texts than in Thai texts.
- Boosters and attitude markers are more common in Thai articles than in international articles.

4.3.2 Hedges

Hedges are by a large number the most common linguistic device used to express writers' stance in both corpora. They are used to soften the writer's commitments. Table 4.25 illustrates the distribution of sub-categories of hedges across Moves. Table 4.26 presents the number of Moves including hedging devices.

Table 4.25: Number of occurrences of hedging devices across Moves

Hedging devices	International corpus		Thai corpus		Pearson Chi-square test		
	Total number of occurrences	Freq. per 1,000 words	Total number of occurrences	Freq. per 1,000 words	X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side
Modal verbs	1,469	4.26	1,026	4.69	5.481	.019	.003 small effect
Verbs	1,170	3.40	340	1.55	169.888	< .001	.017 small effect
Adverbs	1,043	3.03	341	1.56	117.836	< .001	.014 small effect
Adjectives	336	.98	59	.27	95.097	< .001	.013 small effect
Nouns	7	.02	0	.00	4.446	.048	.003 small effect
Others	52	.15	23	.11	2.111	.146	.002 small effect

Table 4.26: Number of Moves including hedging devices

Hedging devices	Number of Moves including stance markers				
	International corpus (N=23)	Thai corpus (N=23)	Pearson Chi-square test		
			X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side
Modal verbs	21 (91.3)	19 (82.6%)	.767	.665	.129 small effect
Verbs	19 (82.6%)	21 (91.3)	.767	.665	.129 small effect
Adverbs	21 (91.3)	19 (82.6%)	.767	.665	.129 small effect
Adjectives	17 (73.9%)	10 (43.5%)	4.394	.036	.309 medium effect
Nouns	4 (17.4%)	0 (0%)	4.381	.109	.309 medium effect
Others	14 (60.9%)	7 (30.4%)	4.293	.038	.306 medium effect

In Table 4.25, modal verbs are the most common sub-category of hedging devices in both corpora. They are more common in international texts than in Thai texts. However, given that the Bonferroni correction was .008, no significant difference was found between texts in the frequencies of these grammatical devices. By contrast, statistically significant differences between texts exist in the number of occurrences of verbs, adverbs and adjectives, (verbs: $x^2(1) = 169.888$, $p < .001$, small effect: Cramer's V effect size = .017; adverbs: $x^2(1) = 117.836$, $p < .001$, small effect: Cramer's V effect size = .014; adjectives: $x^2(1) = 95.097$, $p < .001$, small effect: Cramer's V effect size = .013). These three grammatical devices occur at a greater frequency in the international corpus than in the Thai corpus. Nouns and others devices are more prevalent in international texts than in Thai texts, but no statistically significant differences were evident in the frequencies of these two sub-categories of hedges.

From the data in Table 4.26, the greater number of Moves in both corpora include modal verbs, verbs, and adverbs, compared to the other three sub-categories. When comparing both groups of texts, international articles have a higher number of Moves incorporating these three types of linguistic devices than Thai articles, except verbs. However, the chi-square tests showed that there were no significant differences between texts in the number of moves including these three sub-categories. With regard to the adjectives, nouns, and others, they are more often included in international articles than in Thai articles. Nevertheless, no significant differences between texts were evident in the number of Moves including these linguistic devices.

To conclude, modal verbs are the most frequently used hedging device in both sets of text. On the contrary, nouns are the least frequent devices in both sets of data. In neither case is there a statistically significant difference. Statistically significant differences between the two sets of texts were observed in the occurrences of verbs, adverbs, and adjectives. These three types of grammatical devices are much more pervasive in the international corpus than in the Thai corpus. Modal verbs, verbs, and adverbs are included in Moves in both corpora at a higher frequency, compared to the other three sub-categories. There are no statistically significant differences in the number of moves including all six sub-categories.

- Modal verbs are the most frequently used hedging device in both sets of text.
- Nouns are the least frequent devices in both sets of data.
- Statistically significant differences between the two sets of texts were observed in the occurrences of verbs, adverbs, and adjectives.
- Verbs, adverbs, and adjectives are much more pervasive in the international corpus than in the Thai corpus.
- Modal verbs, verbs, and adverbs are included in Moves in both corpora at a higher frequency, compared to the other three sub-categories.
- There are no statistically significant differences in the number of moves including all six sub-categories.

4.3.2.1 Sub-categories of Hedges (Modal verbs)

Turning now to frequency and patterns of use of sub-categories of hedges, Table 4.27 presents the frequency of modal verbs across Moves. The specific modal verb *may* is the most common modal verb in international articles, while *should* is the most prevalent modal verb in Thai articles. Based on the adjusted significance threshold, .008, there were statistically significant differences in the frequencies of these two specific modal verbs between the two groups, (*may*: $x^2(1) = 81.582$, $p < .001$, small effect: Cramer's V effect size = .012; *should*: $x^2(1) = 150.676$, $p < .001$, small effect: Cramer's V effect size = .016). In addition, there was a significant difference between texts in the frequency of the modal *could*, ($x^2(1) = 11.434$, $p < .001$, small effect: Cramer's V effect size = .005). Thai writers employ the modal *could* more extensively than international writers. The other two modal verbs, *would* and *might* are more common in international articles than in Thai articles. By contrast, *ought* is more dominant in Thai articles than in international articles. However, the chi-square tests revealed that there were no significant differences between texts in the frequencies of these three specific modals.

As shown in Table 4.28, most Moves in both corpora include the modal *could*. It was found in 21 moves in international articles and in 16 moves in Thai articles. Nevertheless, no significant difference was evident in the number of Moves

incorporating this specific modal verb between the two groups. *Should* is the one hedge that occurs at a greater frequency in Thai articles. Nevertheless, the chi-square test showed that this difference was not significant. *Ought* is the least included device in both sets of texts. It was found in only two Moves in each corpus. With regard to the other three specific modal verbs, they are more likely to be employed in international texts than in Thai texts. The chi-square tests showed that there were no statistically significant differences in the number of Moves including these three specified modal verbs.

In summary, a greater number of modal verbs occur in the international corpus than in the Thai corpus. The modal *may* and *should* are the most common modals in international and Thai texts respectively. There were significant differences between texts in the number of occurrences of these two specific modal verbs. Most Moves in both corpora include the specific modal *could*. By contrast*, ought* is the least frequent feature included in Moves in both corpora. The chi-square results show that there are no significant differences between the two sub-corpora in the number of Moves including all six specific modal verbs.

- A greater number of modal verbs occur in the international corpus than in the Thai corpus.
- The modal *may* and *should* are the most common modals in international and Thai texts respectively.
- There were significant differences between texts in the number of occurrences of these two specific modal verbs.
- Most Moves in both corpora include the specific modal *could*.
- *Ought* is the least frequent feature included in Moves in both corpora.
- The chi-square results show that there are no significant differences between the two sub-corpora in the number of Moves including all six specific modal verbs.

Table 4.27: Number of occurrences of modal verbs (hedges) across Moves

Modal verbs	International corpus		Thai corpus		Pearson Chi-square test		
	Total number of occurrences	Freq. per 1,000 words	Total number of occurrences	Freq. per 1,000 words	X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side
1. may	584	1.69	173	.79	81.582	< .001	.012 small effect
2. should	304	.88	464	2.12	150.676	< .001	.016 small effect
3. could	277	.80	237	1.08	11.434	< .001	.005 small effect
4. would	221	.64	111	.51	4.092	.043	.003 small effect
5. might	81	.24	39	.18	2.033	.154	.002 small effect
6. ought	2	.006	2	.009	.210	.645	.001 small effect

Table 4.28: Number of Moves including modal verbs (hedges)

Modal verbs	Number of Moves including stance markers				
	International corpus (N=23)	Thai corpus (N=23)	Pearson Chi-square test		
			X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side
1. may	16 (69.6%)	13 (56.5%)	.840	.359	.135 small effect
2. should	17 (73.9%)	16 (69.6%)	.107	.743	.048 small effect
3. could	21 (91.3%)	16 (69.6%)	3.453	.135	.274 small effect
4. would	16 (69.6%)	14 (60.9%)	.383	.536	.091 small effect
5. might	12 (52.2%)	9 (39.1%)	.789	.375	.131 small effect
6. ought	2 (8.7%)	2 (8.7%)	.000	1.00	.000 small effect

4.3.2.2 Sub-categories of Hedges (Verbs)

Table 4.29 compares the number of occurrences of lexical verbs across Moves. Table 4.30 presents the number of Moves containing stance markers. Table 4.29, shows that all lexical verbs are more common in international texts than in Thai texts. It is apparent that the verb *suggest* is the most common verb in both corpora. Based on the Bonferroni correction, .004, international authors make greater use of the verb *suggest* than Thai writers, ($x^2(1) = 114.247$, $p < .001$, small effect: Cramer's V effect size = .013). Furthermore, statistically significant differences were found in the frequencies of the verb *appear*, *argue*, *assume*, *claim*, *estimate*, *feel*, *indicate*, *seem* and *tend to*, (*appear*: $x^2(1) = 9.411$, $p = .002$, small effect: Cramer's V effect size = .004; *argue*: $x^2(1) = 40.309$, $p < .001$, small effect: Cramer's V effect size = .008; *assume*: $x^2(1) = 11.074$, $p < .001$, small effect: Cramer's V effect size = .004; *claim*: $x^2(1) = 14.103$, $p < .001$, small effect: Cramer's V effect size = .005; *estimate*: $x^2(1) = 16.998$, $p < .001$, small effect: Cramer's V effect size = .005; *feel*: $x^2(1) = 8.200$, $p = .004$, small effect: Cramer's V effect size = .004; *indicate*: $x^2(1) = 16.097$, $p < .001$, small effect: Cramer's V effect size = .005; *seem*: $x^2(1) = 10.633$, $p = .001$, small effect: Cramer's V effect size = .004, *tend to*: $x^2(1) = 19.527$, $p < .001$, small effect: Cramer's V effect size = .006). With respect to frequencies of the verb *doubt*, *postulate*, *suppose* and *suspect*, no statistically significant differences were observed between the two sets of texts, though they occur more commonly in the international corpus than in the Thai corpus.

Table 4.30, Moves in both corpora contain the verb *suggest* at the highest frequency. It occurs in 78.3% of the international corpus and 65.2% of the Thai corpus. However, no significant difference between texts was evident in the number of Moves including this verb. By contrast, there was a significant difference between texts in the number of Moves incorporating the verb *argue*. International writers extensively employ this verb, ($x^2(1) = 9.583$, $p = .002$, medium effect: Cramer's V effect size = .456). Based on the analysis in this study, *argue* is used for two functions: to present other's views or arguments and to present the writer's arguments. The former was found in both corpora, while the latter is found more commonly in the international corpus. Actually, it was found in only one Thai article. The following examples illustrate how the verb

argue was used to present the writer's view in international articles (4.1, 4.2) and in Thai article (4.3).

(4.1) Second, existing studies on assessments of tourism impacts have prioritized residents' perspectives, whereas from a mobility perspective, we *argue* that domestic tourists can also be sensitive to impacts on dark heritage sites. (E 23)

(4.2) Again, it could be *argued* that the relationship between these types of tourists and their support for MI sustainability initiatives was not, however, clear enough to be able to use these segments to predict support for MIDCW. (E 39)

(4.3) It may be *argued* that when tourists visit a particular destination with positive travel experience, they are more likely to be happy or satisfied with their trips, and later they may come back to the same destination. (TH19)

As shown in the example (4.1), the writers use the verb *argue* with the first-person pronoun *we* to offer their contrast view with the previous studies. In examples (4.2) and (4.3), writers introduce their own claims in a neutral way by using the verb *argue* with model verb (4.3) and in passive form (4.2). Presenting a writer's claims is a key element in academic texts. Writers, demonstrating confidence in their evaluation and judgements, will gain credibility and be regarded as proficient writers (Hyland, 2002a). Thus, the underuse of this verb to present the writer's claims may be considered a lack of personal stance and lead to failure in establishing a successful argument and in obtaining scholarly credibility in texts.

With regard to the other verbs, international texts have a higher number of Moves including these verbs than Thai texts. Nevertheless, the results of the chi-square tests revealed that none of these differences were statistically significant.

Table 4.29: Number of occurrences of verbs (hedges) across Moves

Verbs	International corpus		Thai corpus		Pearson Chi-square test		
	Total number of occurrences	Freq. per 1,000 words	Total number of occurrences	Freq. per 1,000 words	X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side
1. appear	85	.25	28	.13	9.411	.002	.004 small effect
2. argue	120	.35	17	.08	40.309	< .001	.008 small effect
3. assume	31	.09	4	.02	11.074	< .001	.004 small effect
4. claim	45	.13	7	.03	14.103	< .001	.005 small effect
5. doubt	1	.003	0	.00	.635	1.000	.001 small effect
6. estimate	41	.12	4	.02	16.998	< .001	.005 small effect
7. feel	88	.26	31	.14	8.200	.004	.004 small effect
8. indicate	236	.68	92	.42	16.097	< .001	.005 small effect
9. postulate	8	.023	1	.005	2.914	.167	.002 small effect
10. seem	86	.25	27	.12	10.633	.001	.004 small effect
11. suggest	329	.95	106	.48	114.247	< .001	.013 small effect
12. suppose	6	.02	2	.01	.645	.496	.001 small effect
13. suspect	2	.01	0	.00	1.270	.525	.002 small effect
14. tend to	92	.27	21	.10	19.527	< .001	.006 small effect

Table 4.30: Number of Moves including verbs (hedges)

Verbs	Number of Moves including stance markers				
	International corpus (N=23)	Thai corpus (N=23)	Pearson Chi-square test		
			X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side
1. appear	13 (56.5%)	8 (34.8%)	2.190	.139	.218 small effect
2. argue	13 (56.5%)	3 (13%)	9.583	.002	.456 medium effect
3. assume	9 (39.1%)	3 (13%)	4.059	.044	.297 small effect
4. claim	9 (39.1%)	4 (17.4%)	2.681	.102	.241 small effect
5. doubt	1 (4.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1.022	1.00	.149 small effect
6. estimate	7 (30.4%)	1 (4.3%)	5.447	.047	.344 medium effect
7. feel	11 (47.8%)	10 (43.5%)	.088	.767	.044 medium effect
8. indicate	16 (69.6%)	12 (52.2%)	1.460	.227	.178 small effect

Verbs	Number of Moves including stance markers				
	International corpus (N=23)	Thai corpus (N=23)	Pearson Chi-square test		
			X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side
9. postulate	5 (21.7%)	1 (4.3%)	3.067	.187	.258 small effect
10. seem	13 (56.5%)	7 (30.4%)	3.185	.074	.263 small effect
11. suggest	18 (78.3%)	15 (65.2%)	.965	.326	.145 small effect
12. suppose	4 (17.4%)	2 (8.7%)	.767	.665	.129 small effect
13. suspect	2 (8.7%)	0 (0.0%)	2.091	.489	.213 small effect
14. tend to	13 (59.1%)	7 (30.4%)	3.185	.074	.263 small effect

To sum up, the verb *suggest* is the most frequently used device and accounts for the highest mean number of words in both sets of texts. International articles have a higher number of occurrences of all lexical verbs. There are significant differences in the frequencies of the verb *appear*, *argue*, *assume*, *claim*, *estimate*, *feel*, *indicate*, *seem,* and *tend to*. In terms of the number of Moves containing stance markers, the statistically significant difference between texts was only observed in the number of Moves including the verb *argue*,13 to 3.

- The verb *suggest* is the most frequently used device and accounts for the highest mean number of words in both sets of texts.
- International articles have a higher number of occurrences of all lexical verbs.
- There are significant differences in the frequencies of the verb *appear*, *argue*, *assume*, *claim*, *estimate*, *feel*, *indicate*, *seem,* and *tend to*.
- In terms of the number of Moves containing stance markers, the statistically significant difference between texts was only observed in the number of Moves including the verb *argue*,13 to 3.

4.3.2.3 Sub-categories of Hedges (Adverbs)

Table 4.31 presents the statistics for occurrences of adverbs across Moves. Table 4.32 compares the number of Moves containing adverbial stance markers. Table 4.31 shows that the particular adverb *often* is the most common adverb in international texts, whereas *mainly* is the most commonly used adverb in Thai texts. A significant difference was found in the number of occurrences of *often*, but was not found in the number of occurrences of *mainly*, ($x^2(1) = 86.349$, $p < .001$, small effect: Cramer's V effect size = .0125). In this analysis the adjusted significance threshold was set at .002. Given this, there are also significant differences in the frequencies of *about*, *frequently*, *generally*, *largely*, *relatively* and *somewhat*, (*about*: $x^2(1) = 11.862$, $p < .001$, small effect: Cramer's V effect size = .005; *frequently*: $x^2(1) = 15.879$, $p < .001$, small effect: Cramer's V effect size = .005; *generally*: $x^2(1) = 10.710$, $p = .001$, small effect: Cramer's V effect size = .004; *largely*: $x^2(1) = 21.700$, $p < .001$, small effect: Cramer's V effect size = .006; *relatively*: $x^2(1) = 39.124$, $p < .001$, small effect: Cramer's V effect size = .008; *somewhat*: $x^2(1) = 10.012$, $p = .002$, small effect: Cramer's V effect size =

.004) International authors make more extensive use of these adverbs, compared to Thai authors. There are also differences between texts in the frequencies of the other adverbs except the adverb *probably*, but these differences are not statistically significant.

As shown in Table 4.32, *largely* and *relatively* are the two most common adverbs in Moves in the international corpus. 65.2% of Moves in international texts include these two adverbs while only 8.7% and 17.4% of Moves in Thai texts include the adverbs respectively. These differences are statistically significant, (*largely*: $x^2(1) = 15.769$, $p < .001$, large effect: Cramer's V effect size = .585; *relatively*: $x^2(1) = 10.850$, $p < .001$, medium effect: Cramer's V effect size = .486). By contrast, *mainly* is the most common adverb used in Moves in Thai texts. However, there is no difference between texts in the number of Moves including this adverb. In this study, both international and Thai writers use the adverb *largely* to weaken their certainty of propositions or informational content, as shown in the examples (4.4) – (4.6). However, only international writers use *largely* to highlight the degree of scarcity of previous research, as illustrated in the example (4.7) - (4.8), and to explain research measurement, as shown in the example (4.9). In the examples (4.7) – (4.9) writers use *largely* to present a fact or situation in relation to their studies rather than to downplay their claims or propositions.

(4.4) The economy of Bhutan is based *largely* on agriculture and forestry, which provide livelihoods for over 60% of the population.

(E22)

(4.5) Then the Thai youth are *largely* changed to be alienated from Thai temples.

(TH25)

(4.6) The success of community-based tourism is *largely* dependent on the involvement of all stakeholders among which decision-making is shared (Haywood, 1988).

(TH28)

(4.7) STEs need to utilize various social capitals for operation their business, where social network is expected to play a key role; however, the role of social network in sustainable tourism development in the context of developing countries has been *largely* ignored in the literature.

(E16)

(4.8) The extent of engagement with standard tourist activities while abroad for medical treatment remains *largely* unknown and there is a clear need for any conceptualisation or reconceptualization to be evidence based.

(E 21)

(4.9) The measures used in the first section were *largely* based on the Leisure Motivation Scale (Beard & Ragheb, 1983) and its modified version used by Ryan and Glendon (1998).

(E20)

With regard to the adverb *relatively*, both international and Thai use this adverb to present claims or findings, as shown in the examples 4.10- 4.13.

(4.10) Cooperatives are a *relatively* equitable means of benefit distribution and community participation in China.

(E25)

(4.11) Validation suggests that these results are *relatively* robust.

(E4)

(4.12) Four items (Items 4, 6, 17 and 23) are located in this zone, indicating that tourists had *relatively* modest expectation regarding the region's performance on these attributes, however, the regional destination does not perform well from the perspective of tourists regarding these critical success factors.

(TH18)

(4.13) This is also confirmed within the MEAN and STDEV of each village, each has high value of MEAN and *relatively* low STDEV to exhibit each village's desire in each category.

(TH 10)

It may also serve to highlight a knowledge gap (example 4.14 - 4.15) and to justify methodology (example 4.16 – 4.17). These two functions are only shown in the international corpus.

(4.14) Tourism policy studies in Norway are also *relatively* under-researched with the exception of a few studies such as Go¨ssling, Hall, Ekstro¨m, Engeset, and Aall (2012).

(E 42)

(4.15) There is *relatively* limited evidence regarding the perceptions and the stance of the local policy makers as individuals who collectively have the lead-role in promoting an appropriate image and brand for their destinations.

(E 34)

(4.16) Narayan (2005) calculates two sets of critical values for small sample sizes that will be adopted for this study since we have a *relatively* small sample size with 21 observations.

(E35)

(4.17) There were three sub-aims for the inclusion of the three supplemental cases: (1) to identify major issues and conflicting parties more accurately and *relatively* completely; (2) to verify if the major issues in the main case study have appeared in the supplemental case studies through comparison; and (3) to see if there is any difference among the four cases.

(E2)

The international corpus has a higher number of Moves including the other adverbs except for the adverbs *approximately* and *around*, which both sets of texts have the same number of Moves containing these two specific adverbs. However, the chi-square tests revealed that there were no significant differences between texts in the number of Moves using these adverbs.

Table 4.31: Number of occurrences of adverbs (hedges) across Moves

Adverbs	International corpus		Thai corpus		Pearson Chi-square test		
	Total number of occurrences	Freq. per 1,000 words	Total number of occurrences	Freq. per 1,000 words	X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side
1. about	54	.16	12	.05	11.862	< .001	.005 small effect
2. almost	30	.09	22	.10	.263	.608	.001 small effect
3. apparently	9	.03	3	.01	.968	.389	.001 small effect
4. approximately	30	.09	32	.15	4.257	.039	.003 small effect
5. around	24	.07	21	.10	1.160	.282	.001 small effect
6. broadly	7	.02	2	.01	1.047	.497	.001 small effect
7. essentially	14	.04	7	.03	.268	.604	.001 small effect
8. fairly	14	.04	7	.03	.268	.604	.001 small effect
9. frequently	51	.15	8	.04	15.879	< .001	.005 small effect
10. generally	84	.24	26	.12	10.710	.001	.004 small effect
11. largely	52	.15	5	.02	21.700	< .001	.006 small effect
12. mainly	90	.26	44	.20	2.036	.154	.002 small effect
13. mostly	55	.16	39	.18	.277	.599	.001 small effect
14. often	204	.59	19	.09	86.349	< .001	.012 small effect
15. perhaps	17	.05	7	.03	.946	.331	.001 small effect
16. possibly	17	.05	8	.04	.493	.483	.001 small effect
17. presumably	5	.01	0	.00	3.176	.164	.002 small effect

Adverbs	International corpus		Thai corpus		Pearson Chi-square test		
	Total number of occurrences	Freq. per 1,000 words	Total number of occurrences	Freq. per 1,000 words	X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side
18. probably	9	.03	6	.03	.008	.927	.000 small effect
19. quite	29	.08	13	.06	1.101	.294	.001 small effect
20. rather	20	.06	4	.02	4.969	.026	.003 small effect
21. relatively	100	.29	11	.05	39.124	< .001	.008 small effect
22. roughly	5	.01	1	.00	1.242	.415	.001 small effect
23. sometimes	27	.08	13	.06	.678	.410	.001 small effect
24. somewhat	23	.07	2	.01	10.012	.002	.004 small effect
25. typically	23	.07	6	.03	4.023	.045	.003 small effect
26. usually	50	.15	23	.11	1.654	.198	.002 small effect

Table 4.32: Number of Moves including adverbs (hedges)

Adverbs	Number of Moves including stance markers				
	International corpus (N=23)	Thai corpus (N=23)	Pearson Chi-square test		
			X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side
1. about	7 (30.4%)	6 (26.1%)	.107	.743	.048 small effect
2. almost	9 (39.1%)	5 (21.7%)	1.643	.200	.189 small effect
3. apparently	4 (17.4%)	1 (4.3%)	2.020	.346	.210 small effect
4. approximately	6 (26.1%)	6 (26.1%)	.000	1.00	.000 small effect
5. around	5 (21.7%)	5 (21.7%)	.000	1.00	.000 small effect
6. broadly	3 (13.0%)	2 (8.7%)	.224	1.00	.070 small effect
7. essentially	6 (26.1%)	4 (17.4%)	.511	.475	.105 small effect
8. fairly	6 (26.1%)	4 (17.4%)	.511	.475	.105 small effect

Adverbs	Number of Moves including stance markers				
	International corpus (N=23)	Thai corpus (N=23)	Pearson Chi-square test		
			X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side
9. frequently	10 (43.5%)	3 (13.0%)	5.254	.022	.338 medium effect
10. generally	14 (60.9%)	7 (30.4%)	4.293	.038	.306 medium effect
11. largely	15 (65.2%)	2 (8.7%)	15.769	< .001	.585 large effect
12. mainly	12 (52.2%)	11 (47.8%)	.087	.768	.043 small effect
13. mostly	12 (52.2%)	9 (39.1%)	.789	.375	.131 small effect
14. often	14 (60.9%)	6 (26.1%)	5.662	.017	.351 medium effect
15. perhaps	5 (21.7%)	4 (17.4%)	.138	1.00	.055 small effect
16. possibly	7 (30.4%)	5 (21.7%)	.451	.502	.099 small effect
17. presumably	3 (13.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3.209	.233	.264 small effect

Adverbs	Number of Moves including stance markers				
	International corpus (N=23)	Thai corpus (N=23)	Pearson Chi-square test		
			X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side
18. probably	5 (21.7%)	3 (13.0%)	.605	.699	.115 small effect
19. quite	8 (34.8%)	7 (30.4%)	.099	.753	.046 small effect
20. rather	8 (34.8%)	3 (13.0%)	2.987	.084	.255 small effect
21. relatively	15 (65.2%)	4 (17.4%)	10.850	< .001	.486 medium effect
22. roughly	3 (13.0%)	1 (4.3%)	1.095	.608	.154 small effect
23. sometimes	9 (39.1%)	4 (17.4%)	2.681	.102	.241 small effect
24. somewhat	8 (34.8%)	2 (8.7%)	4.600	.032	.316 medium effect
25. typically	7 (30.4%)	5 (21.7%)	.451	.502	.099 small effect
26. usually	10 (43.5%)	7 (30.4%)	.840	.359	.135 small effect

In conclusion, *often* and *mainly* are the most common adverbs used in international and Thai texts respectively. However, the statistically significant difference between texts only exists in the number of occurrences of *often*. Moreover, international authors are more likely than Thai authors to significantly employ the following adverbs: *about*, *frequently*, *generally*, *largely*, *relatively,* and *somewhat*. The two particular adverbs, *largely* and *relatively* are used in the majority of Moves in international articles, while *mainly* is widely used in Moves in Thai articles. A significant difference between texts was observed only in the number of Moves including *largely* and *relatively*. No statistically significant difference was found in the number of Moves including *mainly*.

- *Often* and *mainly* are the most common adverbs used in international and Thai texts respectively.
- The statistically significant difference between texts only exists in the number of occurrences of *often*.
- International authors are more likely than Thai authors to significantly employ the following adverbs: *about*, *frequently*, *generally*, *largely*, *relatively,* and *somewhat*.
- The two particular adverbs, *largely* and *relatively* are used in the majority of Moves in international articles, while *mainly* is widely used in Moves in Thai articles.
- A significant difference between texts was observed only in the number of Moves including *largely* and *relatively*.
- No statistically significant difference was found in the number of Moves including *mainly*.

4.3.2.4 Sub-categories of Hedges (Adjectives)

Table 4.33 presents the variation in the use of adjectives (hedges) across Moves**.** Table 4.34 compares the number of Moves including adjectives used as stance markers. Table 4.33 shows that *likely* is the most common adjective in both corpora. International articles make more extensive use of this adjective than Thai articles, ($x^2(1) = 39.550$, $p < .001$, small effect: Cramer's V effect size = .008). Based on the Bonferroni correction, .006, significant differences between texts

were also found in the frequencies of *possible* and *typical*, (*possible*: $x^2(1) = 33.999$, $p < .001$, small effect: Cramer's V effect size = .008; *typical*: $x^2(1) = 12.827$, $p < .001$, small effect: Cramer's V effect size = .005). The international researchers use these two adjectives more significantly than the Thai researchers. International researchers also tend to make greater use of other adjectives than Thai researchers except for the adjectives *probable* and *uncertain*. However, these differences are non-significant.

From Table 4.34, *possible* and *likely* are the most common adjectives included in Moves in international texts and Thai texts respectively. However, the chi-square tests did not show significant differences between texts in the number of Moves including these two adjectives. The other adjectives are more dominant in international texts than in Thai texts except for the adjectives *probable* and *uncertain*. However, the chi-square results revealed that there were no significant differences in the number of Moves incorporating these adjectives.

4.33: Number of occurrences of adjectives (hedges) across Moves

Adjectives	International corpus		Thai corpus		Pearson Chi-square test		
	Total number of occurrences	Freq. per 1,000 words	Total number of occurrences	Freq. per 1,000 words	X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side
1. apparent	14	.04	2	.01	4.674	.031	.003 small effect
2. likely	180	.52	40	.18	39.550	< .001	.008 small effect
3. plausible	4	.01	0	.00	2.541	.163	.002 small effect
4. possible	82	.24	8	.04	33.999	< .001	.008 small effect
5. probable	0	.000	1	.005	1.574	.388	.002 small effect
6. typical	34	.10	4	.02	12.827	< .001	.005 small effect
7. uncertain	1	.003	1	.005	.105	1.000	.000 small effect
8. unclear	10	.03	3	.01	1.360	.243	.002 small effect
9. unlikely	11	.03	0	.000	6.987	.009	.004 small effect

Table 4.34: Number of Moves including adjectives (hedges)

Adjectives	Number of Moves including stance markers				
	International corpus (N=23)	Thai corpus (N=23)	Pearson Chi-square test		
			X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side
1. apparent	8 (34.8%)	2 (8.7%)	4.600	.032	.316 medium effect
2. likely	2 (8.7%)	9 (39.1%)	5.855	.016	.357 medium effect
3. plausible	3 (13.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3.209	.233	.264 small effect
4. possible	12 (70.6%)	5 (29.4%)	4.572	.032	.315 medium effect
5. probable	0 (0.0%)	1 (4.3%)	1.022	1.00	.149 small effect
6. typical	11 (47.8%)	3 (13.0%)	6.571	.010	.378 medium effect
7. uncertain	1(4.3%)	1 (4.3%)	.000	1.00	.000 small effect
8. unclear	6 (26.1%)	3 (13.0%)	1.243	.459	.164 small effect
9. unlikely	6 (26.1%)	0 (0.0%)	6.900	.022	.387 medium effect

To sum up, *likely* is the most prevalent adjective used by Thai writers. The difference between texts in the number of occurrences of this adjective is significant. International writers make more extensive use of *possible* and *typical* than Thai writers. There are no significant differences in the frequencies of the other six adjectives between the two groups. *Possible* and *likely* are found more commonly in Moves in international and Thai articles respectively. However, there are no statistically significant differences between texts in the number of Moves including these two adjectives as well as the other adjectives.

- *Likely* is the most prevalent adjective used by Thai writers.
- There is a statistically significant difference between the two groups in the number of occurrences of the adjective *likely*.
- International writers make more extensive use of *possible* and *typical* than Thai writers.
- There are no significant differences in the frequencies of the other six adjectives between the two groups.
- *Possible* and *likely* are found more commonly in Moves in international and Thai articles respectively.
- However, there are no statistically significant differences between texts in the number of Moves including these two adjectives as well as the other adjectives.

4.3.2.5 Sub-categories of Hedges (Nouns)

Nouns are the least frequently used devices in the sub-categories of hedges in this study. Table 4.35 compares frequencies of nouns (hedges) across Moves. Table 4.36 shows the number of Moves including nouns used as stance markers in both corpora. From Table 4.35, two nouns, namely *claim,* and *doubt* are more common in international texts than in Thai texts. They were not found in any Thai articles. However, in neither case is a statistically significant difference. *Claim* was included in three Moves and *doubt* was included in two Moves of international texts, as shown in Table 4.36.

To conclude, nouns are more dominant in the international corpus than in the Thai corpus. However, no statistically significant differences between the two corpora were observed in the number of occurrences of the nouns as well as in the number of Moves including both nouns.

- Nouns are more dominant in the international corpus than in the Thai corpus.
- No statistically significant differences between the two corpora were observed in the number of occurrences of the nouns as well as in the number of Moves including both nouns.

Table 4.35: Number of occurrences of nouns (hedges) across Moves

Nouns	International corpus		Thai corpus		Pearson Chi-square test		
	Total number of occurrences	Freq. per 1,000 words	Total number of occurrences	Freq. per 1,000 words	X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side
1. claim	4	.01	0	0.00	2.541	.163	.002 small effect
2. doubt	3	.01	0	0.00	1.905	.287	.002 small effect

Table 4.36: Number of Moves including nouns (Hedges)

Nouns	Number of Moves including stance markers						
	International corpus (N=23)	Freq. per 1,000 words	Thai corpus (N=23)	Freq. per 1,000 words	Pearson Chi-square test		
					X^2	P value	Cramer's V effect side
1. claim	3 (13.0%)	.01	0 (0.0%)	0.00	3.209	.233	.264 small effect
2. doubt	2 (8.7%)	.01	0 (0.0%)	0.00	2.091	.489	.213small effect

4.3.2.6 Sub-categories of Hedges (Others)

Table 4.37 shows the number of occurrences of others (hedges) across Moves. Table 4.38 presents statistics of the number of Moves incorporating others (hedges). As shown in Table 4.37, all specified phrases are more common in the international corpus than in the Thai corpus. *In general* is the most popular phrase in both corpora. Given that the adjusted significance threshold was .007, there was no significant difference between texts in the number of occurrences of *in general*. With regard to the other six phrases, significant differences were not observed in the frequencies of those phrases.

Table 4.38, shows that Moves in both corpora include *in general*, compared to other phrases. *In general* was found in 52.2% and 30.4% of Moves in international and Thai texts respectively. Nonetheless, no significant difference between the two groups was evident in the number of Moves including this phrase. International texts include the other six phrases of stance markers. Nevertheless, none of these differences were statistically significant.

In summary, *in general* is the most preferred phrase employed by both groups of writers. Although international researchers make greater use of all phrases of stance markers than Thai researchers, there are no statistically significant differences between the two cohorts of writers, regarding the number of occurrences, and the number of Moves including stance markers.

- *In general* is the most preferred phrase employed by both groups of writers.
- International researchers make greater use of all phrases of stance markers than Thai researchers.
- There are no statistically significant differences between the two cohorts of writers, regarding the number of occurrences, and the number of Moves including stance markers.

Table 4.37: Number of occurrences of others (hedges) across Moves

Others	International corpus		Thai corpus		Pearson Chi-square test		
	Total number of occurrences	Freq. per 1,000 words	Total number of occurrences	Freq. per 1,000 words	X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side
1. certain amount	1	.003	0	.00	.635	1.000	.001 small effect
2. certain extent	3	.01	0	.00	1.905	.287	.002 small effect
3. certain level	3	.009	1	.005	.323	1.000	.001 small effect
4. from this perspective	1	.003	0	.000	.635	1.000	.001 small effect
5. in general	38	.11	22	.10	.120	.729	.000 small effect
6. in most cases	3	.01	0	.00	1.905	.287	.002 small effect
7. on the whole	3	.01	0	.00	1.905	.287	.002 small effect

Table 4.38: Number of Moves including others (hedges)

Others	Number of Moves including stance markers				
	International corpus (N=23)	Thai corpus (N=23)	Pearson Chi-square test		
			X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side
1. certain amount	1 (4.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1.022	1.00	.149 small effect
2. certain extent	3 (13.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3.209	.233	.264 small effect
3. certain level	3 (13.0%)	1(4.3%)	1.095	.608	.154 small effect
4. from this perspective	1 (4.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1.022	1.00	.149 small effect
5. in general	12 (52.2%)	7 (30.4%)	2.241	.134	.221 small effect
6. in most cases	1 (4.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1.022	1.00	.149 small effect
7. on the whole	2 (8.7%)	0 (0.0%)	2.091	.489	.213 small effect

4.3.3 Boosters

Boosters are used to express a writer's certainty. Table 4.39 shows the variation in the use of four sub-categories of boosters across Moves. Table 4.40 presents the number of Moves including boosters. In Table 4.39 we can see that verbs are the most dominant boosting devices in both corpora. They are used more commonly in the international corpus than in the Thai corpus, but this difference is not significant, based on the adjusted significance threshold at .01. A statistically significant difference between texts was observed in the frequency of modal verbs, ($x^2(1) = 94.111$, $p < .001$, small effect: Cramer's V effect size = .013). Thai writers make more widespread use of modal verbs than international writers. Similarly, Thai researchers also tend to make greater use of adverbs than international researchers, but this difference is not significant. In contrast, adjectives are more common in international texts than in Thai texts. However, this difference is not significant.

Unsurprisingly, verbs are by far the most common device typically included in Moves in both corpora, as shown in Table 4.40. When comparing both groups of texts, international texts have a higher number of Moves including verbs and adjectives than Thai texts. However, in neither case is there a statistically significant difference. By contrast, Thai articles have a higher number of Moves including adverbs and modal verbs, but these differences are non-significant as well.

Table 4.39: Number of occurrences of boosting devices across Moves

Boosting devices	International corpus		Thai corpus		Pearson Chi-square test		
	Total number of occurrences	Freq. per 1,000 words	Total number of occurrences	Freq. per 1,000 words	X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side
Verbs	962	2.79	678	3.10	4.322	.038	.003 small effect
Adverbs	132	.38	91	.42	.362	.547	.001 small effect
Adjectives	74	.21	33	.15	2.885	.089	.002 small effect
Modal verbs	80	.23	174	.80	94.111	< .001	.013 small effect

Table 4.40: Number of Moves including boosting devices

Boosting devices	Number of Moves including stance markers				
	International corpus (N=23)	Thai corpus (N=23)	Pearson Chi-square test		
			X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side
Verbs	22 (95.7%)	19 (82.6%)	2.020	.346	.210 small effect
Adverbs	11 (47.8%)	13 (56.5%)	.348	.555	.087 small effect
Adjectives	11 (47.8%)	10 (43.5%)	.088	.767	.044 small effect
Modal verbs	13 (56.5%)	14 (60.9%)	.090	.765	.044 small effect

In conclusion, both corpora share a similar pattern of use of boosting devices. Verbs are the most widespread boosting devices in both sets of texts. There is a significant difference in the frequency of modal verbs. The Thai corpus has more extensive use of modal verbs than the international corpus. Verbs are the most common device incorporated in Moves in both corpora. The international corpus typically includes verbs and adjectives in Moves while most Moves in the Thai corpus include adverbs and modal verbs. However, there are no significant differences in the number of moves including all sub-categories of boosting devices.

- Verbs are the most widespread boosting devices in both sets of texts.
- There is a significant difference in the frequency of modal verbs.
- The Thai corpus has more extensive use of modal verbs than the international corpus.
- Verbs are the most common device incorporated in Moves in both corpora.
- The international corpus typically includes verbs and adjectives in Moves.
- Most Moves in the Thai corpus include adverbs and modal verbs.
- There are no significant differences in the number of moves including all sub-categories of boosting devices.

4.3.3.1 Sub-categories of Boosters (Verbs)

Considering frequencies and patterns of use of sub-categories of boosters, as noted above, verbs are by far the most common boosting device used by both groups of researchers. Table 4.41 presents the number of occurrences of verbs used as stance markers in both corpora. Table 4.42 presents the number of Moves containing those verbs in both corpora. As shown in Table 4.41, *show* is the most common device in both sets of texts. Thai texts have a slightly higher number of occurrences of *show* than international texts, but this difference is not statistically significant. In this analysis, the Bonferroni correction was .006. Significant differences between the two sets of data were observed in the frequencies of *demonstrate*, *know* and *realize*, (demonstrate: $x^2(1) = 14.240$, $p < .001$, small effect: Cramer's V effect size = .005; know: $x^2(1) = 27.993$, $p < .001$ small effect: Cramer's V effect size = .007; realize: $x^2(1) = 34.211$, $p < .001$, small

effect: Cramer's V effect size = .008). International articles make more extensive use of *demonstrate* whereas *know* and *realize* are more extensively used in Thai articles. Both groups of data have the same number of occurrences of *establish* and *prove*. There are differences between the two groups in the frequencies of the other verbs, but these differences are not significant.

Table 4.42 shows that most Moves in the international corpus include the verb *demonstrate* while the majority of Moves in the Thai corpus use the verb *show*. A significant difference between texts was found in the frequency of *demonstrate*, but was not found in the frequency of *show*, ($x^2(1) = 9.583$, $p = .002$, medium effect: Cramer's V effect size = .456). Both international and Thai scholars use the specific verb *demonstrate* to present the results of other studies, as shown in the examples (4.18 – 4.19), or to present their own findings, as shown in the example (4.20 – 4.21). Only international authors use the verb *demonstrate* to justify the validity of research methods or procedures, and to state a research objective, as shown in the example (4.22) and (4.23) respectively. Providing readers with a justification of the validity of research procedures helps a writer ensure readers that his or her study meets the disciplinary standard. In so doing, the writer gains research credibility.

(4.18) Several studies have *demonstrated* that cognitive image of a destination significantly affects behavioural intentions (Wang & Fu, 2015; Whang et al., 2016).

(E 33)

(4.19) Kim et al. (2017) *demonstrated* that satisfactory medical activity in the hospital influences loyalty toward that hospital.

(TH 29)

(4.20) Survey results *demonstrate* that the majority of respondents, whether or not they participate directly in tourism, support tourism development (96.9%) and hold positive views regarding its future development (87.7%).

(E 6)

(4.21) However, results of the surveys demonstrated that only a few villagers in either village understood the definition of sustainable CBT development.

(TH 24)

(4.22) Subsequent confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) suggested that the scale *demonstrated* adequate convergent validity with each primary factor loading ≥ 0.87 and average variance extracted (AVE) ≥ 0.61 (Table 1). Discriminant validity was also *demonstrated* with no secondary factor

loading > 0.30 and the square of the correlation of each pair of factors being less than the variance extracted for each factor.

(E 41)

(4.23) We aim to *demonstrate* that the methodological process is suitable to characterize the ecotourism potential of regions with recreation appeal that lack conservation and development funding, and that it can be scalable and replicable worldwide.

(E 17)

Analysis shows that there are differences between texts in the number of Moves incorporating the other verbs except the verb *know*, none of these differences were statistically significant.

Table 4.41: Number of occurrences of verbs (boosters) across Moves

Verbs	International corpus		Thai corpus		Pearson Chi-square test		
	Total number of occurrences	Freq. per 1,000 words	Total number of occurrences	Freq. per 1,000 words	X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side
1. believe	44	.13	37	.17	1.594	.207	.002 small effect
2. demonstrate	106	.31	32	.15	14.240	< .001	.005 small effect
3. establish	52	.15	33	.15	.000	.997	.000 small effect
4. find	328	.95	226	1.03	.889	.346	.001 small effect
5. know	24	.07	52	.24	27.993	< .001	.007 small effect
6. prove	16	.05	10	.05	.002	.968	.000 small effect
7. realize	8	.02	36	.16	34.211	< .001	.008 small effect
8. show	345	1.00	234	1.07	.603	.438	.001 small effect
9. think	39	.11	18	.08	1.266	.260	.001 small effect

Table 4.42**:** Number of Moves including verbs (boosters)

Verbs	Number of Moves including stance markers				
	International corpus (N=23)	Thai corpus (N=23)	Pearson Chi-square test		
			X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side
1. believe	10 (43.5%)	9 (39.1%)	.090	.765	.044 small effect
2. demonstrate	20 (87.0%)	10 (43.5%)	9.583	.002	.456 medium effect
3. establish	12 (52.2%)	8 (34.8%)	1.415	.234	.175 small effect
4. find	17 (73.9%)	14 (60.9%)	.890	.345	.139 small effect
5. know	11 (47.8%)	11 (47.8%)	.000	1.000	.000 small effect
6. prove	9 (39.1%)	4 (17.4%)	2.681	.102	.241 small effect
7. realize	5 (21.7%)	9 (39.1%)	1.643	.200	.189 small effect
8. show	18 (78.3%)	16 (69.6%)	.451	.502	.099 small effect
9. think	7 (30.4%)	8 (34.8%)	.099	.753	.046 small effect

To conclude, there are significant differences between texts in the frequencies and number of Moves including the verb *demonstrate*. International authors make more extensive use of this verb than Thai authors. There are significant differences between texts in the frequencies of *know* and *realize*. Thai researchers employ these two verbs more often than international researchers.

- There are significant differences between texts in the frequencies and number of Moves including the verb *demonstrate*.
- International authors make more extensive use of the verb *demonstrate* than Thai authors.
- There are significant differences between texts in the frequencies of *know* and *realize*.
- Thai researchers employ *know* and *realize* more often than international researchers.

4.3.3.2 Sub-categories of Boosters (Adverbs)

Table 4.43 compares the number of occurrences of adverbs (boosters) across Moves between the two sub-corpora. Table 4.44 compares the number of Moves including adverbs used as stance markers. As shown in Table 4.43, it is apparent that *always* is the most frequently used adverb in the international corpus whereas *clearly* is the most dominant adverb in the Thai corpus. Given that the adjusted significance threshold was .004, there were no significant differences in the frequencies of these two specific adverbs between the two groups. There were differences between texts in the frequencies of the other specified adverbs except for the adverb *undoubtedly*. Nonetheless, these differences were not statistically significant.

From Table 4.44, *always* is the most common adverb included in Moves in international articles. By contrast, *clearly* is the most common adverb incorporated in Moves in Thai texts. No statistically significant differences between texts were evident in the number of Moves encompassing these two adverbs. There were differences in the number of Moves including the other adverbs except for the adverbs *evidently* and *never*, but these differences were not significant.

Table 4.43: Number of occurrences of adverbs (boosters) across Moves

Adverbs	International corpus		Thai corpus		Pearson Chi-square test		
	Total number of occurrences	Freq. per 1,000 words	Total number of occurrences	Freq. per 1,000 words	X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side
1. actually	13	.04	5	.02	.928	.335	.001 small effect
2. always	29	.08	16	.07	.205	.651	.001 small effect
3. certainly	1	.003	4	.02	3.565	.078	.003 small effect
4. clearly	19	.06	20	.09	2.540	.111	.002 small effect
5. definitely	0	.00	3	.01	4.723	.059	.003 small effect
6. evidently	1	.003	1	.005	.105	1.000	.000 small effect
7. indeed	25	.07	3	.01	9.327	.002	.004 small effect
8. in fact	22	.06	18	.08	.638	.424	.001 small effect
9. never	6	.02	8	.04	1.974	.160	.002 small effect
10. of course	3	.01	1	.005	.323	1.000	.001 small effect
11. really	10	.03	13	.06	3.026	.082	.002 small effect
12. surely	2	.01	0	.00	1.270	.525	.002 small effect
13. undoubtedly	2	.01	3	.01	.942	.383	.001 small effect

Table 4.44: Number of Moves including adverbs (boosters)

Adverbs	Number of Moves including stance markers				
	International corpus (N=23)	Thai corpus (N=23)	Pearson Chi-square test		
			X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side
1. actually	4 (17.4%)	3 (13.0%)	.168	1.00	.061 small effect
2. always	9 (39.1%)	6 (26.1%)	.890	.345	.139 small effect
3. certainly	1 (4.3%)	4 (17.4%)	2.020	.346	.210 small effect
4. clearly	7 (30.4%)	8 (34.8%)	.099	.753	.046 small effect
5. definitely	0 (0.0%)	2 (8.7%)	2.091	.489	.213 small effect
6. evidently	1 (4.3%)	1 (4.3%)	.000	1.000	.000 small effect
7. indeed	7 (30.4%)	3 (13.0%)	2.044	.153	.211 small effect
8. in fact	5 (21.7%)	6 (26.1%)	.119	.730	.051 small effect
9. never	4 (17.4%)	4 (17.4%)	.000	1.000	.000 small effect
10. of course	3 (13.0%)	1 (4.3%)	1.095	.608	.154 small effect
11. really	5 (21.7%)	7 (30.4%)	.451	.502	.099 small effect
12. surely	1 (4.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1.022	1.000	.149 small effect
13. undoubtedly	2 (8.7%)	1 (4.3%)	.357	1.000	.088 small effect

In summary, there are no statistically significant differences between texts in the frequencies of all specified adverbs as well as in the number of Moves including these adverbs. *Always* and *clearly* are the most common adverbs in international and Thai articles respectively.

- There are no statistically significant differences between texts in the frequencies of all specified adverbs as well as in the number of Moves including these adverbs.
- *Always* and *clearly* are the most common adverbs in international and Thai articles respectively.

4.3.3.3 Sub-categories of Boosters (Adjectives)

Table 4.45 shows the number of occurrences of adjectives (boosters) across Moves. Table 4.46 compares the number of Moves using adjectives in both corpora. As shown in Table 4.45, *Evident* and *obvious* are the most common adjectives in international texts and Thai texts respectively. Based on the adjusted significance threshold at .007, significant differences between texts were not found in the frequencies of these two adjectives. Although there were differences in the number of occurrences of the other adjectives, these differences were not significant.

From Table 4.46, there is a similar pattern of use of adjectives to mark the writer's certainty between both sub-corpora. The adjective *clear* is the most common adjective used in Moves in both groups of texts whereas the adjective *definite* is omitted in Moves in both corpora, bar one mention in the Thai texts. The chi-square tests showed that there were no significant differences between texts in the number of Moves including these two adjectives. With regard to the other adjectives, international articles have a higher number of Moves including these adjectives than Thai articles. However, none of these differences were statistically significant.

Table 4.45: Number of occurrences of adjectives (boosters) across Moves

Adjectives	International corpus		Thai corpus		Pearson Chi-square test		
	Total number of occurrences	Freq. per 1,000 words	Total number of occurrences	Freq. per 1,000 words	X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side
1. certain	12	.03	2	.01	3.554	.059	.003 small effect
2. clear	18	.05	8	.04	.713	.398	.001 small effect
3. definite	0	.00	1	.005	1.574	.388	.002 small effect
4. evident	22	.06	6	.03	3.575	.059	.003 small effect
5. obvious	17	.05	10	.05	.037	.847	.000 small effect
6. sure	5	.01	5	.02	.524	.525	.001 small effect
7. undeniable	0	.00	1	.005	1.574	.388	.002 small effect

Table 4.46: Number of Moves including adjectives (boosters)

Adjectives	Number of Moves including stance markers				
	International corpus (N=23)	Thai corpus (N=23)	Pearson Chi-square test		
			X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side
1. certain	3 (13.0%)	2 (8.7%)	.224	1.000	.070 small effect
2. clear	9 (39.1%)	5 (21.7%)	1.643	.200	.189 small effect
3. definite	0 (0.0%)	1 (4.3%)	1.022	1.000	.149 small effect
4. evident	5 (21.7%)	4 (17.4%)	.138	1.000	.055 small effect
5. obvious	7 (30.4%)	4 (17.4%)	1.075	.300	.153 small effect
6. sure	4 (17.4%)	3 (13.0%)	.168	1.000	.061 small effect
7. undeniable	3 (13.0%)	1 (4.3%)	1.095	.608	.154 small effect

To conclude, both corpora share a similar pattern of use of adjectives; that is, *evident* and *obvious* share a commonality in both sets of texts. The adjective *clear* is the most dominant adjective included in Moves in both corpora. There are no significant differences between texts in both frequencies of all specified adjectives and the number of Moves including those adjectives.

- *Evident* and *obvious* share a commonality in both sets of texts.
- The adjective *clear* is the most dominant adjective included in Moves in both corpora.
- There are no significant differences between texts in both frequencies of all specified adjectives and the number of Moves including those adjectives.

4.3.3.4 Sub-categories of Boosters (Modal verbs)

Table 4.47 presents the number of occurrences of modal verbs (boosters) across Moves. Table 4.48 shows the number of Moves containing modal verbs. *Must* is the only modal verb analysed as a boosting device. From Table 4.47 this grammatical device is much more common in the Thai corpus than in the international corpus. This difference is statistically significant, ($x^2(1) = 94.111$, $p < .001$, small effect: Cramer's V effect size = .013).

As expected, the Thai corpus has a higher number of Moves including *must* than the international corpus, as shown in Table 4.48. It was found in 56.5% of international texts and 60.9% of Thai texts. However, this difference is not significant.

To sum up, *must* is much more common in Thai articles than in international articles. A statistically significant difference between texts was found in the number of occurrences but was not found in the number of Moves.

- *Must* is much more common in Thai articles than in international articles.
- A statistically significant difference between texts was found in the number of occurrences but was not found in the number of Moves.

Table 4.47: Number of occurrences of modal verbs (boosters) across Moves

Adjectives	International corpus		Thai corpus		Pearson Chi-square test		
	Total number of occurrences	Freq. per 1,000 words	Total number of occurrences	Freq. per 1,000 words	X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side
1. must	80	.23	174	.80	94.111	< .001	.013 small effect

Table 4.48: Number of Moves including modal verbs (boosters)

Modal	Number of Moves including stance markers				
	International corpus (N=23)	Thai corpus (N=23)	Pearson Chi-square test		
			X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side
1. must	13 (56.5%)	14 (60.9%)	.090	.765	.044 small effect

4.3.4 Attitude Markers

Attitude markers are tools used to express an author's attitude to propositions. In this study, three sub-categories of attitude markers were identified. Table 4.49 shows the variations in the use of sub-categories of attitude markers across Moves. Table 4.50 compares the number of Moves incorporating attitude markers. In Table 4.49, attitude markers are more dominant in Thai articles than in international articles. Adjectives are the most common sub-category of attitude markers in both corpora. However, a significant difference between texts was not observed in the frequency of this grammatical device based on the adjusted significance threshold at .017. A statistically significant difference was found in the frequency of verbs. Compared to international authors, Thai authors make more widespread use of verbs, ($x^2(1) = 14.847$, $p < .001$, small effect: Cramer's V effect size = .005). Regarding the frequency of adverbs, no significant difference was evident between the two groups.

As expected, most Moves in both corpora include adjectives, as shown in Table 4.50, 87% of Moves in the international corpus and 91.3% of Moves in the Thai corpus. This difference is not statistically significant. International texts have a higher number of Moves containing adverbs than Thai texts. By contrast, Thai articles have a higher number of Moves including verbs. However, in neither case is there a statistically significant difference.

In summary, attitude markers are more prevalent in Thai articles than in international articles. There is a statistically significant difference between texts in the occurrences of verbs. They are much more common in Thai articles than in international articles. In terms of the number of Moves including attitude markers, adjectives are the most common grammatical features included in Moves in both corpora. No significant differences between texts were observed in the number of Moves incorporating all sub-categories of attitude markers.

- Attitude markers are more prevalent in Thai articles than in international articles.
- Verbs are much more common in Thai articles than in international articles.
- In terms of the number of Moves including attitude markers, adjectives are the most common grammatical features included in Moves in both corpora.
- No significant differences between texts were observed in the number of Moves incorporating all sub-categories of attitude markers.

Table 4.49: Number of occurrences of attitude markers across Moves

Attitude markers	International corpus		Thai corpus		Pearson Chi-square test		
	Total number of occurrences	Freq. per 1,000 words	Total number of occurrences	Freq. per 1,000 words	X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side
Adjectives	711	2.06	485	2.22	1.473	.225	.002 small effect
Adverbs	181	.53	133	.61	1.633	.201	.002 small effect
Verbs	65	.19	78	.36	14.847	< .001	.005 small effect

Table 4.50: Number of Moves including attitude markers

Attitude marker devices	Number of Moves including stance markers				
	International corpus (N=23)	Thai corpus (N=23)	Pearson Chi-square test		
			X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side
Adjectives	20 (87.0%)	21 (91.3%)	.224	1.00	.070 small effect
Adverbs	15 (65.2%)	13 (56.5%)	.365	.546	.089 small effect
Verbs	10 (43.5%)	12 (52.2%)	.348	.555	.087 small effect

4.3.4.1 Sub-categories of Attitude Markers (Adjectives)

Table 4.51 provides the statistics for the occurrences of all specified adjectives (attitude markers) distributed across the corpus. Table 4.52 compares the number of Moves including the adjectives (attitude markers). It is apparent from Table 4.51 that *important* is the most dominant adjective in both corpora. It is more common in the Thai corpus than in the international corpus. Given that the adjusted significance threshold was set at .002, this difference is non-significant. Statistically significant differences between the two groups were evident in the frequencies of *appropriate* and *expected*. Thai writers make more significant use of the adjective *appropriate* whereas international writers make more extensive use of the adjective *expected*, (*appropriate*: $x^2(1) = 14.898$, $p < .001$, small effect: Cramer's V effect size = .005; *expected*: $x^2(1) = 12.513$, $p < .001$, small effect: Cramer's V effect size = .005).

Table 4.52 shows that the adjective *important* is the most often included in Moves in both sets of texts, it was found in 87% of Moves in both corpora. Both sets of texts have the same number of Moves including the adjectives *appropriate*, *essential*, *interesting*, *understandable,* and *usual*. There are differences between texts in the number of moves incorporating the other adjectives, but these differences are not significant.

In conclusion, the adjective *important* is the most common linguistic device in both corpora by a large margin. There are statistically significant differences between texts in the frequencies of *appropriate* and *expected*. *Appropriate* is more common in the Thai corpus, and *expected* is more common in the international corpus. *Important* is the most widely used adjective in Moves in both sets of data. With regard to the other adjectives, there are differences in the number of Moves containing these adjectives between the two corpora, but none of these differences are statistically significant.

- The adjective *important* is the most common linguistic device in both corpora by a large margin.
- There are statistically significant differences between texts in the frequencies of *appropriate* and *expected*.
- *Appropriate* is more common in the Thai corpus.
- *Expected* is more common in the international corpus.
- *Important* is the most widely used adjective in Moves in both sets of data.
- There are no statistically significant differences in the number of Moves containing the other adjectives between the two corpora.

Table 4.51: Number of occurrences of adjectives (attitude markers) across Moves

Adjectives	International corpus		Thai corpus		Pearson Chi-square test		
	Total number of occurrences	Freq. per 1,000 words	Total number of occurrences	Freq. per 1,000 words	X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side
1. amazed	1	.003	0	.00	.635	1.000	.001 small effect
2. appropriate	57	.17	71	.32	14.898	< .001	.005 small effect
3. astonishing	1	.003	0	.00	.635	1.000	.001 small effect
4. curious	0	.00	1	.005	1.574	.388	.002 small effect
5. desirable	20	.06	6	.03	2.721	.099	.002 small effect
6. dramatic	3	.01	1	.005	.323	1.000	.001 small effect
7. essential	50	.15	40	.18	1.189	.276	.001 small effect
8. expected	77	.22	21	.10	12.513	< .001	.005 small effect
9. fortunate	1	.003	0	.00	.635	1.000	.001 small effect
10. important	420	1.22	275	1.26	.154	.695	.001 small effect
11. inappropriate	6	.02	9	.04	2.827	.093	.002 small effect
12. interesting	39	.11	39	.18	4.088	.043	.003 small effect
13. preferable	4	.01	2	.01	.077	1.000	.000 small effect
14. remarkable	8	.02	6	.03	.095	.758	.000 small effect
15. shocking	1	.003	0	.00	.635	1.000	.001 small effect
16. striking	4	.01	0	.00	2.541	.163	.002 small effect
17. surprising	2	.01	3	.01	.942	.383	.001 small effect

Adjectives	International corpus		Thai corpus		Pearson Chi-square test		
	Total number of occurrences	Freq. per 1,000 words	Total number of occurrences	Freq. per 1,000 words	X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side
18. understandable	4	.01	2	.01	.077	1.000	.000 small effect
19. unexpected	3	.01	2	.01	.003	1.000	.000 small effect
20. unfortunate	2	.006	1	.005	.038	1.000	.000 small effect
21. unusual	4	.012	1	.005	.747	.655	.001 small effect
22. usual	4	.01	5	.02	1.058	.323	.001 small effect

Table 4.52: Number of Moves including adjectives (attitude markers)

Adjectives	Number of Moves including stance markers				
	International corpus (N=23)	Thai corpus (N=23)	Pearson Chi-square test		
			X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side
1. amazed	1 (4.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1.022	1.000	.149 small effect
2. appropriate	17 (73.9%)	17 (73.9%)	.000	1.000	.000 small effect
3. astonishing	1 (4.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1.022	1.000	.149 small effect
4. curious	0 (0.0%)	1 (4.3%)	1.022	1.000	.149 small effect
5. desirable	10 (43.5%)	6 (26.1%)	1.533	.216	.183 small effect
6. dramatic	3 (13.0%)	1 (4.3%)	1.095	.295	.154 small effect
7. essential	13 (56.5%)	13 (56.5%)	.000	1.000	.000 small effect
8. expected	13 (56.5%)	8 (34.8%)	2.190	.139	.218 small effect
9. fortunate	1 (4.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1.022	1.000	.149 small effect
10. important	20 (87.0%)	20 (87.0%)	.000	1.000	.000 small effect
11. inappropriate	3 (13.0%)	6 (26.1%)	1.243	.459	.164 small effect
12. interesting	10 (43.5%)	10 (43.5%)	.000	1.000	.000 small effect
13. preferable	3 (13.0%)	2 (8.7%)	.224	1.000	.070 small effect

Adjectives	Number of Moves including stance markers				
	International corpus (N=23)	Thai corpus (N=23)	Pearson Chi-square test		
			X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side
14. remarkable	6 (26.1%)	5 (21.7%)	.119	.730	.051 small effect
15. shocking	1 (4.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1.022	1.000	.149 small effect
16. striking	4 (17.4%)	0 (0.0%)	4.381	.109	.309 small effect
17. surprising	1 (4.3%)	3 (13.0%)	1.095	.608	.154 small effect
18. understandable	2 (8.7%)	2 (8.7%)	.000	1.000	.000small effect
19. unexpected	3 (13.0%)	1 (4.3%)	1.095	.608	.154 small effect
20. unfortunate	2 (8.7%)	1 (4.3%)	.357	1.000	.088 small effect
21. unusual	2 (8.7%)	0 (0.0%)	2.091	.489	.213 small effect
22. usual	3 (13.0%)	3 (13.0%)	.000	1.000	.000 small effect

4.3.4.2 Sub-categories of Attitude Markers (Adverbs)

Table 4.53 illustrates the number of occurrences of all specified adverbs (attitude markers) in the corpus whereas Table 4.54 shows the number of Moves including adverbs (attitude markers). In Table 4.53, *even* is the most prevalent adverb in both corpora. It is more common in international texts than in Thai texts, but this difference was non-significant based on the adjusted significance threshold at .003. There are differences in the number of occurrences of the other adverbs except for the adverbs *dramatically*, *interestingly,* and *remarkably*. However, these differences were not statistically significant.

As in Table 4.54, *even* is the most frequent adverb used in Moves to manifest the writer's attitude in both corpora (56.5% in international texts and 43.5% in Thai texts). A chi-square test revealed that no significant difference was found in the number of Moves including this linguistic feature. There are differences between texts in the number of Moves containing other adverbs except for the adverb *dramatically* and *fortunately*, but none of these differences are statistically significant.

To sum up, *even* is the most common adverb in both corpora. No statistically significant differences were found in the frequencies of all specified adverbs between the two groups of texts. *Even* is also the most frequent adverb included in Moves in both corpora. There are no statistically significant differences between texts in the number of Moves incorporating all specified adverbs. It can thus be said that there is no difference between the two groups of writers in the pattern of use of adverbs to express their attitude to propositions.

- *Even* is the most common adverb in both corpora.
- No statistically significant differences were found in the frequencies of all specified adverbs between the two groups of texts.
- *Even* is also the most frequent adverb included in Moves in both corpora.
- There are no statistically significant differences between texts in the number of Moves incorporating all specified adverbs.

- It can thus be said that there is no difference between the two groups of writers in the pattern of use of adverbs to express their attitude to propositions.

Table 4.53: Number of occurrences of adverbs (attitude markers) across Moves

Adverbs	International corpus		Thai corpus		Pearson Chi-square test		
	Total number of occurrences	Freq. per 1,000 words	Total number of occurrences	Freq. per 1,000 words	X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side
1. appropriately	8	.02	9	.04	1.422	.233	.002 small effect
2. correctly	3	.01	4	.02	.987	.442	.001 small effect
3. dramatically	3	.01	3	.01	.314	.683	.001 small effect
4. even	111	.32	68	.31	.055	.815	.000 small effect
5. fortunately	1	.003	1	.005	.105	1.000	.000 small effect
6. hopefully	1	.002	2	.01	.978	.564	.001 small effect
7. importantly	20	.06	17	.08	.786	.375	.001 small effect
8. inappropriately	0	.00	2	.01	3.149	.151	.002 small effect
9. interestingly	13	.04	8	.04	.005	.944	.000 small effect
10. preferably	0	.00	4	.02	6.298	.023	.003 small effect
11. remarkably	2	.01	3	.01	.942	.383	.001 small effect
12. surprisingly	10	.03	3	.01	1.360	.243	.002 small effect
13. understandably	3	.01	0	.00	1.905	.287	.002 small effect
14. unexpectedly	2	.01	0	.00	1.270	.525	.002 small effect
15. unfortunately	4	.01	9	.04	5.054	.025	.003 small effect

Table 4.54: Number of Moves including adverbs (attitude markers)

Adverbs	Number of moves including stance markers				
	International corpus (N=23)	Thai corpus (N=23)	Pearson Chi-square test		
			X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side
1. appropriately	4 (17.4%)	6 (26.1%)	.511	.475	.105 small effect
2. correctly	2 (8.7%)	3 (13.0%)	.224	1.000	.070 small effect
3. dramatically	3 (13.0%)	3 (13.0%)	.000	1.000	.000 small effect
4. even	13 (56.5%)	10 (43.5%)	.783	.376	.130 small effect
5. fortunately	1 (4.3%)	1 (4.3%)	.000	1.000	.000 small effect
6. hopefully	1 (4.3%)	2 (8.7%)	.357	1.000	.088 small effect
7. importantly	4 (17.4%)	7 (30.4%)	1.075	.300	.153 small effect
8. inappropriately	0 (0.0%)	2 (8.7%)	2.091	.489	.213 small effect
9. interestingly	6 (26.1%)	4 (17.4%)	.511	.475	.105 small effect
10. preferably	0 (0.0%)	3 (13.0%)	3.209	.233	.264 small effect
11. remarkably	2 (8.7%)	3 (13.0%)	.224	1.000	.070 small effect
12. surprisingly	5 (21.7%)	1 (4.3%)	3.067	.187	.258 small effect
13. understandably	2 (8.7%)	0 (0.0%)	2.091	.489	.213 small effect
14. unexpectedly	2 (8.7%)	0 (0.0%)	2.091	.489	.213 small effect
15. unfortunately	3 (13.0%)	4 (17.4%)	.168	1.000	.061 small effect

4.3.4.3 Sub-categories of Attitude Markers (Verbs)

Table 4.55 presents the distribution of verbs (attitude markers) across Moves in both corpora. Table 4.56 provides the statistics for the number of Moves including verbs (attitude markers). In Table 4.55, *agree* and *prefer* are the most dominant verbs in Thai and international articles respectively. Given that the adjusted significance threshold was .017, a significant difference between texts was not found in the frequency of *prefer*, but was found in the frequency of *agree*, ($x^2(1) = 16.965$, $p < .001$, small effect: Cramer's V effect size = .005). Both sets of texts have the same degree of occurrences of *disagree*.

Table 4.56 highlights that *prefe*r is the most popular verb included in Moves in both corpora. It occurred in 43.5% of Moves in both sub-corpora. By contrast, *disagree* is the least frequent verb included in Moves in both sets of texts. International texts have a higher number of Moves incorporating this linguistic feature than Thai texts. Nonetheless, this difference is not significant.

In summary, *agree* and *prefer* are the most prevalent verbs in Thai and international texts respectively. A significant difference between texts was evident only in the frequency of *agree*. *Prefer* is the most frequent verb included in Moves in both groups of texts. There are no significant differences in the number of Moves containing all three specified verbs.

- *Agree* and *prefer* are the most prevalent verbs in Thai and international texts respectively.
- A significant difference between texts was evident only in the frequency of *agree*.
- *Prefer* is the most frequent verb included in Moves in both groups of texts.
- There are no significant differences in the number of Moves containing all three specified verbs.

Table 4.55: Number of occurrences of verbs (attitude markers) across Moves

Verbs	International corpus		Thai corpus		Pearson Chi-square test		
	Total number of occurrences	Freq. per 1,000 words	Total number of occurrences	Freq. per 1,000 words	X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side
1. agree	27	.08	45	.21	16.965	< .001	.005 small effect
2. disagree	5	.01	2	.01	.311	.713	.001 small effect
3. prefer	33	.10	32	.14	2.480	.115	.002 small effect

Table 4.56: Number of Moves including verbs (attitude markers)

Verbs	Number of Moves including stance markers				
	International corpus (N=23)	Thai corpus (N=23)	Pearson Chi-square test		
			X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side
1. agree	6 (26.1%)	8 (34.8%)	.411	.522	.094 small effect
2. disagree	3 (13.0%)	1 (4.3%)	1.095	.608	.154 small effect
3. prefer	10 (43.5%)	10 (43.5%)	.000	1.000	.000 small effect

4.3.5 Self-mentions

Self-mentions are references to the writer(s). Table 4.57 compares the number of occurrences of sub-categories of self-mentions whereas Table 4.58 shows the number of Moves including sub-categories of self-mentions. As shown in Table 4.57, all sub-categories of self-mentions except others are much more common in the international corpus than in the Thai corpus. First-person plural pronouns are the most common type of self-mentions in international articles whereas others tend to be the most dominant category in Thai articles. According to the adjusted significance threshold at .01, statistically significant differences between texts were found in the frequencies of all sub-categories, (first-person singular pronouns: $x^2(1) = 60.296$, $p < .001$, small effect: Cramer's V effect size = .010; first-person plural pronouns: $x^2(1) = 173.950$, $p < .001$, small effect: Cramer's V effect size = .018; possessive determiners: $x^2(1) = 135.261$, $p < .001$, small effect: Cramer's V effect size = .015; others: $x^2(1) = .003$, $p = .003$, small effect: Cramer's V effect size = .004).

Table 4.58 shows that most Moves in international texts include first-person plural pronouns while most Moves in Thai texts are likely to incorporate others. A statistically significant difference between the two groups was observed in the former case, but was not found in the latter case, ($x^2(1) = 17.338$, $p < .001$, large effect: Cramer's V effect size = .614). Statistically significant differences were also found in the number of Moves containing first-person singular pronouns and possessive determiners, (first-person singular pronouns: $x^2(1) = 9.678$, $p = .002$, medium effect: Cramer's V effect size = .459; possessive determiners: $x^2(1) = 23.365$, $p < .001$, large effect: Cramer's V effect size = .713). These two grammatical devices are more extensively included in Moves in international articles.

In conclusion, all sub-categories of self-mentions except others are much more common in international texts than in Thai texts. These differences are significant. Compared to the other sub-categories, first-person plural pronouns are the most common feature in the international corpus. By contrast, others are the most common device in the Thai corpus. There are also differences between texts in the number of Moves including first-person singular pronouns, first-

person plural pronouns, and possessive determiners. They are more often included in Moves in international texts than in Thai texts.

- All sub-categories of self-mentions except others are much more common in international texts than in Thai texts.
- Compared to the other sub-categories, first-person plural pronouns are the most common feature in the international corpus.
- Others are the most common device in the Thai corpus.
- There are also differences between texts in the number of Moves including first-person singular pronouns, first-person plural pronouns, and possessive determiners, which are more often included in Moves in international texts than in Thai texts.

Table 4.57: Number of occurrences of self-mentions across Moves

Self-mentions devices	International corpus		Thai corpus		Pearson Chi-square test		
	Total number of occurrences	Freq. per 1,000 words	Total number of occurrences	Freq. per 1,000 words	X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side
First- person singular pronouns	99	.29	1	.005	60.296	< .001	.010 small effect
First-person plural pronouns	328	.95	14	.06	173.950	< .001	.018 small effect
Possessive determiners	217	.63	1	.005	135.261	< .001	.015 small effect
Others	84	.24	84	.38	8.806	.003	.004 small effect

Table 4.58: Number of Moves including self-mentions

Self-mention devices	Number of Moves including stance markers				
	International corpus (N=23)	Thai corpus (N=23)	Pearson Chi-square test		
			X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side
First- person singular pronouns	10 (43.5%)	1 (4.3%)	9.678	.002	.459 medium effect
First-person plural pronouns	20 (87.0%)	6 (26.1%)	17.338	< .001	.614 large effect
Possessive determiners	17 (73.9%)	1 (4.3%)	23.365	< .001	.713 large effect
Others	13 (56.5%)	16 (69.6%)	.840	.359	.135 small effect

4.3.5.1 Sub-categories of self-mentions (First-person singular pronouns)

Table 4.59 provides the number of occurrences of first-person singular pronouns across moves. Table 4.60 presents the number of moves containing first-person singular pronouns. From Table 4.59, first-person singular pronouns are much more common in international texts than in Thai texts. *I* is more common than *me* in both corpora. According to the Bonferroni correction at .025, significant differences between texts were found in the number of occurrences of both *I* and *me*, (*I*: $x^2(1) = 52.043$, $p < .001$, small effect: Cramer's V effect size = .010; *me*: $x^2(1) = 8.257$, $p = .004$, small effect: Cramer's V effect size = .004).

As shown in Table 4.60, most moves in both corpora are more likely to include *I* rather than *me*. A statistically significant difference between texts was not found in the number of Moves incorporating *me* but was found in the number of Moves incorporating *I*, ($x^2(1) = 8.178$, $p = .004$, medium effect: Cramer's V effect size = .422). International texts make more extensive use of the pronoun *I* than Thai texts. In this study, international articles use the pronoun *I* to explain a procedure (example 4.24), demonstrate results (example 4.25) and claims (examples 4.26 - 4.27).

(4.24) *I* conducted 11 expert interviews with 14 participants as well as 14 tourist interviews across the 5 villages studied, summarised in Table 1 and Table 2.

(4.25) *I* found evidence of eagerness to interact, as well as barriers to interaction.

(4.26) *I* defined interactions as meaningful when they appeared to have mutual personal value

(4.27) The everyday life *I* observed provides a basis for creative tourism and requires little investment.

(E19)

The pronoun *I* was found in only one move, namely, Move 23 in the Thai corpus. It was employed to recommend further research, as shown in the example (4.28)

(4.28) Having analysed this study, *I* would like to suggest the following recommendations for future study.

(TH 40)

According to Hyland (2002a), the use of first-person pronouns to explain a procedure, as illustrated in example (4.24) is considered a lower risk for the writer than the use for stating results or claims, as shown in the example of (4.25-27). He further claimed that expressing personal conviction as to the results with the

use of self-reference is a risky strategy and vulnerable to criticism, but it best enables researchers to “explicitly foreground their distinctive contribution and commitment to a position” (p. 1103).

To sum up, first-person singular pronouns occur more commonly in international articles than in Thai articles. These differences are statistically significant. With regard to the number of Moves including first-person singular pronouns, the pronoun *I* is exhibited more significantly in Moves in international texts than in Thai texts.

- There are significant differences between texts in the frequencies of first-person singular pronouns.
- First-person singular pronouns occur more commonly in international articles than in Thai articles.
- With regard to the number of Moves including first-person singular pronouns, the pronoun *I* is exhibited more significantly in Moves in international texts than in Thai texts.

Table 4.59: Number of occurrences of first-person singular pronouns (self-mention) across Moves

First-person singular pronouns	International corpus		Thai corpus		Pearson Chi-square test		
	Total number of occurrences	Freq. per 1,000 words	Total number of occurrences	Freq. per 1,000 words	X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side
1. I	86	.25	1	.005	52.043	< .001	.010 small effect
2. me	13	.04	0	.00	8.257	.004	.004 small effect

Table 4.60: Number of Moves including first-person singular pronouns (self-mention)

First-person singular pronouns	Number of Moves including stance markers				
	International corpus (N=23)	Thai corpus (N=23)	Pearson Chi-square test		
			X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side
1. I	9 (39.1%)	1 (4.3%)	8.178	.004	.422 medium effect
2. me	2 (8.7%)	0 (0.0%)	2.091	.489	.213 small effect

4.3.5.2 Sub-categories of self-mentions (First-person plural pronouns)

Table 4.61 compares the distribution of first-person plural pronouns across Moves. Table 4.62 presents the number of Moves including first-person plural pronouns. From Table 4.61 we can see that first-person plural pronouns are more common in international articles than in Thai articles. *We* is the most common pronoun in both sets of texts. The Bonferroni correction in this analysis was set at .025. Therefore, a significant difference between texts was evident in the frequency of *we*, but was not found in the frequency of *us*, ($x^2(1) = 170.594$, $p < .001$, small effect: Cramer's V effect size = .017).

As expected the number of Moves containing *we* is higher than the number of Moves containing *us* in both corpora, as shown in Table 4.62. When comparing both sets of texts, the international corpus has a higher number of Moves including the two specified devices than the Thai corpus. There is a statistically significant difference in the number of Moves including *we* between the two sets of texts, ($x^2(1) = 17.338$, $p < .001$, large effect: Cramer's V effect size = .614). By contrast, there was no statistically significant difference in the number of Moves incorporating *us* between the two groups. In this study, both exclusive *we* (excluding the readers) and inclusive *we* (including the readers) were found in the corpus, but only the use of exclusive *we* was counted as stance markers. The analysis revealed that *we* was used to state results/claims (examples 4.29- 4.32), state a purpose (examples 4.33 – 4.36), and elaborate an argument (examples 4.37– 4.39) in both international and Thai articles.

(4.29) *W*e can argue that in Cluster 6 – Functionality Seekers – all developing countries scored high.

(E 20)

(4.30) Specifically, *we* found that visitors who identified strongly as 'being Dutch' (the 'in-group') have stronger self-enhancement motives compared to those who identify less strongly, and that edutainment features strongly in the museum experience.

(E 48)

(4.31) Therefore, in terms of general social conditions of the communities surrounding Ayutthaya Historical Park, *we* conclude that the community's beliefs and traditions showed no conflicts with the society or state's policies.

(TH 26)

(4.32) Taking each dependent variable into account, with each resulting significance, *we* came up with the following numbers: Economic (B=0.405), Social (B=0.201) and Environment (B=0.137).

(TH 2)

(4.33) In particular *we* seek to shed light on what types of medical tourists seek a tourist experience as part of their medical tourism experience, and how this is manifested in practice. *We* document what types of tourist experiences are sought and explore whether these differ from what other leisure travellers may experience.

(E 21)

(4.34) The results can be expected to contribute to the knowledge in the field of tourism development and management, and *we* hope to offer suggestions for long-term tourist destination development and government policies on tourism development.

(E 15)

(4.35) In this study, *we* examined the roles of service scape (medical activity), perceived value, satisfaction, trust, and revisit intention in the medical tourism of Udon Thani Province, Thailand.

(TH 29)

(4.36) The main type of urban tourism *we* are concerned with in this study is religious tourism.

(TH 15)

(4.37) *We* assume that this type of conflict behaviour is not frequent in the conflicts in rural China that occur due to tourism development because all the media reports and academic papers on the issue which *we* encountered indicate that the stakeholders almost always have incompatible claims.

(E 2)

(4.38) Therefore, *we* believe that by introducing SIT into a warfare heritage tourism context, the role of warfare heritage in processes which enhance collective self-esteem and national bonding will become clearer.

(E 48)

(4.39) *We* believed that the participations would elevate the community's capacity in developing tourism, enable the analysis of the model to be more suitable, cooperative and reflective to the actual needs of the tourists as well as generating incomes for the country.

(TH 3)

In addition to the above functions, international authors also appear to use the pronoun *we* to explain research methodology (example 4.40), evaluate the study (example 4.41), make suggestions for implications (example 4.42) and further

research (example 4.43). However, the use of *we* for these purposes was not found in the Thai corpus.

(4.40) *We* employ the ARDL cointegration methodology with bounds testing of Pesaran et al. (2001).

(E35)

(4.41) Because our data are cross-sectional, *we* cannot fully disentangle complex causal loops. Nevertheless, *we* feel our models capture the dominant interrelationships and lay the groundwork for further research. *We* have used an information theoretic approach to calculate the average of top models among the set of models.

(E 4)

(4.42) Therefore, *we* recommend that tourism-related departments provide tourists with information regarding the cultural and social habits of their countries or regions to enable more comprehensive understanding.

(E 15)

(4.43) *We* suggest that future research should explore the customary price points; whether increasing the price beyond a specific amount will cause demand to drop dramatically.

(E 37)

In summary, first-person plural pronouns occur more consistently in international texts than in Thai texts. A significant difference between texts was evident in the frequency of *we*, but not evident in the frequency of *us*. In addition, there was a significant difference between texts in the number of Moves incorporating *we*.

- First-person plural pronouns occur more consistently in international texts than in Thai texts.
- A significant difference between texts was evident in the frequency of *we*, but not evident in the frequency of *us*.
- There was a significant difference between texts in the number of Moves incorporating *we*.

Table 4.61: Number of occurrences of first-person plural pronouns (self-mention)across Moves

First-person plural pronouns	International corpus		Thai corpus		Pearson Chi-square test		
	Total number of occurrences	Freq. per 1,000 words	Total number of occurrences	Freq. per 1,000 words	X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side
1. we	319	.93	13	.06	170.594	< .001	.017 small effect
2. us	9	.03	1	.005	3.502	.100	.002 small effect

Table 4.62: Number of Moves including first-person plural pronouns (self-mention)

First-person plural pronouns	Number of Moves including stance markers				
	International corpus (N=23)	Thai corpus (N=23)	Pearson Chi-square test		
			X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side
1. we	20 (87.0%)	6 (26.1%)	17.338	< .001	.614 large effect
2. us	5 (21.7%)	1 (4.3%)	3.067	.187	.258 small effect

4.3.5.3 Sub-categories of self-mentions (Possessive determiners)

Table 4.63 provides the number of occurrences of possessive determiners across Moves and Table 4.64 presents the number of Moves including possessive determiners. Similar to the first two sub-categories, it is apparent that possessive determiners are more common in international texts than in Thai texts, as shown in Table 4.63. *Our* is more common than *my* in both corpora. *My* was not found in any Thai texts. According to the adjusted significance threshold at .025, there were significant differences between texts in the frequencies of the two specific possessive determiners, (*our*: $x^2(1) = 114.925$, $p < .001$, small effect: Cramer's V effect size = .014; *my*: $x^2(1) = 20.325$, $p < .001$, small effect: Cramer's V effect size = .006).

Unsurprisingly, the number of Moves incorporating *our* is higher than the number of Moves incorporating *my* in both corpora. A significant difference between texts was only found in the case of *our*, ($x^2(1) = 23.365$, $p < .001$, large effect: Cramer's V effect size = .713). International researchers make more extensive use of *our* than Thai researchers.

In the international corpus, *our* was deployed for several functions. It was usually collocated with nouns, such as analysis, research, knowledge, findings, results, methodology, etc. to show the writer's commitment or contribution to research (examples 4.44), state a purpose (example 4.45), show results or findings (example 4.46), explain what was done (example 4.47), and describe research methodology, including samples and variables (example 4.48).

(4.44) *Our* results can contribute to a better understanding of how biodiversity and nature-based tourism interact in PAs and how these interactions may be altered by different conservation strategies used by PAs.

(E 4)

(4.45) *Our* exploratory study sets out to obtain a deeper understanding of this existing and hypothetically widespread, though almost un-researched, medical travel behaviour.

(E 37)

(4.46) *Our* findings indicated that personal values have a significantly positive influence on subjective well-being ($t = 3.655$, $p < 0.001$), supporting H2.

(E 10)

(4.47) We limit *our* review to defining community-based tourism and highlighting the dominant forces in its success or failure.

(E 19)

(4.48) *Our* sample comprised eighteen New Zealanders who had travelled overseas for medical treatment.

(E 21)

However, in the Thai corpus, *our* was only employed to show results or findings, as shown in example 4.49.

(4.49) The study's findings mostly confirm our initial assumption regarding the developmental model of the key success factor of sustainability for community-based tourism.

(TH 28)

In conclusion, the international corpus has a higher degree of use of possessive determiners than the Thai corpus. There were statistically significant differences in the number of occurrences of the two possessive determiners between the two sets of texts. Furthermore, there was a significant difference in the number of Moves containing *our*.

- The international corpus has a higher degree of use of possessive determiners than the Thai corpus.
- There were statistically significant differences in the number of occurrences of the two possessive determiners between the two sets of texts.
- There was a significant difference in the number of Moves containing *our*.

Table 4.63: Number of occurrences of possessive determiners (self-mention)across Moves

Possessive determiners	International corpus		Thai corpus		Pearson Chi-square test		
	Total number of occurrences	Freq. per 1,000 words	Total number of occurrences	Freq. per 1,000 words	X^2	P value	Cramer's V effect side
1. our	185	.54	1	.005	114.925	< .001	.014 small effect
2. my	32	.09	0	.00	20.325	< .001	.006 small effect

Table 4.64: Number of Moves including possessive determiners (self-mention)

Possessive determiners	Number of Moves including stance markers				
	International corpus (N=23)	Thai corpus (N=23)	Pearson Chi-square test		
			X^2	P value	Cramer's V effect side
1. our	17 (73.9%)	1 (4.3%)	23.365	< .001	.713 large effect
2. my	4 (17.4%)	0 (0.0%)	4.381	.109	.309 medium effect

4.3.5.4 Sub-categories of self-mentions (Others)

In this sub-category, additional self-mention words, namely *the researcher*, *the researchers*, *the researcher's*, *the researchers'*, *the authors,* and *the authors* were added to Hyland's framework, as they occurred in this study. Table 4.65 compares the number of occurrences of the sub-category of self-mentions (others) across Moves while Table 4.66 presents the number of Moves including sub-categories of self-mentions (Others). From Table 4.65, *the researchers* is the most common linguistic device in international articles whereas *the researcher* is the most common in Thai articles. Based on the adjusted significance threshold at .006, the statistically significant difference was evident only in the latter case, ($x^2(1) = 71.221$, $p < .001$, small effect: Cramer's V effect size = .011). A significant difference was also observed in the frequency of *the authors*, ($x^2(1) = 17.149$, $p < .001$, small effect: Cramer's V effect size = .006). It is apparent that international writers make more use of this specified device than Thai writers. None of the Thai authors use this device to express their stance. There are also differences in the frequencies of the other devices except for *the author*, but these differences were not significant.

Table 4.66 shows that *the authors* is the most common feature included in Moves in international texts, while *the researcher* is the most frequent feature included in Moves in Thai texts. None of the Thai articles includes *the authors* at all. Both cases are statistically significant differences, (the authors: $x^2(1) = 11.189$, $p = .001$, medium effect: Cramer's V effect size = .493; *the researcher*: $x^2(1) = 9.127$, $p = .003$, medium effect: Cramer's V effect size = .445).

Similar to the use of *we* and *I*, *the authors* was used for stating a purpose (example 4.50), describing research methods/procedures (example 4.41), presenting results or claims (example 4.52), making suggestions for further research (example 4.53), and giving a definition (4.54).

(4.50) *The authors* are specifically interested in how these images affect perceptions of potential tourists about the destination on various destination attributes, what attitudes toward the destination these images produce, and whether the images generate the desire to visit the destination.

(E 45)

(4.51) Before implementing the full-scale questionnaire survey, *the authors* first conducted a pilot survey in both areas in August 2016, accompanied by a

well-trained master course student from Lao PDR who studied in the authors' lab.

(E 16)

(4.52) While this may be true, *the authors* argue that the general community wellbeing approach outlined in this paper could be applied to any SID.

(E 39)

(4.53) It could be argued that these findings are possibly related to the degree a destination has established a distinct and clear brand and image, as acknowledged by the policy makers; however, *the authors* consider that further research is necessary before a firm conclusion can be drawn.

(E 34)

(4.54) In this research, *the authors* follow the definition of STEs by the Lao government.

(E 16)

The researcher was usually used to describe research sampling, method, or procedure. This function was found in both sets of texts, as shown in examples 4.55 and 4.56. It is also used to present findings or claims (example 4.57), indicate a limitation of the study (example 4.58), and make suggestions as to implications (example 4.59).

(4.55) Assistant data collectors were employed to accompany *the researcher* from Kunzila, Gorgora and Woyna sample sites where *the researcher* has little awareness about the sampled area.

(E 29)

(4.56) *The researcher* began gathering initial data and general problems in June 2012 and compiled all the necessary information for preparing the questionnaire before collecting the actual data from May – June 2012, which result in a three-day data-collection process.

(TH 26)

(4.57) Although Thai-Vietnamese people living in the urban area of Mukdahan province had established the Thai-Vietnamese Association administrated by the president and the committee of the association in order to help the members and public services and charities of the community, *the researcher* found that the members and the committee of the association paid respect and listened to Mr. Tin Ngan Wan even as he is not only the president of the association, but also a leader by nature.

(TH 34)

(4.58) The data of heritage assets are collected, observed, and analysed in the view of *the researcher.*

(TH 4)

(4.59) Both Western and Asian tourists suggested that tourism development should be stopped to limit impact which is highly agreed by *the researcher* to prevent any further impact.

(TH 42)

With regard to the other self-reference words, there are differences between texts in the number of Moves containing these words except for the word *the author* and *the researcher's*. Nevertheless, none of these differences were significant.

To conclude, there are significant differences between texts in the frequencies of *the authors* and *the researcher*. International texts make more extensive use of *the authors* than Thai texts, while Thai texts make more significant use of *the researcher* than international texts. The two specific devices are also the most frequently used devices in Moves in international and Thai articles respectively. Statistically significant differences were found in the number of Moves including the two devices. Regarding the other self-reference words, no statistically significant differences were evident in the number of occurrences as well as in the number of Moves containing these words.

- There are significant differences between texts in the frequencies of *the authors* and *the researcher*.
- International texts make more extensive use of *the authors* than Thai texts.
- By contrast, Thai texts make more significant use of *the researcher* than international texts.
- *The authors* and *the researcher* are also the most frequently used devices in Moves in international and Thai articles respectively.
- Statistically significant differences were found in the number of Moves including *the authors* and *the researcher*.
- Regarding the other self-reference words, no statistically significant differences were evident in the number of occurrences as well as in the number of Moves containing these words.

Table 4.65: Number of occurrences of others (self-mention) across Moves

Others	International corpus		Thai corpus		Pearson Chi-square test		
	Total number of occurrences	Freq. per 1,000 words	Total number of occurrences	Freq. per 1,000 words	X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side
1. the author	4	.01	3	.01	.047	1.000	.000 small effect
2. the author's	1	.003	0	.00	.635	1.000	.001 small effect
3. the authors	27	.08	0	.00	17.149	< .001	.006 small effect
4. the authors'	6	.02	0	.00	3.811	.088	.003 small effect
5. the researcher	11	.03	66	.30	71.221	< .001	.011 small effect
6. the researcher's	1	.003	2	.01	.978	.564	.001 small effect
7. the researchers	34	.10	12	.05	3.151	.076	.002 small effect
8. the researchers'	0	.00	1	.005	1.574	.388	.002 small effect

Table 4.66: Number of moves including others (self-mention)

Others	Number of moves including stance markers				
	International corpus (N=23)	Thai corpus (N=23)	Pearson Chi-square test		
			X^2	P-value	Cramer's V effect side
1. the author	3 (13.0%)	3 (13.0%)	.000	1.000	.000 small effect
2. the author's	1 (4.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1.022	1.000	.149 small effect
3. the authors	9 (39.1%)	0 (0.0%)	11.189	.001	.493 medium effect
4. the authors'	4 (17.4%)	0 (0.0%)	3.381	.109	.309 medium effect
5. the researcher	4 (17.4%)	14 (60.9%)	9.127	.003	.445 medium effect
6. the researcher's	1 (4.3%)	1 (4.3%)	.000	1.000	.000 small effect
7. the researchers	8 (34.8%)	5 (21.7%)	.965	.326	.145 small effect
8. the researchers'	0 (0.0%)	1 (4.3%)	1.022	1.000	.149 small effect

4.4 Summary of the chapter

This chapter reported the results of the analysis of Move structures and linguistic features used to express authorial stance. It began by addressing the research questions of the study. It went on to present the characteristics of Move structures according to the following sections: the Abstract, the Introduction, the Methods, the Results, and the Discussion-Conclusions sections. The chi-square tests and one-way ANOVA tests were performed to test statistically significant differences between texts in frequencies and mean sentences per text of Moves and steps. The patterns of Move sequence and Move cycle were also reported. It then presented the findings of the analysis of linguistic devices employed to express the writer's stance. The results suggest that there are similarities and differences between the two sub-corpora in rhetorical structure and patterns of use of linguistic devices used to express authorial stance. The next chapter discusses the main findings in relation to the rhetorical structure and the linguistic devices employed to express the writer's stance.

Chapter5

Discussion

5.1 Introduction

This study compared the similarities and differences between English research articles in tourism written by Thai researchers and published in Thai journals and those in international journals in terms of rhetorical structures and linguistic features used to express the writer's stance. A number of significant findings have emerged. They will be presented and discussed according to the research questions of the study. The first question in this study sought to examine the similarities and differences between international and Thai articles in rhetorical structure, which will be discussed in section 5.2. The second research question was to investigate the similarities and differences between the two groups in the use of linguistic features to express the writer's stance, which will be discussed in section 5.3. Section 5.4 involves a summary of the chapter.

5.2 Characteristics of Move structure (researcher question 1)

Overall, most Moves and steps appear to be more common in the international corpus than in the Thai corpus. The discussion of similarities and differences in rhetorical structure between international and Thai articles will be presented in the following order: The Abstracts, the Introductions, the Methods, The Results, and the Discussion-conclusions.

5.2.1 The Abstract of the article

There are both similarities and differences between the two sets of data in the use of Moves in the abstracts. The current study found that in the Abstract section, the most common Moves in both corpora are Move 2 (Presenting the research) and Move 4 (Summarizing the findings). This finding is consistent with those of Maher (2017), Pho, (2008, 2013), and Santos, (1996) who found that Move 2, Move 3 (Describing the methodology), and Move 4 are the most common moves in the Abstract section. In this study, it was found that the most common moves in the abstracts of the Thai corpus followed this convention, but the most common moves in the international corpus were Move 2, Move 4 and Move 5 (Discussing the research).

The results of this study show that the number of occurrences of Move 3 is statistically significant between the two corpora. It was found in only 60% of international texts but as many as 92% of Thai texts. This suggests that presenting the methodology in the abstracts might not be regarded as significant as Move 2 and Move 4 in the international corpus. Finding that Move 3 was an infrequent move in the international abstracts is in line with that of Samraj (2005), who demonstrated that Move 3 occurred in approximately 50% of the abstracts in Wildlife Behaviour and Conservation biology. Most of the abstracts from both disciplines in Samraj's (2005) study generally contained three moves, namely Move 2, Move 4 and Move 5, which were also reported in the international corpus in the present study. However, according to Bhatia (1993), discussion of methodology is a significant feature in research abstracts, which is commonly viewed as a summary of the whole research article. This is not apparent in Samraj's (2005) study and this study, at least in the international abstracts. The role of Move 3 in Samraj's (2005) study and the international corpus in this study appears to be smaller than in the contexts examined by Bhatia (1993). The less frequent use of Move 3 in the international corpus in this study and Samraj's (2005) study may suggest that the abstract is not a mere overview of the research articles (Samraj, 2005).

This finding, however, is contrary to those of Maher (2017), Pho, (2008, 2013), and Santos, (1996), who found that Move 3 occurred in almost or all of investigated texts in applied linguistics. One possible explanation for this discrepancy might be that abstracts in those previous studies are in the field of applied linguistics, but the abstracts in the current study are in the tourism field. Scholars, such as Hyland (1999, 2004), Samraj (2005), and Swales (1990) have suggested that rhetorical structure is different according to disciplines, genres, and contexts. Each discourse community seems to have its own style and rhetorical conventions (Kanoksilapatham, 2011; Swales, 2011). The finding in this study supports this idea by showing that none of these Moves occurs in all abstracts in both corpora, contrasting with the previous findings.

A possible explanation for the obvious difference in the frequency of Move 3 between the two groups may be explained by the fact that most of the abstracts in Thai articles are longer than those in international articles. The average length of the abstracts in the international corpus is 150.28 words per text while the

average length of the abstracts in the Thai corpus is 225.96 words per text. A longer abstract allows a writer to write a longer summary of his/her research, in which the research design can be described. This also implies that an article format might have an impact on the rhetorical structure. In addition, as posited by Santos (1996), the size of textual space allocated for each Move (move balance), one of the key features of abstracts, is likely to link with the writers' need to present the most relevant Move. That is, the length and visibility of a Move tend to be presented according to its importance. It may thus draw an inference that describing research methodology tends to be less important than Move 2 and Move 4 in international articles in this study.

The analysis reveals that Move 1 (Situating the research) is generally less common than other Moves in the Abstract section. It was found in less than 60% of texts in both corpora. This finding corroborates the findings of previous studies (Ahmed, 2015; Amnuai, 2019; Pho, 2008). However, Kurniawan & Sabila (2021) showed that the Introduction Move tended to be much more common in the tourism abstracts in Indonesian journal articles than in the international articles (it should be noted that Hyland's (2004) *Introduction* Move used in Kurniawan & Sabila's study appears to be what the present study calls *Situating the research* Move or Move 1). This finding differs from the finding presented here. This difference may be related to different contexts of study. It is possible that there is more need for situating the research in Indonesian context than in Thai context. This difference also supports the idea that rhetorical structure may vary according to contexts.

There are similarities between the two corpora in relation to Move sequencing and cyclicity of Moves. In general, Moves in the abstract section occur in linear order in this study. This finding supports the work of Kurniawan & Sabila (2021) which showed that Moves in the abstract section of tourism research articles tended to be presented in a linear sequence. However, this outcome is contrary to that of Ahmed (2015) who found that the general trend of Move occurrence in the tourism abstracts from different international journals and online sources appears to be non-linear. This confirms the existence of variations in the same discipline. However, the non-linear order of Move occurrences was also found in six international abstracts and eight Thai abstracts. This reflects the assertion that the reversed sequence of Moves is one of the main genre-specific

characteristics of abstracts (Santos, 1996). In accordance with the present result, previous research has demonstrated that the cyclicity of Moves can be found in the Abstract section (Pho, 2008, 2013). To conclude, based on the analysis, both groups of writers have similarities in terms of using certain Moves. This suggests that they are likely to construct the abstract in the same pattern, though there is a difference in the use of Move 3. Such similarities also indicate that both groups of writers have the same rhetorical convention for the Abstracts.

5.2.1.2 The Introduction section

Both groups of authors follow a similar pattern in the use of Moves in the Introduction section. In general, both cohorts of writers follow the rhetorical convention of Swales' (2004) introduction. All three moves were found in both sets of texts. In this study, Move 6 (Establishing a territory) occurred most frequently in both sub-corpora. It was found in all of the introduction sections in both international and Thai texts. This finding suggests that through the realisation of Move 6, both cohorts of scholars share similar rhetorical practices within their research community. This finding is in line with those of Kanoksilapatham (2007) and Pho (2013), who found that Move 6 was one of the most common moves in the introductions of research articles. In the aforementioned studies, Move 6 and Move 8 (Presenting the present work) were the most common Moves in research articles; they occurred in all of the introductions. In this study, Move 8 was found in 98% and 94% of the introduction of international and Thai articles respectively. However, the analysis revealed that there were significant differences in the average number of sentences for those three Moves between the two corpora. International articles have a much higher mean number of sentences for all three Moves than Thai articles. These findings suggest that there is a stronger trend in international journals to provide the audience with more explanation in the introductions in research articles than in Thai journals.

However, there are differences between the two groups of writers in their use of steps to realise Move 6. In this study, Step 1 (Summarising existing studies) was found in all international articles, resulting in the significantly higher proportion of the content of this step in the international corpus, compared to the Thai corpus. This finding is consistent with that of Pho (2013) who found that all researchers

in both applied linguistics and educational technology included Step 1 in their research articles published in international journals. Finding that all research articles included Step 1 in Pho's (2013) and the international corpus in this study suggests that summarising the existing literature is a crucial feature in the international context. By contrast, Thai writers usually make more explicit use of the context of the study (Step 4), to realise Move 6. There is a significant difference between texts in the frequency of Step 4. This infers that providing readers with background information on the context of study appears to be significant in Thai tourism discourse. In addition, there are significant differences between texts in the frequencies of Step 2 (Drawing inferences from previous studies) and Step 5 (Foreshadowing aims of the present study). There is more extensive use of these two steps in the international corpus. These findings suggest that international writers are more likely than Thai writers to present their view or interpretations of existing studies in the introductions and inform readers what the study is going to be about.

The results also show that there is a significant difference between texts in the occurrence of Move 7 (Establishing a niche). International researchers have more extensive use of Move 7 than Thai researchers. The low frequency of Move 7 in the Thai corpus could be attributed to the less competitive research environment in the Thai research community. Thai articles in this study were published in Thai national journals which the authors might find it unnecessary to establish a niche in domestic publications. By contrast, to meet international readers' expectations, this feature appears to be imperative for international publications. It is, therefore, necessary for international authors to demonstrate their knowledge of the limitations, in related literature, in their fields. As pointed out by Kanoksilapatham (2007b), the expectations from the community members vary according to the size of the research community regarding the quality of the research. The larger the community is, the higher expectations are.

Finding that Move 7 is less common in the Thai corpus than in the international corpus is consistent with those of Kanoksilapatham (2007b) and Wannaruk & Amnuai (2016) who demonstrated that Move 7 tended to occur less frequently in the Thai corpus than in the English or international corpus respectively. However, the overall occurrence of Move 7 was found in 80% of Thai texts in Wannaruk & Amnuai's (2016) study, but was found in only 64.29% and 64% of Thai texts in

Kanoksilapatham's (2007b) and this study respectively. These differences may be associated with the different disciplines of the examined research articles. In Wannaruk & Amnuai's study, the analysed research articles were in applied linguistics whereas research articles in Kanoksilapatham's (2007b)study and this study were in biochemistry written in Thai and tourism respectively. Presumably, research writers in applied linguistics are more likely to be trained or accustomed to academic writing conventions including writing research articles in English, compared to research writers in other disciplines. As non-native authors can be influenced by intercultural and interlingual contacts due to the impact of globalisation, through these interactions, rhetorical habits in English may have an effect on their schema knowledge when writing research articles (Sheldon, 2011). Therefore, it is possible that the occurrence of Move 7 in Wannaruk & Amnuai's (2016) study was higher than in Kanoksilapatham's (2007b) and this study. The finding of Wannaruk & Amnuai (2016) also corroborates the findings of Sheldon (2011), who found that 88.88% and 77.77% of research articles in applied linguistics, written in Spanish and English respectively, include Move 7. Fazilatfar & Naseri (2014), going in the same direction, revealed that Move 7 was found in more than 80% of the articles in applied linguistics written by Iranian scholars. The results in the above studies suggest that non-native English writers in applied linguistics tend to have a high degree of use of Move 7 in their research articles.

Differences between texts exist not only at the Move level but also at the step level of Move 7. The current study found that there is a significant difference between the two groups of writers in the use of Step 1A (Indicating a gap). International writers are more likely than Thai writers to follow the conventional pattern by indicating limitations or shortcomings in previous studies. This finding implies that gap identification may not be a requirement in Thai academic written discourse. The absence of Step 1A in the Thai corpus is in line with that of Jogthong (2001), who found that most Thai writers in educational and medical articles tend to avoid indicating a research gap in the introductions. A similar trend was also reported in other contrastive studies (e.g., Ahmad, 1997; Hirano, 2009), which revealed that non-native English authors tend to omit the step of indicating a gap. It seems possible that the absence of Step 1A is due to the socio-cultural aspect. Making critical comments or evaluations on other's people work is not appropriate in Thai culture. As explained by Jogthong (2001, p.72),

Thai authors are likely to avoid “direct criticism on the work of others”. Likewise, Hirano (2009) concluded that Brazilian scholars do not make an explicit research gap statement in research articles because of their solidarity with the local research community. Similarly, Taylor & Tingguang (1991) found that Chinese authors feel uncomfortable in indicating research gaps and shortcomings in previous studies.

To compensate for the absence of Step 1A in Move 7, the analysis found that Thai writers in this study were more likely to opt for addressing problems occurring in research sites (Step 1B) to establish the niche in their research. In accordance with the present result, Jogthong (2001) has demonstrated that Thai researchers tended to employ a strategy called ‘identifying-potential-problem’ in a specific situation to establish the niche in their research articles in medical and educational fields written in Thai. This strategy was employed most frequently by Thai research writers in their study, which is also in line with the finding in this study. The high degree of use of Step 1B in Jogthong's (2001) study and this study suggests that most Thai researchers are still aware of the importance of Move 7, but might find it unnecessary to present a knowledge gap in the domestic discourse community. As direct criticism of the other’s work may be inappropriate in Thai society (as discussed above), it seems likely that Thai researchers would prefer addressing practical problems and showing the members of the Thai discourse community how their studies could mitigate the problems.

There are similarities in the use of Move 8 (Presenting the present work) in both groups of scholars. It is the second most common Move in the introductions in both corpora. The finding revealed that to realise Move 8, both Thai and international writers are more likely to announce their research descriptively and/or purposively (Step 1), compared to the other six strategies. By contrast, both cohorts of writers tend to avoid announcing principal outcomes (Step 5) in the introductions. These findings are in line with those of Pho (2013), Sheldon (2011), and Wannaruk & Amnuai (2016). Specific to Step 5, it was found in only 4% of international articles, and not found in any Thai articles in this study. This suggests that announcing principal outcomes does not seem to be significant in tourism research articles. As noted by Swales (2004), Step 5 appears in some academic disciplines. Bhatia (1993) posits that reporting results is more common in research abstracts than in article introductions. This appears to be the case in

this study. The absence of Step 5 in Thai articles is consistent with those of previous studies in the Thai context (e.g., Jogthong, 2001; Kanoksilapatham, 2007; Wannaruk & Amnuai, 2016), in which the absence of announcing principal outcomes (Step 5) in the introductions was reported. It may be speculated that Thai authors prefer presenting their findings in the Results section rather than in the Introduction section. According to (Kanoksilapatham, 2007b), who analysed research articles in biochemistry written by Thai scientists, an absence of Step 5 in the introduction may be associated with the smaller size of the Thai research community. Because the competition in research communities in America or western countries is intense, researchers in those countries are expected to present their findings in the introductions to show the research's contribution to the field. By contrast, the Thai research community is smaller; the competition is not as intense as those in western countries. As a result, Thai researchers find it unnecessary to present their findings in the Introductions. However, based on my knowledge of the Thai academic context, the trend for research publication is changing. The Thai research community is currently wider and more competitive in all disciplines. Most institutions of tertiary education in Thailand increasingly encourage Thai scholars and educators to be more involved in research domains and activities. As pointed out by Phothongsunan (2016), Thai scholars and educators are under pressure to publish in national standard journals and international journals or proceedings. Therefore, the reason that Thai research community is small and less competitive may not be applied to account for the absence of Step 5.

However, there are significant differences between the two corpora in the use of Step 2 (Presenting research questions or hypotheses), Step 3 (Definitional clarifications), and Step 4 (Summarizing methods) in Move 8. All these three steps are more common in the international corpus than in the Thai corpus. These results suggest that international writers are more overt about what they are examining. By clearly elucidating the definitions or terminologies, international writers present themselves as 'rigorous researchers with great expertise in their field' (Sheldon, 2011, p. 246). These findings conform to that of Sheldon (2011), who found that these three steps tended to occur more frequently in the English L1 group than in the English L2 and Spanish L1 groups.

As argued by Bhatia (1993), discussion of methodology tends to be mentioned in the Abstracts rather than in the Introductions. This seems to be the case in this study, as the occurrence of Step 4 (Summarizing methods) in the abstract section is more frequent than in the introduction section in both corpora.

Both corpora tend to have similar patterns of Move sequence and Move cyclicity. The sequence of Moves in the Introduction section in this study is mostly follow the conventional pattern (Move 6-Move 7-Move 8). This finding is contrary to that of Hirano (2009) who found that none of the Brazilian Portuguese articles in a subfield of Applied Linguistics followed the conventional pattern. By contrast, the sequence of Moves in English research articles in the same subfield is typically presented in the conventional pattern. The difference in the sequence of Moves in this study and Hirano's (2009) study, specific to Brazilian Portuguese articles, might be due to the cross-linguistic/culture differences. The dominant culture may have an influence on rhetorical convention (Kaplan, 1966; Mauranen, 1993a, 1993b). The cyclical patterns of Move 6-Move 7 and Move 6-Move 8 corroborate the previous studies (Pho, 2013; Sheldon, 2011, 2013). The length of the Introduction may result in cyclicity (Crookes, 1986; Swales, 1990); the longer the Introduction is, the greater probability of cycling occurs. This seems to be the case in this study.

Overall, all three moves occur in both corpora, but there are differences in steps used to realise each move between the two groups of writers. The disparities may be associated with several factors, such as reader types (international and national), culture, and individual style of writing. To illustrate, research articles in the Thai corpus are published in Thailand and the target readers are mostly Thai. Therefore, some steps, such as Step 1A (indicating a gap) might be omitted in the research articles. The omission of this step might be due to Thai culture where direct criticism tends to be avoided.

5.2.1.3 The Methods section

There is a similar trend in the overall pattern of use of Moves in the Methods section between the two corpora. That is, move 10 (Describing the data and data collection procedure) is the most common Move, followed by Move 11 (Describing the data analysis procedure), Move 9 (Contextualizing study methods), and Move 12 (Previewing the following section) respectively. The

analysis revealed that all articles in this study included Move 10. This finding is in line with those of Fazilatfar & Naseri (2014) and Pho (2013). Move 11 was found in 96% and 90% of international and Thai articles respectively. This outcome differs from that of Fazilatfar & Naseri (2014), who found that Move 11 occurred in only 50% of research articles in applied linguistics written by Iranian scholars. On the contrary, Pho (2013) demonstrated that Move 11 occurred in 85% and 70% of research articles in applied linguistics and educational technology research articles respectively. The difference in results of Fazilatfar & Naseri's (2014) and Pho's (2013) studies may be attributed to the existence of intra-disciplinary variations. However, the finding that Move 10 is more common than Move 11 is in line with those of Fazilatfar & Naseri (2014), Nwogu (1997), and Pho (2013). Findings demonstrate that there is a significant difference in the frequency of Move 9 between the two sets of data. There is greater use of Move 9 in Thai articles than in international articles. This indicates that there is a stronger need for Thai scholars to contextualise their research methodology, compared to international scholars. It is apparent that Move 12 seems to be avoided by both groups of writers. It was found in only 3 articles in the international corpus and was not found in any Thai article. This suggests that both international and Thai writers may feel that it is unnecessary to inform readers about what the following section is about. As Move 12 was found in only a few articles in the international corpus, this move could be considered an optional move. However, there are both similarities and differences between both groups of researchers in their use of steps to realise each Move.

Both international and Thai authors have the same inclination in the use of steps to realise Move 9 (Contextualizing study methods). To realise Move 9, three steps were identified in this study, namely Step 1 (Referencing previous works), step 2 (Providing general information), and Step 3 (Identifying the methodological approach). The results reveal that Step 3 is the most common step used by both groups of authors, while Step 1 is the least common step employed by both cohorts of scholars. Step 1 was found in only one Thai article and was not found in any international article. The widespread use of Step 3 in this study implies that most tourism scholars prefer informing the readers about the methodological approach before elucidating how their research is carried out, rather than citing

earlier studies. As explained by Cotos et al. (2017), Step 3 can serve as a transition to a more comprehensive description of how the study was conducted.

Finding that Step 1 was employed least frequently is contrary to that of Cotos et al. (2017), who investigated 900 research articles from thirty disciplines, each represented by thirty articles. They revealed that Step 3 was the least frequently used step in research articles, but Step 1 and Step 2 were more frequent and tended to reoccur in their corpus. A possible explanation for the non-occurrence of Step 1 in the current study, which is opposed to that of Cotos et al. (2017) may be due to the fact that most of the examined research articles in Cotos et al. (2017) study are from hard sciences disciplines (22 disciplines from natural and applied sciences and 8 disciplines from Art/Humanities and social sciences), generally involving experimental procedures. The employment of referencing may help facilitate the insight of the experimental procedure in addition to presenting researchers' competency in choosing accepted methods in the field (Cotos et al., 2017). In contrast, the tourism field can be categorised as a social sciences discipline, in which data is usually gained from real-life experiences, such as surveys and interviews. Aspects of methodology would be presented according to the nature of disciplinary research (Cotos et al., 2017). Given this, it can conceivably be hypothesised that Step 3 is likely to be used in research articles in social sciences. Furthermore, the results regarding the use of Step 3 and Step 1 match those observed in earlier studies in social sciences. To illustrate, Lim (2006) demonstrated that Step 3 was found in the management research articles. Similarly, Zhang & Wannaruk (2016) showed that Step 3 was employed in the research articles in education. It should be noted that Step 3 in this study is called *presenting an overview of the design* step in Lim's (2006) study and *describing research design* Move in Zhang & Wannaruk's (2016) study. On the contrary, Step 1 is not included in the frameworks in the aforementioned studies because it was not found in their studies.

There are both similarities and differences between the two groups of researchers in their use of steps in Move 10 (Describing the data and data collection procedure). In Move 10, four steps were identified, Step 1 (Describing the sample), Step 2 (Describing research instruments), Step 3 (Recounting steps in data collection), and Step 4 (Justifying the data collection procedure). Based on the analysis, Step 1 was the most frequently used strategy, and step 2 was the

second most common step in both corpora. While Step 3 tended to be more common than Step 4 in the international corpus, there was no difference in the frequencies of these two steps in the Thai corpus. Finding that Step 1 is the most common step is consistent with the findings in previous studies (Lim, 2006; Pho, 2013). There are statistically significant differences between texts in the use of Step 3 and Step 4. These two steps are much more common in the international corpus than in the Thai corpus. The finding of Step 3 confirms the finding of Wannaruk & Amnuai (2016), who found that international writers were more likely than Thai writers to describe the data collection procedures. The higher frequencies of Step 3 and Step 4 in the international corpus may suggest that international writers make an attempt to persuade readers that their research designs meet the disciplinary standard (Cotos et al., 2017).

There is a similarity in the overall pattern of use of steps in Move 11 (Describing the data analysis procedure) between the two sets of texts. Step 1 (Recounting data analysis procedure) is the most common step in both corpora. This finding is consistent with the findings of earlier studies (Cotos et al., 2017; Pho, 2013). Finding that Step 1 is generally more common in the international corpus than in the Thai corpus is contrary to that of Wannaruk & Amnuai (2016), who found that describing how the data was analysed tended to occur more frequently in the Thai corpus than in the international corpus. There are significant differences in the frequencies of Step 2 (Justifying the data analysis procedure) and Step 3 (previewing results). These two steps are more common in the international corpus. The greater use of Step 2 in international texts suggests that international authors seek to gain credibility from readers. As pointed out by Cotos et al. (2017), describing the data analysis procedure and justifying the data analysis procedure are strategies that can be used to establish credibility in the Methods section. By presenting and justifying the data analysis procedure, the researchers ensure the readers that the data have been analysed correctly. Regarding Step 3 (previewing results), it was found in 26% and 4% of international and Thai articles respectively. This disparity may be that Thai authors prefer to present results in the Results section. In addition, this difference could be attributed to the type of research (quantitative/qualitative research). It seems likely that quantitative research in this study would need to report

statistical results in relation to the relationships between variables in the Methods section.

There is a similar trend in the occurrences of Moves and cyclical patterns between the two corpora. Moves tend to occur in a linear order in both corpora. However, there were a few articles where Moves occurred in non-linear order in both corpora. The cyclical pattern of Move 10-Move 11 was frequently found in both corpora. In accordance with the present results, Pho (2013) demonstrated that the cyclical pattern of Move 10-Move 11, as well as a reverse of Move sequence, were found in their corpus.

Overall, all four Moves tend to be found more commonly in international articles than in Thai articles. With regard to Move 12 (Previewing the following section), as it occurs in only a few articles in international articles, it is suggested that Move 12 should be regarded as an optional Move in the Methods section. Further studies with larger corpora in tourism are, therefore, suggested to confirm whether Move 12 should be a major Move or optional in tourism articles. Regarding the occurrences of Move 9, Move 10 and Move 11, in both corpora, it can be said that both communities share the same Methods discourse.

5.2.1.4 The Results section

It seems that both international and Thai articles have a similar rhetorical structure in the Results section. That is, Move 14 (Reporting specific/individual results) is the most common move, followed by Move 13 (Preparing for the presentation of the result section), Move 15 (Commenting on specific results), and Move 16 (Summarizing the results respectively). The analysis revealed that Move 14 occurred in all articles in both corpora. This finding is in line with the findings in previous studies in various disciplines, such as sociology (Brett, 1994), computer science (Posteguillo, 1999), biochemistry (Kanoksilapatham, 2003), and applied linguistics (Wannaruk & Amnuai, 2016). Finding that Move 13 is the second common Move in the corpus corroborates the findings of a great deal of the previous work in applied linguistics and educational technology articles (Pho, 2013), biochemistry articles (Kanoksilapatham, 2007a), and sociology articles (Brett, 1994). Move 16 is the least frequent Move used by both groups of writers. This finding is in accordance with that of Pho (2013), who found that this Move was less frequent than the other three Moves in her corpus. In this study, Thai

articles have a higher frequency of Move 16 than international articles. This finding supports the finding of Wannaruk & Amnuai (2016), who reported that Move 16 was more frequent in the Thai corpus than in the international corpus. Regardless of the disciplinary difference, the high degree of use of Move 16 in Wannaruk & Amnuai's (2016) study and the present study may imply that Thai writers are more likely than international writers to underpin their findings by concluding them at the end of the Results section. However, there are both differences and similarities between the two corpora, regarding the use of steps in Move 13 and Move 15.

International and Thai writers use different strategies to realise Move 13. International writers tend to place an emphasis on Step 1 ((Re)stating data collection and analysis procedure). In contrast, Thai writers tend to pay more attention to Step 3 (Giving background knowledge). This difference suggests that international authors may find it necessary to remind the readers about the process of data collection and analysis before presenting their findings. On the contrary, Thai researchers might feel that informing readers about the necessary background of the research, such as research aims or the context of the study would be essential before reporting their results. Finding that Step 2 (Restating research questions or hypotheses) was the least common step used by both groups of writers is contrary to that of Pho (2013), who found that Step 2 was the second most common step in research articles in applied linguistics and Step 3 is the least common step used in research articles in applied linguistics and educational technology (fewer than 10% of the articles). This disparity may lie in the characteristics of disciplinary research.

International and Thai writers follow a similar pattern in their use of steps in Move 15. There are four steps in Move 15: Step 1 (Interpreting results), Step 2 (Comparing results with literature), Step 3 (Accounting for results) and Step 4 (Evaluating results). The results show that Step 1 is the most popular step, whereas Step 4 tends to be neglected by both cohorts of scholars. These findings are consistent with that of Pho (2013). In Pho's (2013) study, Step 1 was the most common step, which occurred in fewer than half of the articles in the corpus. The findings of this study and Pho's (2013) study are in contrast to that of Yang & Allison's (2003) study of applied linguistic articles. In their study, applied

linguists tended to compare their results with related literature (Step 2) rather than interpreting results (Step 1) when commenting on their results.

The cyclicity of Move 13, Move 14 and Move 15 in this study corroborates the finding of Yang & Allison (2003), who also found that these three moves occurred repeatedly across the Results section in applied linguistics research articles. The occurrences of Move 14 and Move 15 in this study and the previous studies, such as Brett (1994), Posteguillo (1999) and Yang & Allison (2003) support the assumption that the Results section does not only present the findings but also comment on results.

5.2.1.5 The Discussion-Conclusions section

Both groups of authors utilise a similar pattern of use regarding Move 19 (Highlighting overall research outcome), Move 20 (Discussing the findings of the study) and Move 23 (Deduction from the research). These three Moves are more common in both corpora, compared to the other four moves. Move 23 is by far the most frequent Move, followed by Move 20 and Move 19 respectively. This finding differs from Pho's (2013) study in which she found that these three moves occurred in all of the articles in her corpus. In this study only Move 23 occurs in all of the international articles, and occurs in 96% of Thai articles. The highest degree of use of Move 23 in both corpora may suggest that deductions from the research are imperative in the Discussion-conclusions section in tourism research articles. Move 19 and Move 20 were found in approximately 90% of the corpus. The finding of this study diverges from the findings of Amnuai & Wannaruk, (2013b); Wannaruk & Amnuai (2016); Yang & Allison (2003) who found that Move 20 is the most common Move in applied linguistics research articles, followed by Move 19. Consistent with the finding of Wannaruk & Amnuai's (2016) study, this research found that Move 19 occurred more frequently in the international corpus than in the Thai corpus. Based on the finding of this study and Wannaruk & Amnuai's (2016) study, regarding the use of Move 19 in the Thai corpus, to a lesser extent, it can be inferred that emphasising some interesting findings from the study appears to play a smaller role in Thai academic discourse, compared to international discourse.

When considering the use of steps in Move 23 between the two groups of authors, there are both similarities and differences in their uses of steps. Both

international and Thai researchers are more likely to rely on Step 1 (Making suggestions/drawing implications) than Step 2 (Recommending further research). This result may be explained by the fact that most tourism studies tend to focus on the effective management of tourism destinations. Research authors in this field, thus, appear to place a greater emphasis on providing practical suggestions or implications for communities to persuade readers that their research findings make valuable contributions to such destinations. With regard to the use of Step 2, the frequency of this step in the international corpus is by far greater than in the Thai corpus (84% of international articles and 42% of Thai articles). This disparity suggests that Thai writers may have different discourse conventions for writing research articles from international writers. While recommending for further study (Step 2) may be taken into account as a significant feature for international researchers, it may be treated as a non-essential feature for Thai researchers. This finding conforms to the finding of Amnuai & Wannaruk (2013) who found that international writers were more likely than Thai writers to recommend future studies in applied linguistics articles. Similarly, this trend has been reported in other contrastive studies. For instance, Peacock (2002) found that the Move of recommendations for future research occurred much less frequently in research articles written by non-native English writers in Business, Language and Linguistics, and Public and Social Administration, compared to research articles written by native English writers in the same disciplines. Likewise, Sheldon (2013) revealed that the number of occurrences of this step in applied linguistics research articles written by Spanish scholars was lower than that in research articles written by native English writers. Previous studies have suggested that the occurrence of this step varies according to discipline. It seems that this step tends to be more frequently found in social sciences articles than in hard sciences articles. For example, it occurred in approximately 58.82% of the computer science research articles (Posteguillo, 1999). It was found in 53.33% of research articles in biochemistry (Kanoksilapatham, 2005). On the other hand, it was found in 73% of Language and Linguistic Discussions (Peacock, 2002). Likewise, it was found in 70% of English applied linguistics discussions (Amirian, Kassaian, & Tavakoli, 2008).

With regard to Move 20, there is no difference in the frequency of this Move between the two sets of texts. There is a similarity in the overall pattern of use of

steps between the two groups of writers. Step 1 (Interpreting/Discussing results) is the most common step, while Step 3 (Accounting for results) is the least frequent step in both corpora. The finding in the current study differs from Yang & Allison's (2003) study, in which Step 3 was more frequent than Step 1 in applied linguistics research articles. There is a statistically significant difference between the two groups of writers in their use of Step 2 (Comparing results with literature). This step is more dominant in the international corpus than in the Thai corpus. This result reflects that of Amnuai & Wannaruk (2013b) who also found that Step 2 was less frequent in the Thai corpus. The lack of reference to previous studies in the Thai corpus in this study may partly be explained by the fact that the topics of research studies in the Thai articles are specifically contextualized in a Thai context where very little previous research has been conducted. As a result, there are not many studies that can be used for comparison.

The analysis also reveals that there are significant differences in the frequency of Move 18 (Summarizing the study), Move 21 (Drawing conclusion of the study/stating research conclusion), and Move 22 (Evaluating the study) between the two groups of texts. These three Moves are much more pervasive in international articles than in Thai articles. This suggests that Thai writers may not perceive these three Moves to be critical, while they are considered important features in international articles. The omission of Move 18 in the Thai articles may be due to the writers' supposition that readers might remember the objectives of the study presented in the previous sections, so it is unnecessary to remind the readers about the objectives of the study. The result also showed that Move 21 was the least frequent Move in the corpus (34% in the international corpus and 10% in the Thai corpus). This result differs from Pho's (2013) study, where Move 18 is the least common, and Move 21 was found in over 80% of research articles in applied linguistics and more than 60% of educational technology articles. However, the low frequency of Move 21 in this study corroborates the finding of Amnuai & Wannaruk's (2013b) study. They found that Move 21 occurred in 13.33% of the Thai corpus and was not found in any articles in the international corpus.

Finding that Move 22 (Evaluating the study) is much more common in the international corpus than in the Thai corpus (88% of articles in international articles and 40% of articles in the Thai corpus) corroborates earlier findings.

Amnuai & Wannaruk (2013a) reported that the number of occurrences of this move in the international articles was three times higher than that of articles in the Thai corpus, and occurred twice in the international articles than that in the Thai articles in another study (Amnuai & Wannaruk, 2013b). Based on the findings in this study and earlier studies, it is possible to hypothesise that Thai authors do not favour evaluating their studies. This may be due to Thai cultural values. As explained by Thai scholars (e.g., Jogthong, 2001; Kanoksilapatham, 2007b), due to particular features of Thai society, such as modesty, humility, and communication norms, the use of argumentative and evaluative skills may be affected. For instance, in Thai society, self-promotion or commenting on their achievements may seem inappropriate. Pupipat (1998) also makes a further claim that Thai cultural traits regarding the 'face phenomenon' and the seniority system may obstruct the ability to discuss or argue, resulting in the inability to produce effective Discussion sections for journal articles. Likewise, Jaroongkhongdach, Watson Todd, Keyuravong, & Hall (2012) claimed that the issue of 'face' in Thai culture may be one of potential causes of low quality of the research articles written by Thai in English Language Teaching (ELT). They also concluded that the literature review and discussion sections in the Thai research articles were poorer than the international articles in terms of justification, awareness and coherence.

However, when looking at the use of steps in Move 22, both international and Thai writers use all steps in the same direction. There are three steps used to realise Move 22, namely Step 1 (Indicating limitations), Step 2 (Indicating significance/advantage), and Step 3 (Evaluating methodology). Step 2 is the most frequent step in both sets of texts and is followed by Step 1 and Step 3 respectively. This finding was also reported by Yang & Allison (2003). However, the finding is in contrast to those of Amnuai & Wannaruk (2013b) and Pho (2013) who found that Step 1 occurred more frequently than Step 2 in their corpora. Although those previous studies investigated articles in the same field, applied linguistics, their findings are inconsistent. The differences in the findings in the previous studies support the idea that rhetorical variations exist in the same discipline. The low frequency of step 3 in both corpora (8% in international articles and not found in Thai corpus) suggests that this step may not be considered a crucial step by both cohorts of writers, compared to the other two

steps. Based on the analysis, significant differences in the use of Step 1 and Step 2 were observed between the two groups of writers. This finding is consistent with that of Kanoksilapatham (2007b) who found that Step 1 occurred infrequently in the Thai corpus, compared to the international corpus. Similarly, Amnuai & Wannaruk (2013a, 2013b) demonstrated that both Step 1 and Step 2 occurred much less frequently in the Thai corpus than in the international corpus. It is possible that Thai authors may consider stating the limitations of the study as a sign of weaknesses or shortcomings of their study; therefore, they tend to avoid indicating limitations in their research articles. By contrast, for international writers, stating the limitations of the study seems to be common and inevitably to be mentioned in research articles. However, as argued by Sheldon, (2013a), it is not expected that every research publication is required to discuss the limitations of the study. This might reflect the low number of occurrences of Step 1 in the Thai corpus. In spite of the differences in the number of occurrences of Step 1 and Step 2 between the two corpora, both cohorts of researchers have demonstrated they create a move containing a particular communicative purpose to achieve the overall goals of the research paper.

The results show that dissimilarities between the two corpora occurred not only at the Move level but also at the step level in Move 17 (Preparing for the presentation of the discussion section). Move 17 was found more frequently in the international corpus than in the Thai corpus. This result is in line with that of Amnuai & Wannaruk (2013b), who investigated the Discussion section in applied linguistics research articles. They also found that Move 17 occurred more often in the international corpus than in the Thai corpus. It should be noted that the four steps used to realise Move 17 are the same steps as in Move 13 in the Results section. However, the occurrences of the steps in these two Moves are at variance in the international corpus. In Move 17, the most distinctive step used by international writers is Step 3 (Giving background knowledge), while in the Results section, the most common step appears to be Step 1((Re)stating data collection and data analysis procedure). This finding is in line with Pho's (2013) study, where Step 3 appeared to be the most common step in Move 17 in the Discussion-Conclusions section, and Step 1 appeared to be the most common step in Move 13 in the Results section. This may suggest that international writers tend to use different strategies according to the communicative purpose

of the sections of texts. With regard to Thai writers, there is no difference in the use of steps in these two moves. That is, Thai writers prefer using Step 3 in both moves. There is a significant difference between the two corpora in the frequency of Step 1 in Move 17. The occurrence of Step 1 in international articles is by far greater than in Thai articles (28% of international articles and 6% of Thai articles). One possible explanation for this might be that Thai writers may judge it unnecessary to repeat the data collection or analysis procedure (Step 1) in the Discussion-Conclusions and pay more attention to providing background knowledge of the research context or relevant theoretical information (Step 3) before discussing their research. According to Swales (1990), reiterating main points, emphasising theoretical information, and reminding the reader of technical information can be used by research writers to reinforce their discussion. This may be applied to account for the high frequency of Step 3 in both corpora in this study.

Based on the analysis, Thai writers tend to open the Discussion-Conclusions section with Move 19 (Highlighting overall research outcome), while international writers tend to initiate the section with Move 17 (Preparing for the presentation of the discussion) or Move 18 (Summarizing the study). This finding was also reported by Amnuai & Wannaruk (2013b). In accordance with the present results, previous studies (e.g., Amnuai & Wannaruk (2013b; Yang & Allison (2003)) have demonstrated that the cyclical pattern of Move 19 (Highlighting overall research outcome)-Move 20 (Discussing the findings of the study) and Move 22 (Evaluating the study)-Move 23 (Deductions from the research) occurred across the section.

This section has discussed the similarities and differences in the characteristics of rhetorical structure between international and Thai articles. Overall, most Moves and steps occur more commonly in international articles than in Thai articles. In the next section, I will present a discussion of results in relation to linguistic devices used to express the authorial stance.

5.3 Overall results of stance devices (Research question 2)

The analysis reveals that there is a similar trend in the overall use of stance markers between the two groups of writers. That is, hedges seem to be the most common stance device, followed by boosters, attitude markers, and self-

mentions respectively. This finding is in line with that of Ahmed et al. (2016) who demonstrated that hedges were by far the most common stance in civil engineering research articles written in Pakistani-by-Pakistani scholars, followed by boosters, attitude markers and self-mentions respectively. However, Ahmed et al. (2016) found that in research articles written by British native scholars in the same field, hedges and boosters were still the most common markers, but self-mentions and attitude markers were ranked third and fourth respectively. The differences in the occurrences of self-mentions and attitude markers between Ahmed et al.'s (2016) British corpus and this study could be related to differences in the nature of disciplines between the hard and social sciences. As pointed out by Hyland (2005b), research in social sciences tends to be more interpretative and less abstract; authors rely more on a personal projection, compared to research in the hard disciplines. Thus, attitude markers are more common in tourism than in civil engineering discourses. Ahmed et al. (2016) noted that the less use of self-mentions and other interactional metadiscourse markers in the Pakistani corpus may be associated with L1 writing practice affecting interaction between the writer and the reader in texts, the quality of academic writing education, and the use of English as a second language in Pakistan.

The high frequency of hedges in both international and Thai corpora demonstrates that both groups of writers present their claims with due caution and respect to colleagues' views (Hyland, 2005b). According to Hyland (2005a), through the use of hedges, writers invite readers to participate in their texts, as hedges enable the writers to open a discursive space where readers are able to argue their interpretations. However, when comparing both groups of texts, the analysis revealed that there was a statistically significant difference in the use of hedges between the two groups. They are more common in international articles than in Thai articles. This implies that international writers are more likely than Thai writers to downplay their commitment to the proposition presented and open a more discursive space for readers to negotiate in their texts.

The results in this study accord with previous contrastive studies which have suggested that hedges were more common in research articles written by L1 writers than those written by L2 writers. On the contrary, boosters seemed to be more common in L2 texts. For example, Mur Dueñas (2011) demonstrated that hedges were more frequently found in English research articles in Business

Management written by North-American scholars than in Spanish research articles in the same field written by Spanish scholars. By contrast, boosters were more commonly found in Spanish research articles than in English articles. Likewise, Mu *et al.*, (2015) concluded that hedges appeared to be more popular in applied linguistics English research articles than in applied linguistics Chinese articles, which showed a stronger tendency of employing boosters. In the current investigation, there were statistically significant differences between the two groups of writers in the use of both hedges and boosters. These findings suggest that international authors tend to be more cautious than Thai authors when presenting their claims or propositions. By contrast, Thai writers seem to be more forceful than international writers when making their claims.

However, the result that Thai writers appeared to use more boosters than international writers is contrary to that of Yotimart & Abd Aziz (2017) who demonstrated that native English writers deployed twice more boosters than Thai writers in English research articles in applied linguistics. According to the authors, this difference could be due to the socio-cultural aspect. Making assertive arguments may be less acceptable in Thai culture. A possible explanation for this disparity might be related to the size of the corpus. The corpus in Yotimart & Abd Aziz's study was much smaller than the current corpus. Yotimart & Abd Aziz's corpus was based on only 30 research articles,15 articles from each corpus. Therefore, their findings may not be reliable. A larger corpus with statistical analysis can provide more reliable results. A possible explanation for the higher degree of use of boosters in the international corpus in Yotimart & Abd Aziz's (2017) study might be that native English writers may attempt to persuade readers of the validity of their claims (Peacock, 2006). According to Peacock (2006), one of the major aims of research article writers is to persuade their audience to claim membership in the relevant discourse community. This could be achieved by the use of boosters, especially the evidential or implicit truth of boosters (e.g., *show*, *demonstrate*).

The results show that the overall frequency of self-mentions in the international corpus is much higher than in the Thai corpus. This suggests that international writers show themselves more explicitly than Thai writers in research articles. In addition, it suggests that international authors are more likely than Thai authors to establish an effective authorial identity and a stronger interaction between the

authors and the readers. This finding is consistent with that of Yotimart & Abd Aziz (2017) who found that self-mentions were more common in the native English corpus than in the Thai corpus. Similarly, Mur Dueñas (2011) found that the employment of self-mentions in Spanish research articles was less than in English research articles written by North-American writers. The marked use of these features in international corpus may be attributed to higher competitiveness in international publications and different reader types (international and national readers). According to Mur Dueñas (2007), the use of self-mentions shows the authorial presence, establishes a writer's credentials, and presents the writer as a contributor of some originality, which may lead to positive reviews. To be successful in publishing in international journals and meet the expectation of international readers, this credibility and originality need to be highlighted more strongly, compared to writing for a national peer group. Similarly, Mu et al., (2015) demonstrated that self-mentions were less frequent in the Chinese research articles, compared to the English research articles in applied linguistics journals. The researchers claimed that this disparity could be associated with the Chinese culture of collectivism, in which Chinese scholars may feel uncomfortable presenting themselves in texts. Based on the results from the aforementioned studies and the current study, the assertion that the employment of self-mentions tends to be infrequent among non-native English writers appears to be the case. Having discussed the overall results of stance markers, I will now move on to discuss the individual stance markers.

5.3.1 Hedges

There is a similar pattern of use of hedging devices between the two groups of texts. That is, modal verbs seem to be the most common hedging device whereas nouns seem to be the least preferable device in both sub-corpora. In accordance with the present results, previous studies have demonstrated that modal verbs are the most commonly used category of hedges in research articles in various fields, such as electrical engineering (Farrokhi & Emami, 2008), applied linguistics (Getkham, 2011), humanity and social science (Wiboonwachara & Rungrojsuwan, 2020) and library and information (Mirzapour & Mahand, 2012). Finding that nouns were the least common device in the corpus is also in agreement with that of Mirzapour and Mahand (2012), who showed that nouns

were the least frequent strategy used in research articles in the discipline of library and information.

However, there are significant differences between the two groups of authors regarding the number of occurrences of verbs, adverbs, and adjectives. These results are consistent with data obtained in Papangkorn's (2019) study, in which verbs, adverbs, and adjectives are more common in argumentative essays composed by native English learners than in those composed by Thai learners. The results from the present study and Papangkorn's (2019) study suggest that Thai writers may have limited lexical knowledge of hedging devices, resulting in diminished use of these stance markers in their texts. Findings that international researchers make more use of verbs and adverbs are consistent with those of earlier contrastive studies. Mirzapour and Mahand (2012) showed that verbs and adverbs were more likely to be common in library and information science research articles written by English native writers than those written by non-native writers. Similarly, Farrokhi & Emami (2008) demonstrated that verbs and adverbs were found more commonly in the native English corpus than in the non-native corpus in research articles in applied linguistics and electrical engineering.

When looking at frequencies of use of specific modal verbs, there are both similarities and differences between the two sub-corpora. The findings revealed that the modals *may*, *could,* and *should* were the most frequently employed modals in both sub-corpora. Finding that *may* was one of the most frequent modal verbs is consistent with those of Hyland (1999) and Hyland and Jiang (2018), who also found that *may* was one of the most common hedges in their corpora. Similarly, Yotimart and Abd Aziz (2017) demonstrated that *may* and *should* occurred frequently in their corpus. When comparing both groups of texts, however, the analysis revealed that there were significant differences between texts in the number of occurrences of these three specific modal verbs. International texts have a significantly higher degree of use of the modal verb *may* whereas Thai texts tend to have an extensively higher degree of use of the modal verbs: *should* and *could*. These discrepancies may be due to an overlap of meanings of these modals and stylistic differences. That is, *may* tends to be commonly used to express possibility; *should* can be commonly used to make recommendations or give advice, express obligation, and possibility, and *could* can be used to make suggestions or express possibility or ability. Therefore,

writers can use *may* or *could* to express possibilities depending on their preferences. As pointed out by Hyland (1998b), the actual meanings of modals in different registers are not clearly distinguished; the modals carry a wide semantic range and each modal expresses an overlap of meanings. Another possible explanation for this might be due to L1 influence. Translation equivalences in Thai may affect the use of these markers in Thai writers. For instance, *could* is generally used to express ability rather than possibility in Thai, whereas *may* is commonly employed to show uncertainty and lack of confidence in the writer or speaker's proposition. *Should* is normally used to give suggestions or obligations. This could account for the high frequencies of *could* and *should* in the Thai corpus.

There is a similar trend in the use of verbs in both corpora regarding the most frequent verb. The verb *suggest* is the most frequently used verb in both sets of data. This finding is consistent with that of Yang (2014), who found that *suggest* was one of the most common verbs in research articles in applied linguistics. Despite the fact that *suggest* appears to be the most common verb in both corpora, there is a significant difference between texts in the number of occurrences of this verb. It is more likely to be employed more extensively in international articles than in Thai articles. This finding was also reported by Prasithrathsint (2015), who found that there was more extensive use of the verb *suggest* in research articles written by native English writers than in research articles written by Filipino and Thai writers.

In addition, there is a significant difference in the use of the verb *argue* in Moves between the two groups of scholars. Based on the analysis in this study, this verb was usually employed to present the views of other people or the writer's views or claims. The use of this verb in the Thai corpus in relation to presenting the writer's claims was rarely found; it was found in only one Thai article. This finding is in line with that obtained by Yotimart & Abd Aziz (2017), who found that none of the Thai research articles in applied linguistics used this verb to present the author's own arguments, while it was found 7 times in the native English articles. A possible explanation for this might be that most Thai researchers have been taught to be objective and should not express their own views in research articles. In the current study, a Thai writer presents the writer's own argument in a neutral way by using the verb *argue* with the pronoun *it* and modal *may* to soften

the claim, as shown in *it may be argued that….* As opposed to Thai writers, international writers seem to be more confident in presenting their claims by using the verb *argue* with the first-person pronoun *we*, as shown in *we argue that….* Another possible explanation for this disparity might be due to higher competitiveness in publishing in an international journal. In other words, to achieve international publication, scholars need to present more strongly their voice and their position in the texts to gain scholarly credibility than when they write for domestic peer groups. Therefore, this could account for the higher frequency of *argue* in the international corpus.

With regard to adverbs, there are significant differences in the use of the adverb *largely* and *relatively* in Moves between the two corpora. These two adverbs are generally less common in the Thai corpus. These two specific adverbs tend to be used to lessen the degree of certainty in a proposition or of informational content. This function can be seen in both corpora. However, they may be used to highlight a knowledge gap and to explain or justify the methodology. These two functions are only found in international articles. As suggested by Hyland (1998, p. 362), attribute hedges, such as *largely, generally, approximately,* and so on, deal with "the relationship between propositional elements rather than the relationship between a proposition and a writer". Attribute hedges, thus, are used to indicate the extent of precision in writers' expression rather than express doubt on certainty or withhold commitment to writers' propositions.

5.3.2 Boosters

Boosters tend to be more common in the Thai corpus than in the international corpus. This suggests that Thai writers tend to present their claims more assertively and make a stronger commitment to their claims than international writers. This finding supports previous contrastive research, which has suggested that there was a higher degree of use of boosters in texts composed by non-native authors than in those composed by native English authors (Hu & Cao, 2011; Liu & Huang, 2017; Mur Dueñas, 2011).

In this study, there are 4 sub-categories of boosting devices: verbs, adverbs, adjectives, and modal verbs. There are both similarities and differences in the use of these categories in both text groups. Based on the analysis, both groups of writers have a similar tendency in the deployment of the sub-category of verbs;

that is, they are the most commonly used device in both corpora. This finding is in line with that of Papangkorn (2019), who revealed that verbs were the most common boosting device in argumentative essays written by English native learners and Thai learners. However, the result is contrary to that of Mirzapour & Mahand (2012) who revealed that modal verbs were the most preferable category in research articles composed by native English and non-native writers in the field of library and information science, followed by verbs. Modal verbs were ranked second and third in the Thai corpus and international corpus respectively in the present study. The analysis also revealed that there was a significant difference in the number of occurrences of modal verbs between the two groups. It seems that Thai researchers make more significant use of model verbs than international researchers. This outcome differs from those of Mirzapour and Mahand (2012) and Papangkorn (2019), who reported that the native English corpus has a higher degree of use of modal verbs than the non-native corpus. In Papangkorn's (2019) study, modal verbs were not found at all in the Thai corpus.

Let us now consider the use of specific words in sub-categories of boosting devices, there are both similarities and differences in the use of these specific words between the two sets of texts. In terms of similarities, the results show that the verbs *find* and *show* are pervasive in both sets of texts. These findings are consistent with previous research (Hyland, 1998a; Hyland & Jiang, 2018).

Despite a similarity in the overall trend of use of the verbs *find* and *show*, there are differences between the two corpora regarding the frequency of occurrences of verbs. It appears that the verb *demonstrate* is much more common in international articles than in Thai articles. By contrast, the Thai corpus has a higher proportion of verbs *show* and *find* than the international corpus. According to Hyland (1998a), discourse-oriented verbs, such as *show* and *demonstrate* convey objective rather than subjective connotations. Similarly, Skelton (1997) posits that writers employ the verbs *demonstrate*, *show,* and *find* to claim that the truth they are discussing is true as a consequence of the study in question. Hence, a high degree of use of these verbs in both corpora may suggest that both international and Thai writers tend to be more responsible for their asserted propositions or claims and reduce the interpretative role of the writers. In addition, the analysis revealed that there were significant differences between

texts in the frequencies of the verbs *know* and *realize*. It seems that Thai writers use these two verbs much more frequently than international writers. These results are contrary to Papangkorn's (2019) findings, which showed that the frequencies of *know* and *realize* were higher in the international corpus than in the Thai corpus.

There is a significant difference in the use of the modal verb *must* between the two groups. It was used more heavily in the Thai corpus than in the international corpus. This finding is inconsistent with that of Papangkorn (2019) who found that the native English corpus had a higher proportion of *must* than the Thai corpus. *Must* is employed to present obligation (Hyland, 1998b). It can be paraphrased as I am sure (Coates, 1983 cited in Hyland, 1998b). The overuse of *must* in the Thai corpus, thus, may suggest that Thai authors make more confident inferences based on deduction than international authors.

5.3.3 Attitude markers

Attitude markers seem to be more common in Thai articles than in international articles. This result corroborates the finding of Yotimart & Abd Aziz (2017) who revealed that attitude markers were used more heavily in the Thai corpus than in the native English corpus. The findings from Yotimart & Abd Aziz's (2017) study and the current study suggest that Thai writers show subjectivity in the evaluation of texts. It is likely that there is a need for establishing the writer's affective attitude to propositions in order to persuade the members of Thai academic discourse. However, it appears that the use of attitude markers in other L1 contexts is different. For instance, Mu *et al.*, (2015) found that this type of linguistic feature was more prevalent in the English corpus than in the Chinese corpus. Likewise, Kim & Lim (2013) showed that attitude markers were more common in English research article introductions than in Chinese research article introductions in the field of educational psychology. Similarly, Mur Dueñas (2011) revealed that there was a higher degree of use of attitude markers in the English research articles than in the Spanish research articles in the field of business management.

In this study, the difference in the total number of occurrences of attitude markers is statistically significant between the two groups of writers. This outcome is contrary to that of Mur Dueñas, (2011), who found that there was no statistically

significant difference between the English corpus and the Spanish corpus in the inclusion of attitude markers in business management research articles. One possible explanation for the infrequency of this type of device in the international corpus may lie in the objectivity of research articles. Furthermore, diachronic studies have shown that there is a decreasing trend in the use of attitude markers in research articles in certain disciplines, particularly in the social sciences. For example, Hyland & Jiang (2018) demonstrated that the use of attitude markers and boosters in applied linguistics and sociology research articles over the past 50 years (from 1965 to 2015) has declined dramatically. Likewise, Gillaerts & Velde (2010) reported that there was a decreasing trend in the use of hedges, boosters, and attitude markers in applied linguistics abstracts from 1982 to 2007. These previous studies suggest that researchers in social science tend to take a more objective and less personal stance toward research articles. This also may partly explain the low frequency of attitude markers in the international articles in this study.

When looking closely at the use of sub-categories of attitude markers, the analysis showed that there was a statistically significant difference between texts in the frequency of verbs particularly in the frequency of the specific verb, *agree*. *Agree* tends to be used more extensively in Thai articles than in international articles. This result is in agreement with Papangkorn's (2019) finding, which showed that *agree* was much more common in the Thai corpus than in the English corpus.

There are similarities in the overall pattern of use of sub-categories of attitude markers between the two groups of authors. There are three sub-categories of attitude markers devices, namely adjectives, adverbs, and verbs. Adjectives seem to be the most common feature in both sets of texts. This finding is in line with those of previous studies (Koutsantoni, 2004; Liu & Huang, 2017). Consistent with the literature (Hyland & Jiang, 2018; Liu & Huang, 2017; Papangkorn, 2019), the adjective *important* and the adverb *even* are the most popular devices in both sets of texts. Verbs are the least frequent features in both corpora. This finding is contrary to that of Papangkorn (2019), who found that verbs are the most prevalent device in her corpus.

5.3.4 Self-mentions

There are four sub-categories of self-mentions, namely first-person singular pronouns (e.g., *I*, *me*), first-person plural pronouns (e.g., *we*, *us*), possessive determiners (e.g., *our*, *my*), and others (e.g., *the author(s)*, *the writer(s)*). The investigation revealed that there were significant differences between the two groups of texts in the frequencies of all four sub-categories of self-mentions. *I*, *me*, *we, my* and *our* are much more common in the international corpus. These differences may be attributed to the traditional view that academic prose should be impersonal. Therefore, the use of first-person pronouns and possessive determiners does not seem to be appropriate in the Thai context. These ideas seem to be widely accepted by both L1 novice writers and L2 writers. As posited by Hyland (2002c), university students have been taught that academic writing is objective and personal views should be omitted; this idea can be seen in many textbooks and style guides for both L1 and L2 writers. The analysis also demonstrates that there are significant differences in the frequency of *the researcher* and *the authors* between the two sets of texts. As noted in the finding chapter, the word *the researcher(s)* and its possessive determiner forms were added to the sub-category of others. *The authors* is more commonly used in international articles, whereas *the researcher* was found more frequently in Thai articles. These differences may be due to writers' preferences. For Thai authors, the word *the researcher* may seem more impersonal than *I* and *we*. To avoid the first-reference pronouns, using third-person pronouns, such as *the researcher* maintains an objective and impersonal tone. The use of *I* and *we* may signify a strong 'face-threatening act' (FTA) (Brown and Levinson, 1978, 1987). In addition, it seems possible that Thai writers prefer using *the researcher* rather than other third-person pronouns because of its meaning. *The researcher(s)* has a more clearly defined meaning for Thai writers, in the sense that it means a person who carries out, writes, and publishes the research, while *the author(s)* or *the writer(s)* may indicate a person who writes, but may not conduct the research. In the current investigation, *we* is more common than *I* in both sets of data. This finding is consistent with previous studies in several fields, which revealed that the exclusive *we* was more prevalent than *I* in applied linguistics and psychology research articles (Hu & Cao, 2015), pure mathematics research articles (McGrath & Kuteeva, 2012), and the articles of business management (Mur Dueñas, 2007). Previous research (e.g., Harwood, 2005a, 2005b; Hyland, 2001) pointed out that

the use of *we* may express lower degrees of author intrusion and personal voice than the use of *I*. This may account for the high number of occurrences of *we* in the current study.

The deployment of a writer pronoun in a text is a means of expressing a personal stance that reinforces an impression of confidence and authority (Hyland, 2002). However, previous studies have shown that the use of self-mentions may vary according to disciplines (e.g., Hu & Cao, 2015; Hyland, 2001, 2002) and writers' cultural backgrounds (e.g., Breivega et al., 2002; Mur Dueñas, 2007). A stronger identity is more likely to be shown in the soft sciences, such as applied linguistics and sociology than in the hard sciences articles, such as engineering and biology (Hyland, 2002). This is because arguments in social sciences tend to be less precisely measurable, compared to the hard sciences. With regard to cross-cultural studies, most studies conclude that self-representations are more likely to occur in research articles written by native English scholars than those written by non-native scholars. This is the case in this study.

5.4 Summary of the chapter

This chapter has discussed the findings of the analysis of characteristics of Moves and linguistic devices used to express authorial stance in international and Thai articles. It began by stating the major aims of the study. It then went on to provide the discussion of the findings of Move characteristics in both sets of texts from the Abstract to the Discussion-conclusions sections. It then discussed the results of the use of stance markers in both groups of data. The results revealed that most Moves and linguistic markers of authorial stance tend to occur more consistently in the international corpus than in the Thai corpus. However, there were both certain similarities and differences between the two groups of texts in relation to the Move characteristics and the deployment of stance markers. The differences may be associated with several factors, such as reader types (national and international), competition in a discourse community, and socio-cultural aspects. In the next chapter, I will present the conclusion of the study.

Chapter 6

Conclusions

6.1 Introduction

This chapter will conclude the study. It will start by summarising the main research findings in relation to research aims and questions (section 6.2). In addition, the significance of the study and its implications will be discussed in section 6.3 and section 6.4 respectively. Limitations of the study and recommendations for future research will also be provided in section 6.5. Section 6.6 involves a summary of the chapter.

6.2 Summary of findings

This study compared similarities and differences between English research articles in tourism written by Thai research writers and published in Thai national journals to those published in international journals in terms of rhetorical structure and linguistic features to express the writers' stance. To reveal the rhetorical structure of the tourism research articles, the analysis was conducted in terms of Move analysis. Hyland's (2005a) interactional metadiscourse framework was employed to analyse the writers' stance. The major findings of the rhetorical structure are summarised in section 6.2.1, and the key findings of the use of linguistics features to express the writers' stance are summarised in section 6.2.2.

6.2.1 How are English research articles in Tourism written by Thai writers and published in national Thai journals similar to and different from those published in international journals in terms of rhetorical structure?

The move analysis of the tourism articles produced by both international and Thai writers in this study reveals that there are 23 rhetorical moves in the tourism research articles (5 Moves in the Abstract, 3 Moves in the Introduction, 4 Moves in the Methods, 4 Moves in the Results, and 7 Moves in the Discussion-Conclusions). This study has shown that overall, international authors make more use of Moves and steps in research articles than Thai authors. However, there are both similarities and differences between the two groups of texts in relation to their use of Moves and steps in the rhetorical structure.

Regarding the Abstract section, this study has found that generally Move 2 (Presenting the research) and Move 4 (Summarizing the findings) are included in the abstracts in both sets of texts. In addition, most Moves in the Abstracts in both sets of texts usually occur in a linear order. The results of this study confirmed that Move cyclicity was found in the abstracts in both groups of data. In terms of differences, Thai writers make more extensive use of Move 3 (Describing the methodology) than international writers. This discrepancy may be partly due to the length of the abstracts. The average length of the abstracts in international articles is shorter than those in Thai articles. To illustrate, most international articles in this study were taken from the Tourism Management journal, in which the abstract length should not exceed 150 words. By contrast, the length of the abstracts in Thai articles varies greatly according to journals, ranging from 150-300 words to not exceed 1 page. In addition, a few Thai journals do not indicate the abstract length, just mention that the abstract should briefly state the purpose of the research, the principal results and major conclusions. Therefore, a longer abstract enables a writer to produce a longer summary of research, in which the methodology of the research can be included. The lesser degree of use of Move 3 in the international corpus suggests that this Move may not play a prominent role in the international discourse, as choices of articulating Moves in an abstract depend on the importance of Moves (Santos, 1996). Interestingly, the less use of Move 3 in the international corpus in this study questions Bhatia's (1993, p.82) claim that “the abstract presents a faithful and accurate summary, which is representative of the whole article”.

The investigation of the Introductions in this study has shown that the introductions of the tourism research articles composed by both groups of researchers appear to follow Swales' (2004) model. That is all three moves, namely Move 6 (Establishing a territory), Move 7 (Establishing a niche), and Move 8 (Presenting the present work) are likely to be found in the Introductions in both groups of texts. Move 6 was found in all articles in both sets of texts. These findings suggest that both groups of writers have a similar discourse in the Introductions. Furthermore, there are similarities between the two groups of data in terms of the sequence of Moves and Move cyclicity. Moves in both corpora are generally presented in a linear order. However, there are some differences in the introductions between the two corpora.

One of the major findings regarding differences is that Move 7 is much more common in international articles than in Thai articles. This result accords with earlier findings in the Thai context (Kanoksilapatham, 2007b; Wannaruk & Amnuai, 2016), which have shown that Move 7 tends to occur more commonly in the English or international corpus than in the Thai corpus. The discrepancy could be attributed to the less competitive research environment in Thai academic discourse. It seems that Thai authors may not need to establish a niche in national publications, in which the readers' expectations are not as high as the readers' expectations in international publications. By contrast, this Move is usually considered to be a significant feature in international publications. To meet the expectations of international readership, international writers need to identify the weaknesses or shortcomings of previous literature.

In addition, the introductions in international articles are more likely than those in Thai articles to identify a research gap (Step 1A). Identifying a research gap is apparent to be an obligatory element in English research articles. As argued by Swales (1990, p. 158), 'the introduction remains somewhat flat' if a gap is not emphasised in the research article introductions. Therefore, to create a research space in the international context, international writers need to conform to its convention by making an explicit identification of the gap in their introductions. On the contrary, the introductions in Thai articles appear to address a potential problem relevant to research (Step 1B) more often than those in international articles. These results support evidence from previous observation (Jogthong, 2001), which has demonstrated that Thai scholars in medical and educational disciplines appear to identify a potential problem in a specific situation in their research articles rather than indicate a research gap. These differences may be partly explained by the socio-cultural aspect in Thailand. Making a direct criticism of the other's work is inappropriate in Thai culture (Jogthong, 2001). Thai researchers, therefore, tend to avoid identifying a research gap and choose to identify a potential problem in their research as an alternative strategy. Addressing potential problems relevant to their research can help them locate research needs in the Thai academic discourse community. The assertion proposed by Mauranen (1993b) that rhetorical strategies can be constrained by values and belief systems predominating in the discourse community, in which the social context for the text is represented appears to be the case in the Thai

corpus. However, to be successful in international publications, I would argue that Thai authors should raise their awareness of the importance of Move 7, especially the use of Step 1A in the research articles. They should make an explicit critical stance to accentuate the shortcomings of the earlier studies, at least pointing out the limitations of studies in their research areas.

Regarding Move 8, this study has shown that both groups of writers tend to use the same strategies to realise Move 8. That is, Step 1 (Announcing present research descriptively or purposively) appears to be used most frequently, and Step 5 (Announcing principal outcomes) tends to be avoided by both cohorts of scholars. With regard to differences, international writers tend to be more explicit about what they are investigating than Thai writers in terms of presenting research questions or hypotheses (Step 2), clarifying definition (Step 3) and summarising methods (Step 4).

There is a similarity in the overall pattern of use of Moves in the Methods section between the two groups of scholars. That is, Move 10 (Describing the data and data collection procedure) tends to be employed most frequently, followed by Move 11 (Describing the data analysis procedure), Move 9 (Contextualizing study methods), and Move 12 (Previewing the following section) respectively. The study has shown that Move 10 was found in all articles in both sets of texts. Furthermore, the investigation has revealed that the general pattern of the use of steps to realise each Move in both groups of writers appears to be similar. The Move sequence and cyclicity in both sets of data also seem to be parallel. These results suggest that both groups of writers tend to follow a similar rhetorical convention in the Methods discourse. In terms of differences, international authors are more likely than Thai authors to provide data collection procedure (Move 10 step 3), justify the data collection procedure (Move 10 step 4), and justify the data analysis procedure (Move 11 step 2). The aforementioned Moves and Steps are strategies that could be used to establish credibility in the Methods section (Cotos et al., 2017). Thus, to obtain international credibility, international authors ensure the readers that their research methodology meets the disciplinary standard by using these Moves and steps more frequently, compared to Thai researchers.

The investigation of the Results section has demonstrated that both groups of authors share the same rhetorical structure in the Results section. That is, Move 14 (Reporting specific/individual results) is the most dominant Move, followed by Move 13 (Preparing for the presentation of the result section), Move 15 (Commenting on specific results), and Move 16 (Summarizing the results respectively). The analysis has also shown that both groups of authors appear to use the same strategy to realise Move 15.

The investigation of the Discussion-Conclusions section has shown that there are similarities in the use of Move 19 (Highlighting overall research outcome), Move 20 (Discussing the findings of the study), and Move 23 (Deduction from the research) in both sets of texts. Move 23 occurs most frequently, followed by Move 20 and Move 19 respectively. The results revealed that both cohorts of writers tend to give background knowledge before presenting their discussion. However, one of the significant findings regarding differences is that international articles appear to recommend further studies (Move 23 step 2) more often than Thai articles. In addition, international writers are more likely than Thai writers to (re)state data collection and analysis procedure (Move 17 step 1), summarise what the study is about (Move 18), comparing results with literature (Move 20 step 2), draw a conclusion of the study (Move 21), as well as evaluate the study (Move 22). This suggests that Thai writers may regard these features as insignificant features in research articles. Findings that recommending further research and evaluating the study are more common in the international corpus are consistent with those of Sheldon (2013) who demonstrated that evaluation of the study and recommendations for future studies were presented more consistently in English research articles written by native English writers than in those written in English and in Spanish by Spanish writers. Recommending future research based on limitations of the study is a vital element in the Discussion-Conclusions section in English discourse convention because it helps strengthen research community and everyone's case for research grants, and promote knowledge growth (Sheldon, 2013). Given this, it is possible that to satisfy international readership, international authors make more use of these Moves than Thai writers.

6.2.2 How are English research articles in Tourism written by Thai writers and published in national Thai journals similar to and different from those

published in international journals in terms of linguistic features to express writers' stance?

This study has shown that overall authorial stance markers are more likely to be shown in international texts than in Thai texts. Nevertheless, there are similarities and differences between the two groups in their use of stance markers. In terms of similarities, both groups of writers appear to have a similar pattern of use of stance markers. That is, hedges seem to be by far the most common type, followed by boosters, attitude markers, and self-mentions respectively. The high degree of use of hedges in both corpora suggests that both groups of writers make their claims with caution and invite the readers to engage in their texts, as the use of hedges allows the writers to create a discursive space where readers can support or reject their interpretations (Hyland, 2005b). However, the study has shown that there are differences between the two corpora regarding the degree of use of the stance markers. International authors make more use of hedges and self-mentions than Thai writers. By contrast, boosters, and attitude markers tend to be shown more often in Thai articles than in international articles.

In terms of sub-categories of hedging devices, the study has revealed that modal verbs are the most pervasive in both groups of texts. By contrast, nouns appear to be avoided by both cohorts of scholars. However, research articles produced by Thai authors have lower frequencies of verbs, adjectives, and adverbs than those produced by international authors. These differences suggest that Thai writers may have limited lexical knowledge of hedging devices. These results support evidence from previous observations (e.g., Farrokhi & Emami, 2008; Mirzapour & Mahand, 2012), which have shown that there is a higher degree of use of verbs and adverbs in the English native corpus, compared to the non-native corpus. Regarding specific modal verbs, the investigation revealed that international researchers are more likely than Thai researchers to employ the modal *may*. On the other hand, Thai scholars appear to deploy *should* and *could* more often than international scholars. Two possible explanations could be used to account for these results. Firstly, these differences can be attributed to an overlap of the meaning of these modal verbs and stylistic differences. The modals carry several meanings, which are not clearly differentiated. Therefore, choices of modal verbs can be made, based on the writers' preference. Secondly,

these results may be associated with L1 influence. Translation equivalence in Thai may affect the use of these modal verbs in Thai writers.

One of the interesting findings regarding differences in the use of hedging devices is that international writers are more likely than Thai writers to use the verb *argue* to present the writer's claims. This is in accord with previous research (Yotimart & Abd. Aziz, 2017), which has revealed that the use of *argue* to express the author's claims was not found in any research articles in applied linguistics produced by Thai writers. In addition, the study has shown that there are differences in the use of adverbs *largely* and *relatively* between the two groups of writers. Both cohorts of writers usually use *largely* to weaken the certainty in propositions or informational content, and *relatively* to present claims or findings. However, international authors appear to use these two adverbs to indicate a research gap and to justify the methodology, whereas these two functions were not found in the Thai corpus.

The exploration of boosters in this study has suggested that Thai scholars are more likely than international scholars to make more assertive claims in their texts. This result reflects those of earlier studies (Hu & Cao, 2011; Liu & Huang, 2017; Mur Dueñas, 2011), which have suggested that non-native authors tend to use more boosters than native authors. However, there is a similarity between the two groups of writers regarding the use of sub-categories of boosting devices. The analysis reveals that both groups of writers tend to express their certainty of propositions through the use of verbs rather than other sub-categories of boosting devices, especially through the verbs *find* and *show*. Through the employment of these verbs, both cohorts of writers appear to be accountable for their asserted claims and lessen the writer's role in interpretations, as these verbs are generally used to declare the truth as a consequence of the study in question (Skelton, 1997) and express objective connotations (Hyland, 1998a).

The analysis of attitude markers has indicated that Thai articles are more likely than international articles to display subjectivity of evaluation in texts. This is in agreement with previous research (Yotimart & Abd. Aziz, 2017), which has suggested that Thai authors use more attitude markers than English native authors in their texts. However, both groups of writers tend to present their affective attitudes through the use of adjectives and avoid the use of verbs.

With regard to self-mentions, the study has indicated that international researchers are more likely to present themselves overtly in texts than Thai researchers. This accords with previous studies (e.g., Kafes, 2017; Mu et al., 2015; Mur Dueñas, 2007, 2011; Yotimart & Abd. Aziz, 2017), which have suggested that non-native authors make lesser use of self-mentions than native English authors. In this study, all four sub-categories of self-mentions appear to be shown more significantly in international texts than in Thai texts. There are two possible explanations for these disparities. Firstly, it might be that Thai authors hold the traditional view that an academic text should be objective and exclude personal views. Thai researchers, therefore, tend to avoid using first-person pronouns and possessive determiners. Secondly, it is possible that the research environment in international publications is more competitive than the research environment in Thai national publications. To be successful in international publications and meet the expectation of international readership, authors need to present credibility and originality as well as writers' presence in texts. These can be achieved through the use of self-mentions because the use of self-mentions expresses authorial presence, establishes the writer's credentials and presents the writer as making an original contribution, which helps them to gain positive reviews (Mur Dueñas, 2007). Further analysis has shown that the term *the authors* is more likely to be shown in international articles than in Thai articles. By contrast, *the researcher* tends to be found more often in Thai articles than in international articles. As noted above, Thai writers may hold the traditional view of objectivity in academic texts; thus, they may prefer to use third-person pronouns to maintain an objective and impersonal tone in texts. With regard to their preference for using the term *the researcher* rather than other third-person pronouns, a possible explanation may be that *the researcher* carries a more comprehensible meaning for Thai authors in the sense that it refers to a person who conducts, writes, and publishes the research, whereas *the author(s)* or *the writer(s)* could refer to a person who writes but may not conduct the research. In terms of similarity, both international and Thai writers are more likely to employ *we* than *I* in their texts. This is in agreement with earlier observations (e.g., Hu & Cao, 2015; McGrath & Kuteeva, 2012; Mur Dueñas, 2007). It is possible that *we* may show a lesser degree of writer's intrusion and personal voice than *I* (Harwood, 2005b, 2005a; Hyland, 2001).

6.3 Significance of the study

A combination of two distinctive approaches, namely Move analysis and authorial stance used to analyse research articles in tourism, makes several contributions to the current literature. Firstly, the exploration of the Move structure has provided a deeper insight into how the organisation of English research articles in tourism is constructed by international and Thai writers. The study contributes to our understanding of the characteristics of two different rhetorical conventions. It has shown us how values, beliefs, and knowledge are likely to affect the rhetorical structure. The Move analysis has also helped us understand the difficulties that second language writers may face when writing English research articles. The fact that the dominant culture may have an influence on the rhetorical organisation in L2 writing (Kaplan, 1966; Mauranen, 1993a, 1993b) results in the omission of some Moves and steps in L2 texts, such as the omission of Move 7 step1A in Thai articles in this study. This may obstruct L2 writers from successfully publishing their research articles in international journals.

Secondly, to the best of my knowledge, this study appears to be the first study examining both rhetorical structure and stance markers in English research articles in tourism from the Abstract to the Discussion-Conclusions sections. Most studies in the tourism field in previous literature are part-genre analyses (e.g., Ahmed, 2015; Kurniawan & Sabila, 2021; Sabila & Kurniawan, 2020). They examined the rhetorical structure and/or linguistic features of stance markers in a single section, namely the Abstract section.

Thirdly, building on previous studies, this study has proposed a model of Move and step structure for the entire research article in the tourism field. This means that the models for the under-researched sections, such as the Methods section, the Results section, and the Discussion-Conclusions section are provided. Either the model for the entire research article or the model for the individual section is likely to be useful for the analysis of the rhetorical structure of research articles in tourism and other disciplines in social sciences. The details of the proposed model are summarised in Table 6.1.

In addition, the analysis of the use of linguistic features to express authorial stance can provide a deeper comprehension of how the members of each community express their authorial stance in texts. The detailed analysis of the

authorial stance in this study has revealed the overuse and underuse and patterns of linguistic devices employed by both cohorts of writers. This study also revealed how these patterns were used differently in both sets of data. For example, international writers tend to employ the pattern *we argue* to present the writers' views or claims, while this pattern was not found in any Thai article. The study also sheds light on how the choices of rhetorical strategy were confined by the discourse norms, culture, and competitiveness. To illustrate, due to the lesser competitiveness, and holding the traditional view of objectivity in academic texts in Thai academic discourse, Thai writers tend to avoid the use of first-person pronouns in their research articles.

Furthermore, the implementations of Move analysis and authorial stance have strengthened this study by providing us with a fuller picture of the characteristics of the tourism discourse. It enables us to explain the overall structure and rhetorical strategies used in English research articles composed by international and Thai authors. The findings of Move structure in the Introduction section in this study have suggested that in general, Swales' (2004) model successfully accommodated the tourism discourse, but steps in Move 1 (Establishing a territory), and Move 2 (Establishing a niche), which are Move 6 and Move 7 respectively in this study, were less consistent with the model. The findings of the present research support previous studies in realising that Moves and authorial stance can be limited by socio-cultural context. This study also confirms the assertion that the only one step, namely Topic generalization, in Swales' (2004) Move 1 is too broad (Adnan, 2008; Sheldon, 2013). The introductions in the tourism research articles, particularly in the international corpus are somewhat long. Hence, it is necessary to include more steps to better describe the rhetorical structure of this Move.

Finally, this study has expanded Hyland's (2005a) interactional metadiscourse framework. Based on the analysis of the articles in this study, I found that some self-reference pronouns, namely *the researcher(s*) and possessive forms, *the researchers'* and *the researchers* are not included in the framework. Furthermore, the past and past participle forms, *knew* and *proven,* are also missing in the boosting devices. I, therefore, expand the framework by including these words in the framework as they are found in the study.

Table 6.1: Summary of the proposed model of rhetorical structure for the tourism research article

Moves	**Functions/Description**
Abstract **Move 1: Situating the research**	- Setting the scene for the current research (topic generalization)
Move 2: Presenting the research	- Stating the purpose of the study, research questions and/or hypothesis
Move 3: Describing the methodology	- Describing the materials, subjects, variables, procedures, ….
Move 4: Summarizing the findings	- Reporting the main findings of the study
Move 5: Discussing the research	- Interpreting the results/findings and/or giving recommendations, implications/application of the study
Introduction **Move 6: Establishing a territory** Step 1: Summarizing existing studies	- Reporting findings from previous studies, presenting background information, reviewing existing theories, frameworks, models and definitions, presenting general knowledge, addressing a topic that is worth investigating to show the field is well-established, indicating the importance of the field
Step 2: Drawing inferences from previous studies	- Discussing and interpreting previous studies
Step 3: Raising questions/ Generating preliminary hypotheses	- Generating questions and/or tentative hypotheses out of previous studies

Step 4: Referring to context of present study	- Presenting the context or background information of the present study
Step 5: Foreshadowing aim of the present study	- Mentioning what the present study is going to focus on
Step 6: Outlining structure of the section	- Indicating the outline of the section
Move 7: Establishing a niche Step 1A: Indicating a gap	- Indicating a gap in previous research
Step 1B: Indicating problems in research sites or the real world	- Indicating problems in research sites of the present study or the real world
Step 2: Presenting positive justification	- explaining why the gap has to be filled or why the expansion of previous studies is necessary
Move 8: Presenting the present work Step 1: Announcing present research descriptively and/or purposively	- Announcing the purpose or content of the present study
Step 2: Presenting research questions or hypotheses	- Formally (and explicitly) presenting the research questions or hypotheses
Step 3: Defining terms	- Giving definitions of the key terms and/or clarifying the key concepts used in the present study
Step 4: Summarizing methods	- Summarizing the methods used in the present study
Step 5: Announcing principal outcomes	- Announcing some major findings of the study
Step 6: Stating the value of the present research	- Stating the value or significance of the present study
Step 7: Outlining the structure of the paper	- Giving an overview of the structure of the paper
Methods	

Move 9: Contextualizing study methods	
Step 1: Referencing previous works <	- Situating aspects of the chosen methodology in the breadth of relevant previous works by means of citation, footnotes and relatively detailed descriptions of methodologies in the representative studies
Step 2: Providing general information	- Providing relevant theoretical, empirical or informational background (e.g. conceptual /theoretical frameworks) - (Re)stating research purposes, hypotheses, gaps in empirical knowledge and other information that is generally introduced earlier in the paper
Step 3: Identifying the methodological approach	- Specifying the research approach/methods/research design with brevity or elaboration
Move 10: Describing the data and data collection procedure	
Step 1: Describing the sample	- Describing the participants of the study (including the context of the study such as location or source of the sample, the size of the population, the characteristics of the sample, sampling technique or selection or grouping criteria) or the data of the study
Step 2: Describing research instruments	- Describing the questionnaire, interview, or tests used in the study
Step 3: Recounting steps in data collection	- Describing the actual steps in data collection - Explaining why particular subjects or instruments were selected or particular steps had to be followed
Step 4: Justifying the data collection procedure	- Highlighting the advantage(s) of using the sample in

	comparison to other samples used in previous studies - Indicating the extent to which the sample is representative of the population
Move 11: Describing data analysis procedure	
Step 1: Recounting data analysis procedure	- Describing how the data were collated after being collected - Describing the variables including methods of measuring variables - Describing tools used in analysing data (e.g., coding schemes or statistical techniques)
Step 2: Justifying the data analysis procedure	- Explaining why particular analysis tools were used - Justifying with reference to methods, scales or items used in the study including limitations - Making specific reference to the validity and/or reliability of a method for measuring variables
Step 3: Previewing results	- Reporting results of statistical analysis - Reporting relationships between variables - Describing results of comparisons of models, groups and categories - Reporting results pertaining to time-related changes - Introducing some data illustrated in tables
Move 12: Previewing the following section(s)	- Giving an overview of the following section(s)
Results **Move 13: Preparing for the presentation of the results section**	
Step 1: (Re)stating data collection and analysis procedure	- Describing data collection and/or analysis tools, variables,

	steps in collecting and/or analysing the data
Step 2: Restating research questions or hypotheses	- Restating research questions or hypotheses of the study
Step 3: Giving background knowledge	- Giving some background knowledge (e.g., the context of the study, aim and purposes, theoretical or methodology information; referring to literature)
Step 4: Indicating structure of the section	- Indicating how the results are going to be presented
Move 14: Reporting specific/individual results	- Reporting specific results (e.g., results in relation to a table or figure)
Move 15: Commenting on specific results	
Step 1: Interpreting results	- Discussing the results
Step 2: comparing results with literature	- Comparing the results of the present study with previous findings or existing literature
Step 3: Accounting for results	- Explaining reasons for expected or unexpected results
Step 4: Evaluating results	- Evaluating individual results
Move 16: Summarizing results	- Summarizing a number of specific results
Discussion-Conclusions	
Move 17: Preparing for the presentation of the discussion section	
Step 1: (Re)stating data collection and analysis procedure	- Describing data collection, participants, and/or analysis tools, variables, steps in collecting and/or analysing the data
Step 2: Restating research questions or hypotheses	- Restating research questions or hypotheses of the study
Step 3: Giving background knowledge	- Giving some background knowledge (e.g., the context of the study, the existing

	literature, highlighting gaps, theoretical or methodology information)
Step 4: Indicating the structure of the section	- Indicating how the section is going to be presented
Move 18: Summarizing the study	- Restating the aims of the study - Summarize what the study is about
Move 19: Highlighting overall research outcome	- Highlighting some interesting findings from the study
M20: Discussing the findings of the study	
Step 1: Interpreting/discussing results	- Giving general discussion or interpretation of the study
Step 2: Comparing results with literature	- Comparing the findings with previous findings or existing literature
Step 3: Accounting for results	- Explaining reasons for expected or unexpected results
Move 21: Drawing conclusion of the study/Stating research conclusions	- Drawing conclusions from the findings
Move 22: Evaluating the study	
Step 1: Indicating limitations	- Stating limitations of the findings, the methodology or the claims made
Step 2: Indicating significance/advantage	- Indicating the significance or importance of the study
Step 3: Evaluating methodology	- Justifying research methodology concerning the strengths or weaknesses of the research
Moves 23: Deductions from the research	
Step 1: Making suggestions/drawing implications	- Making suggestions or drawing implications from the study (e.g., pedagogical implications)

Step 2: Recommending further research	- Pointing out areas that need further research

6.4 Research implications

The findings of the analysis of the rhetorical structure and authorial stance in research articles in this study have both pedagogical and practical implications. They are likely to be beneficial for both second language teachers, and non-native learners and scholars.

6.4.1 Pedagogical implications for second language teachers

In terms of second language teachers, the rhetorical structure obtained from the analysis can help second language teachers develop syllabus and lesson plans for academic writing or writing for publication courses. The detailed findings of similarities and differences in the use of Moves and steps between the two groups can assist teachers to understand the rhetorical conventions established by the two different discourse communities and make students aware of the conventions. In addition, the detailed findings of Moves and steps can facilitate teachers in designing tasks and materials regarding the rhetorical structure. For example, teachers can design a worksheet focusing on communicative functions in each section in research articles in tourism or other disciplines that they are teaching, and ask students to identify the various communicative functions.

Based on the analysis of stance markers, teachers can use the results to teach students how to effectively use linguistic devices to express the writer's stance in texts. As this study analyses the use of stance features in terms of context and co-text, teachers can use these findings to develop materials in relation to the use of stance markers. For instance, teachers could ask students to identify the functions of stance devices used in different sections in research articles. In addition, the overuse and underuse of patterns of linguistic features used by both cohorts of writers in this study can be used as examples for teachers to explain the functions of these patterns and how they are used in different sections of articles. To illustrate, teachers could point out that the verb *argue* can be employed to present the writer's claims in a neutral way if it is used with modal verbs or in passive form. It can also be deployed with first-person pronouns to introduce the writer's claims in a stronger way. Providing examples and

emphasising different functions of stance markers can reinforce students' writing skills and enable them to express their claims and arguments in academic texts effectively. As the findings of this study have suggested that native culture may have an influence on the rhetorical structure, and the choice of linguistic features used to express authorial stance, teachers should highlight this influence and explain to students how it affects the quality of their texts.

With respect to the use of self-mentions, the less use of this feature in Thai articles may seem appropriate at the national level. However, if students aim to publish their articles in international journals, I would argue that teachers should raise an awareness of the use of self-mentions in their texts to meet the expectations of readers at the international level. Self-mentions can be used as a powerful strategy for highlighting a writer's contribution (Hyland, 2001) and presenting the writer's identity and voice, which creates an impression on the readers (Hyland, 2001, 2002c). For instance, the use of the possessive determiner, *our*, in the international context in the following example can promote the writer's contribution by connecting them closely with their work.

> *Our* results can contribute to a better understanding of how biodiversity and nature-based tourism interact in PAs and how these interactions may be altered by different conservation strategies used by Pas.
>
> (E4)

By collocating *our* with the word "results", the writers highlight their close involvement in research outcomes. In addition to the possessive forms, first-person pronouns such as *we* can be used to explicitly emphasise the writers' distinctive contribution and commitment to their position, as shown in the following example.

> Nevertheless, *we* feel our models capture the dominant interrelationships and lay the groundwork for further research. *We* have used an information theoretic approach to calculate the average of top models among the set of models.
>
> (E4)

6.4.2 Practical implications for non-native learners and scholars

In terms of non-native learners and scholars, the findings of Move structure analysis can help non-native learners and scholars in the tourism discipline, who are likely to publish research articles in international journals, understand the overall structure of research articles in tourism. This model can be used as a

guideline for the article's organisation in other disciplines in social sciences as well. Understanding how to construct and organise the structure of research articles, conforming to the international discourse communities, can help non-native learners and scholars accomplish high standard research articles while writing in English. It is expected that the provided model will be beneficial not only for L2 writers but also for L1 novice writers to deal with difficulties in publishing their research articles in international journals.

Furthermore, the analysis of stance markers will help both L1 novice authors and L2 authors understand how to incorporate linguistics features to express authorial stance in research articles and other types of academic texts. As shown by previous research, both L1 novice writers and L2 writers encounter difficulty in constructing a critical stance (Flowerdew, 2001; Neff et al., 2004). In addition, Flowerdew (2001) makes a further claim that lack of writers' voice and inappropriate structure of the Introduction, Literature Review, and Discussion-Conclusion sections are major causes for failure to publish in international journals for L2 writers. Therefore, the proposed model of the entire research article and the detailed analysis of stance markers in this study will help both L1 novice authors and L2 authors tackle these issues. The overuse and underuse of stance features in the international corpus in this study can facilitate those writers to make appropriate claims and meet the standard of international journals.

6.5 Limitations of the study and recommendations for future research

There are some limitations to this study that further research could investigate. Firstly, the corpus in this study was limited to research articles from a single disciplinary community, the tourism discipline. Thus, the results may not be generalised to the whole academic discourse. Future studies of Move structure and authorial stance in other disciplines will shed light on, not only the features of those disciplinary discourses, but also fill the gaps in the existing literature.

Secondly, this study compares the similarities and differences in the rhetorical structure of research articles written by international writers and Thai writers. Therefore, the results in the Thai corpus may be generalised to Thai writers only. The findings may not be applied to other non-native writers. A further

comparative study should investigate the rhetorical structure and authorial stance in other contexts.

Thirdly, the corpus in this study was based on empirical research articles, so the results may not be applicable to other genres. Further research should expand to other genres, such as theoretical articles, and textbooks, which may have different Move structures and authorial stance.

Fourthly, this study does not link the stance features to the Moves. Future research could explore how stance markers were employed by each group of writers in each Move. Such study could further help us understand what stance markers are more or less frequently used in different rhetorical sections of research articles.

In addition, the results of the analysis of stance markers in this study may be affected by the author's bias. As the analysis of Move structure was a time-consuming process, the period of time for the analysis of stance markers was somewhat limited. Thus, the process of checking linguistic features to ensure that they function as stance markers was conducted by the writer only. To increase the reliability of the study, the future study should have an inter-rater to do this process.

This study conducted a comparison analysis of only two groups of English research articles in the tourism field written by international and Thai writers. Further studies could compare three groups of texts by incorporating a group of research articles in the same discipline written in Thai. Such analysis would help determine similarities and differences in the rhetorical structure and strategies used by three groups of writers.

Moreover, as findings of the present study and earlier studies in Thai context (e.g., Jogthong, 2001) demonstrated that Thai writers tended to avoid explicitly addressing a research gap in research articles, this finding could be attributed to socio-cultural aspect. The future study should incorporate interviews with Thai researchers about their beliefs or motivations toward addressing a research gap or evaluating peers' work in research articles in the study. The results of such study would further explain the possibilities of an absence of gap identification or criticism of other's work in research articles.

Finally, based on the finding of Move 12, which was found in only a few articles in international articles and not found in any Thai article, a study of the larger corpus in the tourism field should be conducted to confirm whether this Move should be considered to be an optional or a major Move.

6.6 Summary of the chapter

This chapter has summarised the study. The study has revealed that overall, the occurrences of Moves and steps as well as stance markers are more likely to occur in international articles than in Thai articles. Nevertheless, there are both similarities and differences between the two groups of writers in terms of rhetorical structure and authorial stances. The disparities may be due to several factors, such as socio-cultural aspects, competitiveness in publications at international and national levels, different readerships, and stylistic preferences. It then went on to provide a discussion of the significance of the study. This study is the first study integrating the analysis of Moves and stance markers to analyse the whole tourism research articles, from the Abstract to the Discussion-conclusions sections. By combining the two distinctive approaches, Move analysis and the analysis of stance features, the results of this study make invaluable contributions to the existing literature. The analysis has provided a fuller picture of the characteristics of two different rhetorical conventions of tourism discourse. The analysis of Move structure enables us to comprehend how Thai and international writers in the tourism discipline construct their research articles while the analysis of stance features helps us understand how each cohort of authors expresses authorial stance in their research articles. The study has also proposed a model of Move and step structure for the entire tourism research article.

Research implications, limitations, and recommendations for future research have also been discussed respectively. The results of the analyses of both rhetorical structure and stance features have implications for EAP in Thai and other contexts. The detailed findings of Move and stance analyses can be used as guidelines for teaching academic writing, particularly writing for publication to postgraduate students in tourism or other disciplines. The findings could help the EAP teachers explain how domestic researchers and their international peers established their rhetorical conventions. Furthermore, the EAP teachers can use

the results of both Move and stance analyses to develop tasks and materials for the course. For instance, in terms of rhetorical structure, the teachers could ask students to identify communicative functions in different sections in research articles. Similarly, in terms of stance features, the teachers could ask students to identify the functions of stance features in different sections in research articles. The findings of this study also make contributions to EAP learners and researchers targeting for international publications. The comprehensive findings of the analyses of rhetorical structure and stance features enable them to meet the international standard to publish their research articles.

Appendix A

Hyland's (2005a, pp. 220–224) stance model:

Attitude Markers

!, admittedly, agree, agrees, agrees, amazed, amazing, amazingly, appropriate, appropriately, astonished, astonishing, astonishingly, correctly, curious, curiously, desirable, desirably, disappointed, disappointing, disappointingly, disagree, disagreed, disagrees, dramatic, dramatically, essential, essentially, even, expected, expectedly, fortunate, fortunately, inappropriate, inappropriately, interesting, interestingly, prefer, preferable, preferably, preferred, remarkable, remarkably, shocked, shocking, shockingly, striking, strikingly, surprised, surprising, surprisingly, unbelievable, unbelievably, understandable, understandably, unexpected, unexpectedly, unfortunate, unfortunately, unusual, unusually, usual

Boosters

Actually, always, believe, believed, believes, beyond doubt, certain, certainly, clear, clearly, conclusively, decidedly, definite, definitely, demonstrate, demonstrated, demonstrates, doubtless, establish, established, evident, evidently, find, finds, found, in fact, incontestable, incontestably, incontrovertible, incontrovertibly, indeed, indisputable, indisputably, know, knew*, known, must, never, no doubt, obvious, obviously, of course, prove, proved, proves, proven*, realize, realized, realizes, really, show, showed, shown, sure, surely, think, thinks, thought, truly, true, undeniable, undeniably, undisputedly, undoubtedly, without doubt

Hedges

About, almost, apparent, appear, appeared, appears, approximately, argue, argued, argues, around, assume, assumed, broadly, certain amount, certain extent, certain level, claim, claimed, claims, could, couldn’t, doubt, essentially, estimate, estimated, fairly, feel, feels, felt, frequently, from my perspective, from our perspective, from this perspective, generally, guess, indicate, indicated, indicates, in general, in most cases, in most instances, in my opinion, in our view, largely, likely, mainly, may, maybe, mostly, often, on the whole, ought, perhaps, plausible, plausibly, possible, postulate, postulated, postulates, presumable,

presumably, probable, quite, rather x, relatively, roughly, seems, should, sometimes, somewhat, suggest, suggested, suggests, suppose, supposed, supposed, suspect, suspects, tend to, tended to, to my knowledge, typical, typically, uncertain, uncertainly, unclear, unclearly, unlikely, usually, would, wouldn't

Self-Mention Features

I, we, me, my, our, mine, us, the author, the author's, the writer, the writer's, the researcher(s)***,** the researcher's*****, the researchers'*****, the authors*****, the authors'*****

*****Additional words, which were found in the study but not included in the framework

Appendix B

List of articles in the international corpus

E1 Shi, F., Weaver, D., Zhao, Y., Huang, M. F., Tang, C., & Liu, Y. (2019). Toward an ecological civilization: mass comprehensive ecotourism indications among domestic visitors to a Chinese wetland protected area. *Tourism Management*, *70*, 59–68.

E2 Wang, L., & Yotsumoto, Y. (2019). Conflict in tourism development in rural China. *Tourism Management*, *70*, 188–200.

E3 Lee, T. H., & Jan, F. H. (2018). Ecotourism behavior of nature-based tourists: an integrative framework. *Journal of Travel Research*, *57*(6), 792–810.

E4 Chung, M. G., Dietz, T., & Liu, J. (2018). Global relationships between biodiversity and nature-based tourism in protected areas. *Ecosystem Services*, *34*, 11–23.

E5 Tsaur, S. H., & Tu, J. H. (2019). Cultural competence for tour leaders: scale development and validation. *Tourism Management*, *71*, 9–17.

E6 Su, M. M., Wall, G., Wang, Y., & Jin, M. (2019). Livelihood sustainability in a rural tourism destination-Hetu Town, Anhui Province, China. *Tourism Management*, *71*, 272-281

E7 Kastenholz, E., Eusébio, C., & Carneiro, M. J. (2018). Segmenting the rural tourist market by sustainable travel behaviour: insights from village visitors in Portugal. *Journal of Destination Marketing and Management*, *10*, 132–142.

E8 Boucher, S., Cullen, M., & Calitz, A. (2018). Factors influencing cultural event tourism in Nelson Mandela Bay, South Africa. *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change*, *16*(5), 539–551.

E9 Keyim, P. (2018). Tourism collaborative governance and rural community development in Finland: the case of Vuonislahti. *Journal of Travel Research*, *57*(4), 483–494.

E10 Kim, Hyelin, Lee, S., Uysal, M., Kim, J., & Ahn, K. (2015). nature-based tourism: motivation and subjective well-being. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, *32*(1), S76–S96.

E11 Del Chiappa, G., Atzeni, M., & Ghasemi, V. (2018). community-based collaborative tourism planning in islands: a cluster analysis in the context of Costa Smeralda. *Journal of Destination Marketing and Management*, *8*, 41–48.

E12 Cini, F., & Passafaro, P. (2019). Youth and ecotourism: a qualitative exploration. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, *19*(1), 126–131.

E13 Avila-Foucat, V. S., & Rodríguez-Robayo, K. J. (2018). Determinants of livelihood diversification: the case wildlife tourism in four coastal communities in Oaxaca, Mexico. *Tourism Management*, *69*, 223–231.

E14 Ivanov, B., Dillingham, L. L., Parker, K. A., Rains, S. A., Burchett, M., &

Geegan, S. (2018). Sustainable attitudes: protecting tourism with inoculation messages. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *73*, 26–34.

E15 Tsaur, S. H., Yen, C. H., & Teng, H. Y. (2018). Tourist–resident conflict: a scale development and empirical study. *Journal of Destination Marketing and Management*, *10*, 152–163.

E16 Zhang, L., & Zhang, J. (2018). Perception of small tourism enterprises in Lao PDR regarding social sustainability under the influence of social network. *Tourism Management*, *69*, 109–120.

E17 Santarém, F., Campos, J. C., Pereira, P., Hamidou, D., Saarinen, J., & Brito, J. C. (2018). Using multivariate statistics to assess ecotourism potential of water-bodies: a case-study in Mauritania. *Tourism Management*, *67*, 34–46.

E18 Lee, T. H., & Jan, F. H. (2019). Can community-based tourism contribute to sustainable development? Evidence from residents' perceptions of the sustainability. *Tourism Management*, *70*, 368–380.

E19 Blapp, M., & Mitas, O. (2018). Creative tourism in Balinese rural communities. *Current Issues in Tourism*, *21*(11), 1285–1311.

E20 Marques, C., Mohsin, A., & Lengler, J. (2018). A multinational comparative study highlighting students' travel motivations and touristic trends. *Journal of Destination Marketing and Management*, *10*, 87–100

E21 Lovelock, B., & Lovelock, K. (2018). "We had a ball … as long as you kept taking your painkillers" just how much tourism is there in medical tourism? Experiences of the patient tourist. *Tourism Management*, *69*, 145–154.

E22 Suntikul, W. (2018). Cultural sustainability and fluidity in Bhutan's traditional festivals. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *26*(12), 2102–2116.

E23 Prayag, G., Suntikul, W., & Agyeiwaah, E. (2018). Domestic tourists to Elmina Castle, Ghana: motivation, tourism impacts, place attachment, and satisfaction. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *26*(12), 2053–2070.

E24 Banerjee, S., & Chua, A. Y. K. (2016). In search of patterns among travellers' hotel ratings in TripAdvisor. *Tourism Management*, *53*, 125–131.

E25 Gao, J., & Wu, B. (2017). Revitalizing traditional villages through rural tourism: a case study of Yuanjia Village, Shaanxi Province, China. *Tourism Management*, *63*, 223–233.

E26 van der Zee, E., Gerrets, A. M., & Vanneste, D. (2017). Complexity in the governance of tourism networks: balancing between external pressure and internal expectations. *Journal of Destination Marketing and Management*, *6*(4), 296–308.

E27 Xu, H., Huang, X., & Zhang, Q. (2018). Tourism development and local borders in ancient villages in China. *Journal of Destination Marketing and Management*, *9*, 330–339.

E28 Zhou, L. (2014). Online rural destination images: tourism and rurality. *Journal of Destination Marketing and Management*, *3*(4), 227–240.

E29 Bires, Z., & Raj, S. (2020). Tourism as a pathway to livelihood diversification: evidence from biosphere reserves, Ethiopia. *Tourism Management*, *81*, 1-14.

E30 Kim, S., & Filimonau, V. (2017). On linguistic relativity and pro-environmental attitudes in tourism. *Tourism Management*, *63*, 158–169.

E31 Domínguez-Gómez, J. A., & González-Gómez, T. (2017). Analysing stakeholders' perceptions of golf-course-based tourism: a proposal for developing sustainable tourism projects. *Tourism Management*, *63*, 135–143.

E32 Moore, S. A., Rodger, K., & Taplin, R. H. (2017). Developing a better understanding of the complexities of visitor loyalty to Karijini National Park, Western Australia. *Tourism Management*, *62*, 20–28.

E33 Afshardoost, M., & Eshaghi, M. S. (2020). Destination image and tourist behavioural intentions: a meta-analysis. *Tourism Management*, *81*, 1-10.

E34 Koufodontis, N. I., & Gaki, E. (2020). Local tourism policy makers and e-image of destinations. *Current Issues in Tourism*, *23*(8), 1037–1048.

E35 Cheng, K. M. (2016). Medical tourism: Chinese maternity tourism to Hong Kong. *Current Issues in Tourism*, *19*(14), 1479–1486.

E36 Guerra, M., & Dawson, S. M. (2016). Boat-based tourism and bottlenose dolphins in Doubtful Sound, New Zealand: The role of management in decreasing dolphin-boat interactions. *Tourism Management*, *57*, 3–9.

E37 Mathijsen, A. (2019). Home, sweet home? Understanding diasporic medical tourism behaviour. Exploratory research of Polish immigrants in Belgium. *Tourism Management*, *72*, 373–385.

E38 Seraphin, H., Gowreensunkar, V., & Ambaye, M. (2016). The Blakeley Model applied to improving a tourist destination: an exploratory study. The case of Haiti. *Journal of Destination Marketing and Management*, *5*(4), 325–332.

E39 Moscardo, G., & Murphy, L. (2016). Using destination community wellbeing to assess tourist markets: a case study of Magnetic Island, Australia. *Journal of Destination Marketing and Management*, *5*(1), 55–64.

E40 Yoshida, K., Bui, H. T., & Lee, T. J. (2016). Does tourism illuminate the darkness of Hiroshima and Nagasaki? *Journal of Destination Marketing and Management*, *5*(4), 333–340.

E41 Ji, M., Wong, I. K. A., Eves, A., & Scarles, C. (2016). Food-related personality traits and the moderating role of novelty-seeking in food satisfaction and travel outcomes. *Tourism Management*, *57*, 387–396.

E42 Mei, X. Y., Arcodia, C., & Ruhanen, L. (2015). The national government as the facilitator of tourism innovation: evidence from Norway. *Current Issues in Tourism*, *18*(12), 1172–1191.

E43 Tosun, C., Dedeoğlu, B. B., & Fyall, A. (2015). Destination service quality, affective image and revisit intention: the moderating role of past experience. *Journal of Destination Marketing and Management*, *4*(4), 222–

234.

E44 Stepchenkova, S., Shichkova, E., Kim, H., Pennington-Gray, L., & Rykhtik, M. (2015). Segmenting the “visiting friends and relatives” travel market to a large urban destination: the case of Nizhni Novgorod, Russia. *Journal of Destination Marketing and Management*, *4*(4), 235–247.

E45 Kim, Hany, & Stepchenkova, S. (2015). Effect of tourist photographs on attitudes towards destination: manifest and latent content. *Tourism Management*, *49*, 29–41.

E46 Hwang, J., & Lyu, S. O. (2015). The antecedents and consequences of well-being perception: an application of the experience economy to golf tournament tourists. *Journal of Destination Marketing and Management*, *4*(4), 248–257.

E47 Liang, Z. X., & Hui, T. K. (2016). Residents’ quality of life and attitudes toward tourism development in China. *Tourism Management*, *57*, 56–67.

E48 Gieling, J., & Ong, C. E. (2016). Warfare tourism experiences and national identity: the case of Airborne Museum ‘Hartenstein’ in Oosterbeek, the Netherlands. *Tourism Management*, *57*, 45–55.

E49 Agyeiwaah, E., Adongo, R., Dimache, A., & Wondirad, A. (2016). Make a customer, not a sale: tourist satisfaction in Hong Kong. *Tourism Management*, *57*, 68–79.

E50 Basoglu, K. A., & Yoo, J. J. E. (2015). Soon or later? The effect of temporal distance on travel decisions. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, *32*(1), S62–S75.

Appendix C

List of articles in the Thai corpus

TH1 Sutamma, J., Boonprakarn, K., & Promehanya, A. (2018). Dynamic development of community-based ecotourism management: Tungyeepeng, Sala-dan sub-district, Koh Lanta district, Krabi province. *Veridian E-Journal, Silpakorn University (Humanities, Social Sciences and Arts)*, *11*(4), 1-18.

TH2 Booneiam, S., Voraseyanont, P., Viriyasuebphong, P., Thomrongsinthaworn, S., & Sungsuwan, T. (2017). Participation in community-based tourism development of the Ban Pong Manao community, Lopburi province. *Burapha Journal of Business Management Burapha University*, *6*(1), 96-110.

TH3 Panyavuttrakul, W., & Tinakhat, P. (2015). Arts and cultural tourism management in Uttaradit, Phrae and Nan Provinces. *Mekong-Salween Civilization Studies Journal*, *7*(1), 113–136.

TH4 Diteepeng, S., & Taylor, K. (2016). Management of the Ban Tha Chin historic site for tourism. *International (Humanities, Social Sciences and Arts*, *9*(5), 273–284.

TH5 Sujaritchai, S., & Artnarong, W. (2016). Assessment of tourism attraction potentials in 3 eastern borders provinces. *Interdisciplinary Research Review*, *11*(6), 14-19.

TH6 Amornwitthawat, P., Thanakasem, N., Samanasena, P., Pansawang, C., & Charoensit, J. (2018). Guidelines for management of Kew Mae Pan and Pha Mon nature trail, Doi Inthanon National Park, Chiang Mai province, Northern Thailand. *Interdisciplinary Research Review*, *13*(3), 22-29.

TH7 Auttarat, S., & Visuthismajarn, P. (2017). A pattern of the sustainable tourism border town management in local government for supporting the ASEAN Economic Community. *Veridian E-Journal, Silpakorn University (Humanities, Social Sciences and Arts)*, *10*(4), 86-101.

TH8 Sregongsang, S. (2016). The Potentiality development of local guide and community based tourism in Plaklao Community, Amnatcharoen province, Thailand for increasing competitive capacity in ASEAN Economic Community. *Mekong-Salween Civilization Studies Journal*, *7*(1), 31-54.

TH9 Chaoprayoo, P., & Panyadee, C. (2016). The construction of semiotics in cultural for tourism promotion in Pai District, Mae Hong Son. *Mekong-Salween Civilization Studies Journal*, *7*(1), 55-76.

TH10 Khamung, R. (2015). Analysis of aptitudes, aspirations, capacities, and resources for a community-based agritourism establishment. *Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences Studies)*, 15(2), 25-58.

TH11 Yot-Arlai, N., & Duangseang, V. (2018). Ethnic groups' participation in sustainable tourism development. *Veridian E-Journal, Silpakorn University (Humanities, Social Sciences and Arts)*, *11*(4), 1062-1075.

TH12 Siribowonphitak, C. (2018). Potential development of cultural heritage tourism of ancient remains in Maha Sarakham. *Veridian E-Journal, Silpakorn University (Humanities, Social Sciences and Arts)*, *11*(4), 806-816.

TH13 Siriwichai, C. (2018). Constructing ASEAN tourism brand identity by applying event and leisure marketing. *Veridian E-Journal, Silpakorn University (Humanities, Social Sciences and Arts)*, *11*(4), 1008-1028.

TH14 Heyprakhon, T., Rinchumphu, D., & Janjamlha, T. (2016). Domestic tourists' perceived value on ASEAN vernacular standard homestay. *ABAC Journal*, *36*(2), 53-77.

TH15 Sermsri, N. (2017). Urban tourism at religious sites: Wat Phra Chetuphon Vimolmangklararm Rajwaramahaviharn (Wat Pho). *Veridian E-Journal, Silpakorn University (Humanities, Social Sciences and Arts)*, *10*(4), 254-267.

TH16 Boonmeerit, W. (2017). Community participation for sustainable heritage tourism and development: the case of the Royal Thai Monastery Lumbini, Nepal. *Veridian E-Journal, Silpakorn University (Humanities, Social Sciences and Arts)*, *10*(4), 335-347.

TH17 Vatwongsathip, P., Rittippant, N., & Sharp, A. (2018). Study on environment impact of tourism industry in historical zone in Meuang District, Nan Province, Thailand. *GMSARN International Journal*, *12*(3), 151–157.

TH18 Dabphet, S. (2017). Applying importance-performance analysis to identify competitive travel attributes: an application to regional destination image in Thailand. *Journal of Community Development Research (Humanities and Social Sciences)*, *10*(3), 7-21.

TH19 Sangpikul, A. (2016). The impact of travel experience on destination loyalty to Bangkok. *Panyapiwat Journal*, *8*, 51-63.

TH20 Asawachai, P. (2018). The impact of religious tourism on Buddhist monasteries: an examination of nine temples in Ang Thong. *Electronic Journal of Open and Distance Innovative Learning (e-JODIL)*, *8*(1), 238-258.

TH21 Yiamjanya, S. (2020). Mining industrial landscape , heritage value and tourism opportunity : focus on Lampang's Mae Moh Mine and communities in its neighborhood. *Electronic Journal of Open and Distance Innovative Learning (e-JODIL)*, *10*(1), 165–187.

TH22 Nuansara, M. (2016). The promotion of cultural tourism sustainability: case study of Tai Lue culture. *Rajabhat Chiang Mai Research Journal*, *17*(2), 5-26.

TH23 Anantamongkolkul, C., & Kongma, T. (2020). Thai university student travel behavior: an extension of theory of planned behavior. *ABAC Journal*, *40*(1), 126-141.

TH24 Kallayanamitra, C., & Buddhawongsa, P. (2014). Sustainability of community-based tourism: comparison of Mae Kam Pong village in Chiang

Mai province and Ta Pa Pao village in Lamphun province. *Chiang Mai university journal of economics. 18*(1), 85-111.

TH25 Sangragsa, N., Yeanoungsuvan, S., & Plomelrsee, S. (2015). The research and development of creative tourism management based on temples for meditation learning and sustainable tourism of Nakhon Pathom Province. *Silpakorn University Journal of Social Sciences*, *15*(1), 73–92.

TH26 Thanvisitthpon, N. (2016). The tourism development policy for Thailand's Ayutthaya historical park on the locals' livelihoods and responsibility. *Silpakorn University Journal of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts*, *16*(2), 1–20.

TH27 Pongponrat, K. (2017). Volunteer tourism development : perceptions from university students in Thailand. *Silpakorn UniversityJournal of Social Science*, *17*(1), 115–148.

TH28 Kampetch, P., & Jitpakdee, R. (2019). The potential for key success of community-based tourism sustainability: case study Baan Rim Klong homestay, Samut Songkram, Thailand. *ABAC Journal*, *39*(4), 111–122.

TH29 Chitthanom, C. (2020). Relationships among medical activity perceived functional values, satisfaction trust, and revisit intention in medical tourism: a case study on CLMV tourists in Thailand. *ABAC Journal*, *40*(3), 54–77.

TH30 Wisudthiluck, S., Sindcharak, T., Sangnit, N., & Noithammaraj, P. (2014). Creative tourism in Thailand: problems and obstacles case studies of ceramic and cotton quilt making. *Thammasat Review*, *17*(1), 168-179.

TH31 Singsomboon, T. (2015). The use of Thai food knowledge as marketing strategies for tourism promotion. *Thammasat Review*, *18*(1), 82–98.

TH32 Smerchuar, N., & Madhyamapurush, W. (2020). The mechanisms of tourism management in achieving sustainable development goals (SDGS): the case of Phulomlo and connected areas, Thailand. *ABAC Journal*, *40*(3), 99–116.

TH33 Panyadee, C., & Chaoprayoon, P. (2018). The impact of international development project on cross border tourism in Thailand and related areas. *Mekong-Salween Civilization Studies Journal 249*, *9*(1), 248–261.

TH34 Vasayangkura, C., & Kunphoommarl, M. (2016). The model of cultural based tourism management in urban community: a case study of Thai-Vietnamese community in Mukdahan province, Thailand. *Mekong-Salween Civilization Studies Journal*, *7*(1), 87-112.

TH35 Damrongsiri, T., & Vivanichkul, N. (2016). Community participation thru eco scuba tourism A case study: Koh Tao, Phangan, Surathanee Province. *Mekong-Salween Civilization Studies Journal*, *7*(1), 151-162.

TH36 Puttivisit, P., & Madhyamapurush, W. (2016). Guidelines for disabilities' career in tourism industry, Chiang Mai Province. *Mekong-Salween Civilization Studies Journal*, *7*(1), 185-198.

TH37 Nunthasiriphon, S. (2015). Application of sustainable tourism development to assess community-based tourism performance. *Kasetsart Journal - Social Sciences*, *36*(3), 577–590.

TH38 Sinlapasate, N., Buathong, W., Prayongrat, T., Sangkhanan, N., Chutchakul, K., & Soonsawad, C. (2020). Tourism carrying capacity toward sustainable tourism development: a case study of phuket world class destination. *ABAC Journal*, *40*(3), 140–159.

TH39 Boonsiritomachai, W., & Pitchayadejanant, K. (2018). Drivers impacting residents'attitudes toward sports event tourism: a Hybrid Sem-Neural Networks Approach. *Modern Management Journal*, *16*(1), 239–250.

TH40 Huabcharoen, S., & Viriyasuebpong, P. (2018). The Influence of incentive travel that impact on purchase intention with an insurance company in Thailand. *Journal of Thai Hospitality and Tourism*, *13*(2), 107–119.

TH41 Madsa, T., & Boonchai, P. (2017). The development of governor's palaces of the seven towns in the southern border region into areas of cultural tourism. *Journal of Yala Rajabhat University*, *12*(2), 195–206.

TH42 Kaewnuch, K. (2017). Tourist's perspectives on environmental impacts in Doi Inthanon National Park. *Dusit Thani Journal*, *11*(3), 64–81.

TH43 Maneesaeng, M., & Wall, W. P. (2017). Factors influencing tourist decision-making towards traveling to Luang Prabang. *Dusit Thani College*, *11*(3), 82–95.

TH44 Yothicar, P., & Punyasiri, S. (2018). The development process of the learning process-based cultural tourism interpretation of Khao Phra Wihan National Park. *Phranakhon Rajabhat Research Journal (Humanities and Social Science)*, *13*(1), 42–55.

TH45 Korkamnertkawin,P., & Promsivapallop, P. (2016). International tourists' perception and behavior towards government's beach clean-up policy: a case study of Patong Beach, Phuket. *International Thai Tourism Journal*, *12*(1), 139-139.

TH46 Pattanapokinsakul, K., & Panuwat, P. (2016). Analysis of push and pull travel motivation of foreign tourist to local markets : a case study of Phuket, Thailand. *Journal of International and Thai Tourism*, *11*(2), 43–63.

TH47 Nunthasiriphon, S., & Vongsaroj, R. (2015). Community-based social marketing behavioural goals for promoting community-based tourism. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Burapha Universitiy*, *23*(43), 273–293.

TH48 Hareebin, Y. (2020). Operational guidelines for human capital and innovative tourism entrepreneurs in sustainable tourism perspectives: an analysis of tour operators in the Andaman Provinces of Thailand. *ABAC Journal*, *40*(3), 117–139.

TH49 Pragobmas, P. (2020). The development of sustainable golf tourism management model in southern provinces on Andaman Coast, Thailand. *ABAC Journal*, *40*(3), 160–179.

TH50 Chairerk, W. (2020). The interpretive plan for Si Sun Thon tourist attraction's uniqueness Thalang district Phuket, Thailand. *ABAC Journal*, *40*(3), 180–200.

Appendix D

Coding scheme for the analysis of the rhetorical structure of research articles in tourism discipline

Abstracts

Moves	Function/Description	Examples from the corpus
Move 1: Situating the research <STR>	- Setting the scene for the current research (topic generalization)	The relationships between biodiversity conservation and ecosystem services are widely debated. (E4)
Move 2: Presenting the research <PTR>	- Stating the purpose of the study, research questions and/or hypothesis	This study aimed to 1) identify different characteristics of Kew Mae Pan and Pha Mon Nature Trail, 2) investigate the problems of tourism management, and 3) propose the guidelines for managing sustainable tourism in Kew Mae Pan and Pha Mon Nature Trail. (TH6)
Move 3: Describing the methodology <DTM>	- Describing the materials, subjects, variables, procedures, ….	This research is quantitatively and qualitatively conducted. The representative samples are eight key informants from the agency relevant to ancient remains and 400 respondents who are people in the area of ancient remains. (TH12)
Move 4: Summarizing the findings <STF>	- Reporting the main findings of the study	Findings also revealed conditions for success in developing creative tourism in a community-based tourism context. (E19)
Move 5: Discussing the research <DTR>	- Interpreting the results/findings and/or giving recommendations,	The findings from the current study suggest that perceptions of touristic

	implications/application of the study	attractions/activities are different by country although some similarities do exist. (E20)

Introductions

Moves	Function/Description	Examples from the corpus
Move 6: Establishing a territory <EST> Step 1: Summarizing existing studies <SES>	- Reporting findings from previous studies, presenting background information, reviewing existing theories, frameworks, models and definitions, presenting general knowledge, addressing a topic that is worth investigating to show the field is well-established, indicating the importance of the field	Conflict in tourism involves multiple stakeholders with diverse values and the interaction dynamics can thus be complex (McKercher, Ho, & du Cros, 2005, p. 542). (E2)
Step 2: Drawing inferences from previous studies <DRI>	- Discussing and interpreting previous studies	These findings suggest a potential positive association between motivation and perceived impacts at dark heritage sites. (E23)
Step 3: Raising questions/ Generating preliminary hypotheses <GPH>	- Generating questions and/or tentative hypotheses out of previous studies	In recognizing the importance of networking and sustainability of STEs, how can an STE establish “proper” awareness concerning sustainable tourism development during its development? (E16)

Moves	Function/Description	Examples from the corpus
Step 4: Referring to context of present study <RCT>	- Presenting the context or background information of the present study	The Angkhang Royal Project Agricultural Extension Area was located in Mae Ngon and Mon Pin sub-district, Fang District, Chiang Mai Province, covering 20,312 Rais 2 Ngans. (TH11)
Step 5: Foreshadowing aim of the present study <FAI>	- Mentioning what the present study is going to be about	Whilst the above solutions focus on the destination, this research is interested in exploring solutions focused on the tourist. (E38)
Step 6: Outlining structure of the section <OSS>	- Indicating the outline of the section	The following section explains each dimension in more detail. (E46)
Move 7: Establishing a niche <ESN> Step 1A: Indicating a gap <GAP>	- Indicating a gap in previous research	However, the discussion on the phenomenon of behavioural conflict has not been well investigated. (E2)
Step 1B: Indicating problems in research sites or the real world <PRS>	- Indicating problems in the research sites of the present study or the real world	Even though Chiang Mai has many potential tourism sites that influence toward high service quality, many more tourists were satisfied with tourism activities, the proliferation of tourists, and the

Moves	Function/Description	Examples from the corpus
		continuity of tourism site development by local organization administration, they still lack understanding in good administration and effective management. (TH22)
Step 2: Presenting positive justification <JUS>	- Explaining why the gap has to be filled or why the expansion of previous research is necessary	To better understand the role of psychological and social determinants of ecotourism behaviours, an integrative theoretical framework is needed to overcome the fragmented approach that arises out of the presence of various, often existing theoretical behavioural models. (E18)
Move 8: Presenting the present work <PPW>		
Step 1: Announcing present research descriptively and/or purposively <PRE>	- Announcing the purpose or content of the present study	This paper examines the positive and negative impacts of tourism at Wat Pho, a leading Bangkok religious tourism site, and its heritage value in the eyes of relevant stakeholders. (TH15)
Step 2: Presenting research questions or hypotheses<RQH>	- Formally (and explicitly) presenting the research questions or hypotheses	To achieve these objectives, three questions were proposed: What issues cause

Moves	Function/Description	Examples from the corpus
		conflict; how do these issues evolve and is there any connection among them; and who are the major parties in the conflicts and what roles do they play. (E2)
Step 3: Defining terms <DEF>	- Giving definitions of the key terms and/or clarifying the key concepts used in the present study	Thus, the term “tour leader” discussed in this study refers to two roles, namely, tour leader and local guide. (E5)
Step 4: Summarizing methods <MET>	- Summarizing the methods used in the present study	The eight countries were selected based on their representativeness of different parts of the globe and ethnicities. (E20)
Step 5: Announcing principal outcomes <OUT>	- Announcing some major findings of the study	Drawing on field studies conducted at religious festivals in Bhutan, the research presented in this paper demonstrates that the conflicts and changes experienced by traditional festivals in the contemporary world and possible ways of engaging these conflicts and changes – may be understood in terms of the mechanisms of liquid modernity. (E22)

Moves	Function/Description	Examples from the corpus
Step 6: Stating the value of the present research <VAL>	- Stating the value or significance of the present study	It is anticipated that understanding the causes of success or failure of CBT will benefit the process of community tourism development in future. (TH24)
Step 7: Outlining the structure of the paper <OST>	- Giving an overview of the structure of the paper	The literature review in the next section examines the relevant global and Chinese contexts to more fully justify the research, and this is followed by a description of the Red Beach National Scenic Corridor case study in North-eastern China and the justification for its selection. Subsequent sections describe the method, the results, and the practical and theoretical implications of the findings. (E1)

Methods

Moves	Function/Description	Examples from the corpus
Move 9: Contextualizing study methods <CSM> Step 1: Referencing previous works <RPW>	- Situating aspects of the chosen methodology in the breadth of relevant previous works by means of citation, footnotes, and relatively detailed descriptions of methodologies in the representative studies	A review of previous studies (Choi & Sirakaya, 2006; Lee and King, 2008; Graham, 2001; Le Trinh Hai et al, 2009) had shown that the most common research method deriving the effective indicators to evaluate the sustainable CBT is a modified Delphi technique. (TH24)
Step 2: Providing general information <PGI>	- Providing relevant theoretical, empirical, or informational background (e.g., conceptual/theoretical frameworks) - (Re)stating research purposes, hypotheses, gaps in empirical knowledge, and other information that is generally introduced earlier in the paper	This study is based on the constructivist paradigm which views nature of knowledge as subjective, regards truth as context dependent, and is supported by hermeneutics and phenomenology. (E2)
Step 3: Identifying the methodological approach <IMA>	- Specifying the research approach/ methods/research design with brevity or elaboration	A mixed methods research design was adopted, incorporating a quantitative questionnaire survey and qualitative semi-structured interviews. (E6)

Moves	Function/Description	Examples from the corpus
Move 10: Describing the data and data collection procedure <DCP>		
Step 1: Describing the sample <DES>	- Describing the participants of the study (including the context of the study such as location or source of the sample, the size of the population, the characteristics of the sample, sampling technique or selection or grouping criteria) or the data of the study	Ban Tha Chin, located on the Gulf of Thailand, is ideal for trade and fishery and has had a continuous existence while it remains historic evidence of the past. (TH4)
Step 2: Describing research instruments <DEI>	- Describing the questionnaire, interview, or tests used in the study	Questions in the in-depth interview were adapted from previous case studies completed both in Thailand and abroad. (TH3)
Step 3: Recounting steps in data collection <RES>	- Describing the actual steps in data collection	All interviews were digitally recorded, and written notes were taken during the interviews, with interview summary notes also made after the interviews. (E 21)
Step 4: Justifying the data collection procedure <JUC>	- Explaining why particular subjects or instruments were selected or particular steps had to be followed - Highlighting the advantage(s) of using the sample in comparison to other samples used in previous studies - Indicating the extent to which the sample is representative of the population	Yuanjia Village was chosen as the study case because it has successfully used rural tourism as an approach to sustainably revitalize itself. (E25)

Moves	Function/Description	Examples from the corpus
Move 11: Describing data analysis procedure <RED>		
Step 1: Recounting data analysis procedure <RED>	- Describing how the data were dealt with after being collected - Describing the variables including methods of measuring variables - Describing tools used in analysing data (e.g., coding schemes or statistical techniques)	The collected questionnaires were coded and analysed in a statistical program, SPSS. (TH 2)
Step 2: Justifying the data analysis procedure <JUA>	- Explaining why particular analysis tools were used - Justifying with reference to methods, scales, or items used in the study including limitations - Making specific reference to the validity and/or reliability of a method for measuring variables	Thematic analysis is capable of capturing the nuances and deeper meanings from qualitative data and allows a latent (interpretive) rather than semantic (explicit or surface) approach to be taken (Braun & Clarke, 2006). (E21)
Step 3: Previewing results <PRR>	- Reporting results of statistical analysis - Reporting relationships between variables - Describing results of comparisons of models, groups, and categories - Reporting results pertaining to time-related changes - Introducing some data illustrated in tables	The regression results and the diagnostic statistics are summarized in Table 4. (E35)
Move 12: Previewing the following section(s) <PFS>	- Giving an overview of the following section(s)	The following section presents and discusses the key themes that emerged in relation to the participants' leisure tourism experiences. (E21)

Results

Moves	Function/Description	Examples from the corpus
Move 13: Preparing for the presentation of the results section <PPR>		
Step 1: (Re)stating data collection and analysis procedure <RDA>	- Describing data collection and/or analysis tools, variables, steps in collecting and/or analysing the data	Construct reliability was assessed using both Cronbach's a and CR. (E22)
Step 2: Restating research questions or hypotheses <RRQ>	- Restating research questions or hypotheses of the study	Hypotheses 4 and 5 postulated a direct positive effect of food satisfaction on tourist WOM and revisit intention. (E 41)
Step 3: Giving background knowledge <GBK>	- Giving some background knowledge (e.g., the context of the study, aim and purposes, theoretical or methodology information; referring to literature)	Human capital refers to the skills, knowledge and health that enable people to pursue livelihood strategies (Chen, Shivakoti, Zhu, & Maddox, 2012). (E25)
Step 4: Indicating structure of the section <ISS>	- Indicating how the results are going to be presented	This section presents the results in three main sections. (E39)

Moves	Function/Description	Examples from the corpus
Move 14: Reporting specific/individual results <RER>	- Reporting specific results (e.g., results in relation to a table or figure)	However, the research found that in both villages only small percentage of villagers had alternative tourist-based jobs. (TH24)
Move 15: Commenting on specific results <COR>		
Step 1: Interpreting results <INR>	- Discussing the results	This means the environment is transformed and the irrigation is imbalanced, causing demand and supply of water to move out of equilibrium. (TH112)
Step 2: comparing results with literature <CRL>	- Comparing the results of the present study with previous findings or existing literature	However, our finding confirmed Connell (2016) that personal experiences and recommendations from friends and family (word-of-mouth) were more important than formal accreditation that was of little meaning to the patients. (E37)
Step 3: Accounting for results <ACR>	- Explaining reasons for expected or unexpected results	The result is not surprising since there is a change from fixed exchange rate regime to managed floating exchange rate regime starting from 1994 in China. (E35)
Step 4: Evaluating results <EVR>	- Evaluating individual results	One limitation of this study is that the empirical results are based on the econometric model focusing on the demand side of maternity tourism while no supply factors are included. (E35)

Moves	Function/Description	Examples from the corpus
Move 16: Summarizing results <SUR>	- Summarizing a number of specific results	It can be concluded, that those 2 variables indeed have positive influence on participation in sustainable tourism development, but sense of belonging to a community played no role for participation in sustainable tourism development. (TH2)

Discussion-Conclusions

Moves	Function/Description	Examples from the corpus
Move 17: Preparing for the presentation of the discussion section <PPD>		
Step 1: (Re)stating data collection and analysis procedure <RDA>	- Describing data collection, participants, and/or analysis tools, variables, steps in collecting and/or analysing the data	Integrating the proposed theoretical relationships, a conceptual model was created and tested using empirical data collected from 230 amateur golfers who attended a golf tournament operated by the PGA/LPGA Tour in the US. (E46)
Step 2: Restating research questions or hypotheses <RRQ>	- Restating research questions or hypotheses of the study	By means of a literature review, this study hypothesized that golf involvement plays a moderating role in the relationships between well-being perception and its outcome variables. (E46)
Step 3: Giving background knowledge <GBK>	- Givinging some background knowledge (e.g., the context of the study, the existing literature, highlighting gaps, theoretical or methodology information)	This research was based on the idea of tourism in protected areas, which according to Wearing & Neil (2011) is a conflict between preservation and use. (TH 42)
Step 4: Indicating the structure of the section <ISS>	- Indicating how the section is going to be presented	The following two paragraphs summarize how these study's findings about the VFR market to a large urban destination compare to findings of previous research. (E44)

Moves	Function/Description	Examples from the corpus
Move 18: Summarizing the study <STS>	- Restating the aims of the study - Summarizing what the study is about	This paper investigated ways in which travellers' rating patterns in TripAdvisor differed between independent and chain hotels. (E24)
Move 19: Highlighting overall research outcome <ORO>	- Highlighting some interesting findings from the study	The results indicated that the tourists' needs of interpretive tools were at a "moderate" level. (TH115)
M20: Discussing the findings of the study <DFS>		
Step 1: Interpreting/discussing results <IDR>	- Giving general discussion or interpretation of the study	This suggests that in order to minimize chances of receiving negative ratings, hotels should primarily focus on meeting the expectations of business and family travellers. (E24)
Step 2: Comparing results with literature <CRL>	- Comparing the findings with previous findings or existing literature	Similarly, Siri-umpai, (2012) also found similar results, that most tourists preferred to visit local markets because of local products, cheap prices, good promotion and unique culture. (TH46)
Step 3: Accounting for results <ACR>	- Explaining reasons for expected or unexpected results	Another possible explanation is the "rosy view" effect, whereby visitors downgrade negative experiences and focus on positive ones to reinforce their emotional state (Hosany et al., 2017). (E23)
Move 21: Drawing conclusion of the study/Stating research conclusions <CNC>	- Drawing conclusions from the findings	Thus, the first conclusion of this paper is that a main reason why so few examples of successful tourism networks are found, is simply, because most network managers

Moves	Function/Description	Examples from the corpus
		hardly invest in trust-based activities, which, according to the literature are dearly needed to develop and maintain active networks in the tourism sector (Bornhorst et al., 2010; Nunkoo & Ramkissoon, 2012; Pavlovich, 2003; Provan & Kenis, 2008; van der Zee & Vanneste, 2015; Volgger & Pechlaner, 2014; Zehrer et al., 2014). (E26)
Move 22: Evaluating the study <EVS>		
Step 1: Indicating limitations <LIM>	- Stating limitations about the findings, the methodology or the claims made	This approach, however, also comes with inherent limitations, which are at the same time sources of inspiration for further research to test the validity and improve the generalizability of this study's findings. (E 26)
Step 2: Indicating significance/advantage <SIG>	- Indicating the significance or importance of the study	This research has contributed to the literature on cultural heritage tourism and management in Thailand by providing a comprehensive, multi-stakeholder case study of a single site. (TH 15)
Step 3: Evaluating methodology <EVM>	- Justifying research methodology concerning the strengths or weaknesses of the research	The issue of sharing survey codes among M-Turks in order to get paid without completing a survey was detected, but it was relatively minor. (E45)
Moves 23: Deductions from the research <DER>		

Moves	Function/Description	Examples from the corpus
Step 1: Making suggestions/drawing implications <SIM>	- Making suggestions or drawing implications from the study (e.g., pedagogical implications)	Local community in Ban Pong Manao Huai Khunram, Phattananikom, Lopburi should develop their local wisdom according to the finding it does not influence participation in sustainable tourism development. (TH 2)
Step 2: Recommending further research <RFR>	- Pointing out areas that need further research	Repeating the study in different institutional contexts could provide valuable new insights. (E 26)

References

Adnan, Z. (2008). Discourse structure of Indonesian research introductions in selected hard science. In S. Burgess & P. Martín-Martín (Eds.), *English as an additional language in research publication and communication* (pp. 39–64). Berlin: Peter Lang.

Ahmad, U. K. (1997). Research article introductions in Malay: rhetoric in an emerging research community. In A. Duszak (Ed.), *Culture and Styles of Academic Discourse* (pp. 237–304). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Ahmad, U., & Mehrjooseresht, M. (2012). Stance Adverbials in Engineering Thesis Abstracts. In *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* (Vol. 66, pp. 29–36).

Ahmed, M., Memon, S., & Soomro, A. F. (2016). An investigation of the use of interactional metadiscourse markers: a cross-cultural study of British and Pakistani engineering research articles. *ARIEL An International Research Journal of Language and Literature*, *27*, 61–85.

Ahmed, S. (2015). Rhetorical organization of tourism research article abstracts. In *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* (Vol. 208, pp. 269–281).

Airey, D. (2015). 40 years of tourism studies – a remarkable story. *Tourism Recreation Research*, *40*(1), 6–15.

Alotaibi, H. S. (2019). An exploration of authorial stance in SSCI-ranked journals versus non-SSCI-ranked journals. *3L: The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*, *25*(3), 65–78.

Alramadan, M. M. (2020). Authorial stance in English, Arabic and EFL applied linguistics research: an appraisal study. *Asiatic*, *14*(1), 189–216.

Altman, H. (1980). Foreign language teaching: focus on the learner. In Howard B. Altman and & C. V. James (Eds.), *Foreign language teaching: meeting individual needs.* (pp. 1–16). Oxford: Pergamon.

Amirian, Z., Kassaian, Z., & Tavakoli, M. (2008). Genre analysis: an investigation of the discussion sections of applied linguistics research articles. *The Asian ESP Journal*, *4*(1), 39–63.

Amnuai, W. (2017). The textual organization of the discussion sections of accounting research articles. *Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences*, 1–6.

Amnuai, W. (2019). Rhetorical move structures and linguistic realizations of abstracts in ICT research articles and master's theses. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, *8*(1), 157–184.

Amnuai, W., & Wannaruk, A. (2013a). A move-based analysis of the conclusion sections of research articles published in international and Thai journals. *3L: The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*, *19*(2), 53–63.

Amnuai, W., & Wannaruk, A. (2013b). Investigating move structure of English applied linguistics research article discussions published in international and Thai journals. *English Language Teaching*, *6*(2), 1–13.

Amornrattanasirichok, S., & Jaroongkhongdach, W. (2017). Engagement in literature reviews of Thai and international research articles in applied linguistics. In *Proceeding of the International Conference: DRAL 3/19th ESEA* (pp. 312–327).

Arsyad, S. (2018). Indonesian authors' stances in citing English research article introductions literature in sciences. *EduLite: Journal of English Education, Literature and Culture*, *3*(2), 205–226.

Atai, M., & Sadr, L. (2006). A cross-cultural genre study on hedging devices in discussion section of applied linguistics research articles. In *Proceedings of the conference of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistic* (pp. 42–57).

Badger, R. (2003). Legal and general: towards a genre analysis of newspaper law reports. *English for Specific Purposes*, *22*(3), 249–263.

Ballantyne, R., Packer, J., & Axelsen, M. (2009). Trends in tourism research. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *36*(1), 149–152.

Bank of Thailand. (2021). Revitalising Thailand's tourism sector. Retrieved from https://www.bot.or.th/Thai/MonetaryPolicy/EconomicConditions/AAA/250624_WhitepaperVISA.pdf

Baratta, A. M. (2009). Revealing stance through passive voice. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *41*(7), 1406–1421.

Basthomi, Y. (2007). Contrastive rhetoric, discourse, and genre analysis: methodological issues. *Bahasa Dan Seni*, *35*(2), 137–147.

Behnam, B., Mirzapour, F., & Mozaheb, M. A. (2014). Writer's presence in English native and non-native speaker research articles. In *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* (Vol. 98, pp. 369–374).

Beirman, D. (2018). Thailand's approach to destination resilience: an historical perspective of tourism resilience from 2002 to 2018. *Tourism Review International*, *22*(3–4), 277–292.

Bhatia, V. K. (1993). *Analysing genre: Language use in professional settings*. New York: Longman.

Bhatia, V. K. (2004). *Worlds of written discourse*. London: Continuum.

Biber, D. (1988). *Variation across speech and writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Biber, D. (2006). Stance in spoken and written university registers. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *5*(2), 97–116.

Biber, D., Conrad, S., & Reppen, R. (1998). *Corpus linguistics: investigating language structure and use*. *Cambridge University press*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Biber, D., & Finegan, E. (1988). Adverbial stance types in English. *Discourse Processes*, *11*(1), 1–34.

Biber, D., & Finegan, E. (1989). Styles of stance in English: lexical and grammatical marking of evidentiality and affect. *Text*, *9*(1), 93–124. Retrieved from l

Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., & Finegan, E. (1999). *Longman grammar of spoken and written English*. Harlow: Longman.

Bickner, R., & Peyasantiwong, P. (1988). Cultural variation in reflective writing. In A. C. Purves (Ed.), *Writing across languages and cultures: Issues in contrastive rhetoric* (pp. 160–174). California: Sage Publications.

Bizzell, P. (1992). *Academic discourse and critical consciousness*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Blommaert, J. (2005). *Discourse: a critical introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Breivega, K. R., Dahl, T., & Flottum, K. (2002). Traces of self and others in research articles: a comparative pilot study of English, French and Norwegian research articles in medicine, economics and linguistics. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *12*(2), 218–239.

Brett, P. (1994). A genre analysis of the results section of sociology articles. *English for Specific Purposes*, *13*(I), 47–59.

Brezina, V., McEnery, T., & Wattam, S. (2015). Collocations in context: A new perspective on collocation networks. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, *20*(2), 139–173.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1978). Universals in language usage: Politeness phenomena. In E. Goody (Ed.), *Questions and politeness: Strategies in social interaction* (pp. 56–310). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, P., & Levison, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Butler, R. (2015). The evolution of tourism and tourism research. *Tourism Recreation Research*, *40*(1), 16–27.

Çakır, H. (2016). Native and non-native writers' use of stance adverbs in English research article abstracts. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*, *6*, 85–96.

Callaghan, M., Knapp, P., & Noble, G. (1993). Genre in practice. In B. Cope & M. Kalantzis (Eds.), *The power of literacy: a genre approach to teaching writing* (pp. 179–202). Bristol: Flamer Press.

Cameron, D., & Panović, I. (2014). *Working with written academic discourse*. London: Sage Publications.

Çandarlı, D. (2012). A cross-cultural investigation of English and Turkish research article abstracts in educational sciences. *Studies About Languages*, (20), 12–17.

Casado-Aranda, L. A., Sánchez-Fernández, J., & Bastidas-Manzano, A. B. (2021). Tourism research after the COVID-19 outbreak: insights for more

sustainable, local and smart cities. *Sustainable Cities and Society*, *73*.

Chang, P., & Schleppegrell, M. (2011). Taking an effective authorial stance in academic writing: making the linguistic resources explicit for L2 writers in the social sciences. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *10*(3), 140–151.

Charles, M. (2003). "This mystery. . .": a corpus-based study of the use of nouns to construct stance in theses from two contrasting disciplines. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *2*(4), 313–326.

Cheng, C. K., Li, X. R., Petrick, J. F., & O'Leary, J. T. (2011). An examination of tourism journal development. *Tourism Management*, *32*(1), 53–61.

Cheung, Y. L., & Lau, L. (2020). Authorial voice in academic writing: A comparative study of journal articles in English literature and computer science. *Iberica*, *2020*(39), 215–242.

Clyne, M. (1987). Cultural differences in the organisation of academic texts. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *11*, 211–247.

Connor, U. (1996). *Contrastive rhetoric: cross-cultural aspects of second-language writing*. *The Cambridge Applied Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Connor, U. (2002). New directions in contrastive rhetoric. *TESOL Quarterly*, *36*(4), 493–510.

Connor, U., & Kaplan, R. B. (1987). *Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 text*. Reading: Addison-Wesley.

Conrad, S., & Biber, D. (2000). Adverbial marking of stance in speech and writing. In S. Hunston & G. Thompson (Eds.), *Evaluation in text: authorial stance and the construction of discourse* (pp. 56–73). New York: Oxford University Press.

Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (1993). Introduction: How a genre approach to literacy can transform the waywriting is taught. In B. Cope & M. Kalantzis (Eds.), *The power of literacy: a genre approach to teaching writingteracy: A genre approach to teaching writing* (pp. 1–21). Bristol: Flamer Press.

Cotos, E., Huffman, S., & Link, S. (2017). A move/step model for methods

sections: demonstrating rigour and credibility. *English for Specific Purposes*, *46*, 90–106.

Coxhead, A. (2000). A new academic word list. *TESOL Quarterly*, *34*(2), 213–238.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed method*. London: Sage Publications.

Crismore, A. (1984). The rhetoric of textbooks: Metadiscourse. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, *16*(3), 279–296.

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.

Crookes, G. (1986). Towards a validated analysis of scientific text structure. *Applied Linguistics*, *7*(1), 57–70.

Dobakhti, L., & Hassan, N. (2017). A corpus-based study of writer identity in qualitative and quantitative research articles. *3L: Language, Linguistics, Literature*, *23*(1), 1–14.

Donesch-Jeżo, E. (2016). Cross-cultural variability of research article abstracts from different discourse communities. *Państwo i Społeczeństwo*, *3*, 33–61.

Dontcheva-Navratilova, O. (2016). Cross-cultural variation in the use of hedges and boosters in academic discourse. *Prague Journal of English Studies*, *5*(1), 163–184.

Ebadi, S., Rawdhan, A. S., & Marjal, B. E. (2015). A comparative study of the use of metadicourse markers in Persian and English academic papers. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, *2*(4), 28–41.

El-Dakhs, D. A. S. (2020). Are Arabic and English research article abstracts different? rhetorical structure & interaction in focus. *Asian ESP Journal*, *16*(51), 6–32.

Farrokhi, F., & Emami, S. (2008). Hedges and boosters in academic writing: native vs. non-native research articles in applied linguistics and engineering. *Journal of English Language Pedagogy and Practice*, *1*(2), 62–98.

Farzannia, S., & Farnia, M. (2018). Metadiscourse markers in introduction sections of Persian and English mining engineering articles. *English for Specific Purposes World*, *49*(17), 1–16.

Fazilatfar, A. M., & Naseri, Z. S. (2014). Rhetorical moves in applied linguistics articles and their corresponding Iranian writer identity. In *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* (Vol. 98, pp. 489–498).

Flowerdew, J. (1999). Writing for scholarly publication in English: the case of Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *8*(3), 243–264.

Flowerdew, J. (2001). Attitudes of journal editors to nonnative speaker contributions. *TESOL Quarterly*, *35*(1), 121–150.

Flowerdew, J. (2002). Introduction: approaches to the analysis of academic discourse in English. In J. Flowerdew (Ed.), *Academic discourse* (pp. 1–17). Harlow: Longman.

Flowerdew, L. (2005). An integration of corpus-based and genre-based approaches to text analysis in EAP/ESP: countering criticisms against corpus-based methodologies. *English for Specific Purposes*, *24*(3), 321–332.

Getkham, K. (2011). Hedging devices in applied linguistics research articles. *Interdisciplinary Discourses in Language and Communication*, 141–154.

Gil-Salom, L., & Soler-Monreal, C. (2014). Writers' positioning in literature reviews in English and Spanish computing doctoral theses. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *16*, 23–39.

Gillaerts, P., & Velde, F. Van De. (2010). Interactional metadiscourse in research article abstracts. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *9*, 128–139.

Gosden, H. (1993). Discourse functions of subject in scientific research articles. *Applied Linguistics*, *14*(1), 56–75.

Gosden, H. (1996). Verbal reports of Japanese novices' research writing practices in English. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *5*(2), 109–128.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic : the social interpretation of language and meaning*. London: Edward Arnold.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar*. *An introduction to functional grammar*.

Harwood, N. (2005a). “Nowhere has anyone attempted ... In this article I aim to do just that” A corpus-based study of self-promotional I and we in academic writing across four disciplines. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *37*, 1207–1231.

Harwood, N. (2005b). “We do not seem to have a theory ... The theory I present here attempts to fill this gap”: inclusive and exclusive pronouns in academic writing. *Applied Linguistics*, *26*(3), 343–375.

Hasan, R. (1985). The structure of a text. In M. A. K. Halliday & R. Hasan (Eds.), *Language, Context and Text* (pp. 52–69). Geelong, Victoria: Deakin University Press.

Hashemi, M. R., & Hosseini, H. (2019). Stance and culture: a comparative study of English and Persian authorial stance in applied linguistics research articles. *Advanced Education*, (12), 21–27.

Hinds, J. (1983). Contrastive rhetoric: Japanese and English. *Text - Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse*, *3*(2), 183–196.

Hinds, J. (1987). Reader versus writer responsibility: a new typology. In U. Connor & R. B. Kaplan (Eds.), *Writing across languages: analysis of L2 text* (pp. 141–152). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Hinds, J. (1990). Inductive, deductive, quasi-inductive: expository writing in Japanese, Korean, Chinese, and Thai. In U. Connor & A. M. Johns (Eds.), *Coherence in writing: esearch and pedagogical perspectives* (pp. 87–109). Virginia: TESOL.

Hinkel, E. (2002). *Second language writers’ text: Linguistic and rhetorical features*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hirano, E. (2009). Research article introductions in English for specific purposes: A comparison between Brazilian Portuguese and English. *English for Specific Purposes*.

Holmes, R. (1997). Genre analysis, and the social sciences: an investigation of the structure of research article discussion sections in three disciplines. *English for Specific Purposes*, *16*(4), 321–337.

Hood, S. (2004). *Appraising research: Taking a stance in academic writing* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Technology, Sydney].

Hopkins, A., & Dudley-Evans, T. (1988). A genre-based investigation of the discussion sections in articles and dissertations. *English for Specific Purposes*, *7*(2), 113–121.

Hu, G., & Cao, F. (2011). Hedging and boosting in abstracts of applied linguistics articles: a comparative study of English- and Chinese-medium journals. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *43*, 2795–2809.

Hu, G., & Cao, F. (2015). Disciplinary and paradigmatic influences on interactional metadiscourse in research articles. *English for Specific Purposes*, *39*, 12–25.

Hunston, S. (2000). Evaluation and the planes of discourse: status and value in persuasive texts. In S. Hunston & G. Thompson (Eds.), *Evaluation in text: Authorial stance and the construction of discourse* (pp. 176–207). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hunston, S. (2002). *Corpora in applied linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hunston, S., & Thompson, G. (2000). *Evaluation in text : authorial stance and the construction of discourse*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hyland, K. (1998a). Boosting, hedging and the negotiation of academic knowledge. *Text*, *18*(3), 349–382.

Hyland, K. (1998b). *Hedging in scientific research articles*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Hyland, K. (1999). Disciplinary discourses: writer stance in research articles. In C. N. Candlin & K. Hyland (Eds.), *Writing: Texts, processes and practices* (pp. 99–121). London: Longman.

Hyland, K. (2001). Humble servants of the discipline? Self-mention in research articles. *English for Specific Purposes*, *20*, 207–226.

Hyland, K. (2002a). Authority and invisibility: authorial dentity in academic writing.

Journal of Pragmatics, *34*, 1091–1112.

Hyland, K. (2002b). Genre: Language, context, and literacy. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *22*, 113–135.

Hyland, K. (2002c). Options of identity in academic writing. *ELT Journal*, *56*(4), 351–358.

Hyland, K. (2002d). What do they mean? Questions in academic writing. *Text*, *22*(4), 529–557.

Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hyland, K. (2004a). *Disciplinary discourses: social interactions in academic writing*. Michigan: The University of Michigan.

Hyland, K. (2004b). Disciplinary interactions: metadiscourse in L2 postgraduate writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *13*(2), 133–151.

Hyland, K. (2005a). *Metadiscourse : exploring interaction in writing*. London: Continuum.

Hyland, K. (2005b). Stance and engagement: a model of interaction in academic discourse. *Discourse Studies*, *7*(2), 173–192.

Hyland, K. (2006). *English for academic purposes: an advanced resource book*. New York: Routledge.

Hyland, K. (2009a). *Academic discourse: English in a global context*. London: Continuum.

Hyland, K. (2009b). *Teaching and reasearch writing* (2nd ed.). Harlow: Longman.

Hyland, K. (2015). Genre, discipline and identity. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *19*, 32–43.

Hyland, K. (2016). Academic publishing and the myth of linguistic injustice. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *31*, 58–69.

Hyland, K., & Jiang, F. (Kevin). (2018). “In this paper we suggest”: Changing patterns of disciplinary metadiscourse. *English for Specific Purposes*, *51*, 18–30.

Hyland, K., & Milton, J. (1997). Qualification and certainty in L1 and L2 students' writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *6*(2), 183–205.

Hyland, K., & Tse, P. (2004a). "I would like to thank my supervisor". Acknowledgements in graduate dissertations. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *14*(2), 259–275.

Hyland, K., & Tse, P. (2004b). Metadiscourse in academic writing : a reappraisal. *Applied Linguistics*, *25*(2), 156–177.

Hyland, K., & Tse, P. (2005a). Evaluative that constructions: signaling stance in research abstracts. *Functions of Lanugage*, *12*(1), 39–63.

Hyland, K., & Tse, P. (2005b). Hooking the reader: a corpus study of evaluative that in abstracts. *English for Specific Purposes*, *24*(2), 123–139.

Hyon, S. (1996). Genre in Three Traditions: implications for ESL. *TESOL Quarterly*, *30*(4), 693–722.

Indrasuta, C. (1988). Narrative styles in the writing of Thai and American Students. In A. C. Purves (Ed.), *Writing across languages and cultures : Issues in contrastive rhetoric* (pp. 206–226). California: Sage Publications.

Işık-Taş, E. E. (2018). Authorial identity in Turkish language and English language research articles in Sociology: the role of publication context in academic writers' discourse choices. *English for Specific Purposes*, *49*, 26–38.

Ivanič, R. (1998). *Writing and Identity: the discoursal construction of identity in academic writing*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ivanič, R., & Camps, D. (2001). I am how I sound: Voice as self-representation in L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *10*(1), 3–33.

Jaroongkhongdach, W., Watson Todd, R., Keyuravong, S., & Hall, D. (2012). Differences in quality between Thai and international research articles in ELT. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *11*(3), 194–209.

Jenkins, S., & Hinds, J. (1987). Business Letter Writing: English, French, and Japanese. *TESOL Quarterly*, *21*(2), 327–349.

Jing, W., & Jing, D. (2018). A comparative study of metadiscourse in English

research article abstracts in hard disciplines by L1 Chinese and L1 English scholars. *Applied Research on English Language*, *7*(3), 399–434.

Jogthong, C. (2001). *Research article introductions in Thai: genre analysis of academic writing* [Doctoral dissertation, West Virginia University]. Proquest. https://www.proquest.com/openview/0d319e691393a6b2fda9b3ce68cb9c13/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y

Kafes, H. (2017). The use of authorial self-mention words in academic writing. *International Journal of Language Academy*, *5*(3), 165–180.

Kanoksilapatham, B. (2003). *A corpus-based investigation of scientific research articles: linking move analysis with multidimensional analysis* [Doctoral dissertation, Georgetown University]. Proquest. https://www.proquest.com/openview/27d535fd031439e839e7b3e42402e3a8/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y

Kanoksilapatham, B. (2005). Rhetorical structure of biochemistry research articles. *English for Specific Purposes*, *24*(3), 269–292.

Kanoksilapatham, B. (2007a). Rhetorical moves in biochemistry research articles. In D. Biber, U. Connor, & T. A. Upton (Eds.), *Discourse on the Move: using corpus analysis to describe discourse structure* (pp. 73–119). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Kanoksilapatham, B. (2007b). Writing scientific research articles in Thai and English: similarities and differences. *Silpakorn University International Journal Silpakorn University International Journal Silpakorn University International Journal*, *7*, 172–203.

Kanoksilapatham, B. (2011). Civil engineering research article Introductions: textual structure and linguistic characterization. *The Asian ESP Journal*, *7*(2), 55–84.

Kaplan, R. B. (1966). Cultural thought patterns. *Language Learning*, *16*, 1–20.

Kapranov, O. (2021). Self-mention in academic writing by in-service teachers of English: exploring authorial voices. In M. Burada, O. Tatu, & R. Sinu (Eds.), *Exploring language variation, diversity and change* (pp. 76–100). Newcastle Upon Tyne: Cambridege scholars publishing.

Karahan, P. (2013). Self-mention in scientific articles written by Turkish and non-Turkish authors. In *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* (Vol. 70, pp. 305–322). Elsevier B.V.

Karimi, K., Maleki, M., & Farnia, M. (2017). Metadiscourse markers in the abstract sections of Persian and English law articles. *International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching & Research*, *5*(18), 69–83.

Kim, L. C., & Lim, J. M. H. (2013). Metadiscourse in English and Chinese research article introductions Metadiscourse in English. *Discourse Studies*, *15*(2), 129–146.

Kim, L. C., & Lim, J. M. H. (2015). Hedging in academic writing - a pedagogically-motivated qualitative study. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *197*, 600–607.

Kirilenko, A. P., & Stepchenkova, S. (2018). Tourism research from its inception to present day : subject area , geography , and gender distributions. *PLos ONE*, *13*(11), 1–20.

Koutsantoni, D. (2004). Attitude, certainty and allusions to common knowledge in scientific research articles. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *3*(2), 163–182.

Koutsantoni, D. (2006). Rhetorical strategies in engineering research articles and research theses: advanced academic literacy and relations of power. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *5*, 19–36.

Kress, Gunter. (1997). *Before writing: rethinking the paths to literacy*. London: Routledge.

Kress, Gunther. (1989). *Linguistic processes in sociocultural practice* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kress, Gunther. (2003). *Literacy in the new media age*. London: Routledge.

Kress, Gunther, & Leeuwen, V. T. (1996). *Reading images: the grammar of visual design*. London: Routledge.

Kuo, C. (1999). The use of personal pronouns: role relationships in scientific journal articles. *English for Specific Purposes*, *18*(2), 121–138.

Kurniawan, E., & Sabila, N. A. A. (2021). Another look at the rhetorical moves and linguistic realizations in international and Indonesian journal articles: a case of tourism research. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *11*(2), 318–329.

Kwan, B. S. C. (2006). The schematic structure of literature reviews in doctoral theses of applied linguistics. *English for Specific Purposes*, *25*(1), 30–55.

Larsen-Freeman, D., & Long, M. H. (1991). *An introduction to second language acquisition research*. London: Longman.

Lee, J. J., & Casal, J. E. (2014). Metadiscourse in results and discussion chapters: across-linguistic analysis of English and Spanish thesis writers in engineering. *System*, *46*(1), 39–54.

Lee, S. H. (2015). Evaluative Stances in persuasive essays by undergraduate students: focusing on appreciation resources. *Text & Talk*, *35*(1), 49–76.

Lewin, B. A., Fine, J., & Young, L. (2001). *Expository discourse: a genre-based approach to social science research texts*. London: Continuum.

Li, Y. (2006). A doctoral student of physics writing for publication: a sociopolitically-oriented case study. *English for Specific Purposes*, *25*(4), 456–478.

Lillis, T., & Curry, M. J. (2006). Professional academic writing by multilingual scholars: interactions with literacy brokers in the production of English-medium texts. *Written Communication*, *23*, 3–35.

Lim, J. M. H. (2006). Method sections of management research articles: a pedagogically motivated qualitative study. *English for Specific Purposes*, *25*, 282–309.

Limbu, M., Xiangjuan, M., & Zeng, M. (2013). Writing across cultures: understanding and teaching writer responsibility and reader responsibility writing. *Journal of Global Literacies, Technologies, and Emerging Pedagogies*, *1*(2), 56–70.

Lin, L., & Evans, S. (2012). Structural patterns in empirical research articles : a cross-disciplinary study. *English for Specific Purposes*, *31*, 150–160.

Lindquist, H. (2009). *Corpus linguistics and the description of English*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Liu, P., & Huang, X. (2017). A study of interactional metadiscourse in English abstracts of Chinese economics research articles. *Higher Education Studies*, *7*(3), 25–41.

Loi, C. K., & Evans, M. S. (2010). Cultural differences in the organization of research article introductions from the field of educational psychology: English and Chinese. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *42*, 2814–2825.

Loi, C. K., Lim, J. M. H., & Wharton, S. (2016). Expressing an evaluative stance in English and Malay research article conclusions: international publications versus local publications. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *21*, 1–16.

Lorés-Sanz, R. (2011). The construction of the author's voice in academic writing: The interplay of cultural and disciplinary factors. *Text and Talk*, *31*(2), 173–193.

Luo, J., & Huang, T. (2015). Genre-based analysis of American tourism brochure. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, *3*, 200–208.

Maher, F. (2017). A genre analysis of research article abstracts written by native and non-native speakers of English. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, *4*(1), 1–13.

Malcolm, L. (1987). What rules govern tense usage in scientific articles? *English for Specific Purposes*, *6*(1), 31–43.

Martin, J. R. (1984). Language, register and genre. In F. Christie (Ed.), *Children Writing: reader* (pp. 21–30). Geelong, Victoria: Deakin UNiversity Press.

Martin, J. R. (1985). *Factual writing: exploring and challenging social reality*. Geelong, Victoria: Deakin University Press.

Martin, J. R. (2000). Beyond exchange: appraisal systems in English. In S. Hunston & G. Thompson (Eds.), *Evaluation in text: authorial stance and the construction of discourse* (pp. 142–175). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Martin, J. R., Christie, F., & Rothery, J. (1987). Social processes in education: a

reply to Sawyer and Watson (and others). In I. Reid (Ed.), *The place of genre in learning: Current debates* (pp. 58–82). Geelong, Australia: Deakin University Press.

Martin, J. R., & Rose, D. (2003). *Working with discourse: meaning beyond the clause*. London: Continuum.

Martin, J. R, & White, P. R. (2005). *The language of evaluation: appraisal in English*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Martín, P. M. (2003). A genre analysis of English and Spanish research paper abstracts in experimental social sciences. *English for Specific Purposes*, *22*(1), 25–43.

Martínez, I. A. (2005). Native and non-native writers' use of first person pronouns in the different sections of biology research articles in English. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *14*(3), 174–190.

Mauranen, A. (1993a). Contrastlve ESP rhetoric: metatext in Finnish-English economics Texts. *English for Specific Purposes*, *12*, 3–22.

Mauranen, A. (1993b). Cultural differences in academic discourse - problems of a linguistic and cultural minority. In S. P. & J. L. Löfman, L. Kurki-Suonio & Lehtonen (Eds.), *The Competent Intercultural Communicator: AFinLA Yearbook* (pp. 157–174). Helsinki: AFinLA.

Mauranen, A., & Bondi, M. (2003). Editotial: evaluative language use in academic discourse. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *2*, 269–271.

McCrostie, J. (2008). Writer visibility in EFL learner academic writing: a corpus-based study. *ICAME Journal*, (32), 97–114.

McEnery, T., & Hardie, A. (2012). *Corpus linguistics: method, theory and practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McEnery, T., & Wilson, A. (2001). *Corpus linguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

McGrath, L., & Kuteeva, M. (2012). Stance and engagement in pure mathematics research articles: linking discourse features to disciplinary practices. *English for Specific Purposes*, *31*(3), 161–173.

Milagros del Saz Rubio, 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.

Miller, C. R. (1984). Genre as social action. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, *70*(2), 151–167.

Ministry of Higher Education, Science, Research and Innovations. (2022). Curriculum Information. Retrieved December 23, 2022 from https://info.mhesi.go.th/searchcurr/searh_all_curr.php#

Mirzapour, F., & Mahand, M. R. (2012). Hedges and boosters in native and non-native library and information and computer science research articles. *3L: Language, Linguistics, Literature*, *18*(2), 119–128.

Monreal, C. S., & Salom, L. G. (2011). A cross-language study on citation practice in PhD theses. *International Journal of English …*, *11*(2), 53–75.

Morton, J., & Storch, N. (2019). Developing an authorial voice in PhD multilingual student writing: the reader's perspective. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *43*, 15–23.

Mu, C., Zhang, L. J., Ehrich, J., & Hong, H. (2015). The use of metadiscourse for knowledge construction in Chinese and English research articles. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *20*, 135–148.

Mur Dueñas, P. (2007). "I/we focus on...": a cross-cultural analysis of self-mentions in business management research articles. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *6*, 143–162.

Mur Dueñas, P. (2011). An intercultural analysis of metadiscourse features in research articles written in English and in Spanish. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *43*, 3068–3079.

Neff, J., Ballesteros, F., & Dafouz, E. (2004). Formulating writer stance : a contrastive study of EFL learner corpora. In U. Connor & T. A. Upton (Eds.), *Applied corpus linguistics: a multidimensional perspective* (pp. 73–89). Newyork: Brill.

Nwogu, K. N. (1997). The medical research paper: structure and functions. *English for Specific Purposes*, *16*(2), 119–138.

Ouellette, M. a. (2008). Weaving strands of writer identity: self as author and the NNES “plagiarist.” *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *17*, 255–273.

Pallant, J. (2020). *SPSS survival manual: a step by step guide to data analysis using IBM SPSS* (7th ed.). New Jersey: Routledge.

Paltridge, B. (1994). Genre analysis and the identification of textual boundaries. *Applied Linguistics*, *15*(3), 288–299.

Paltridge, B. (1997). *Genre, frames, and writing in research settings*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Paltridge, B. (2013). Genre and English for Specific Purposes. In B. Paltridge & S. Starfield (Eds.), *The handbook of English for Specific Purposes* (pp. 347–366). West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.

Papangkorn, P. (2019). *A comparative study of stance and engagement used by English and Thai speakers in English argumentative essays* [Doctoral dissertaiton, Thammasat University] Retrieved from http://grad.litu.tu.ac.th/assets/public/kcfinder/upload_grad_web/public/26_2019_Papitchaya%20Papangkorn.pdf

Peackok, M. (2011). The structure of the methods section in research articles across eight disciplines. *The Asian ESP Journal*, *7*(2), 99–124.

Peacock, M. (2002). Communicative moves in the discussion section of research articles. *System*, *30*, 479–497.

Peacock, M. (2006). A cross-disciplinary comparison of boosting in research articles. *Corpora*, *1*(1), 61–84.

Persson-Fischer, U., & Liu, S. (2021). The impact of a global crisis on areas and topics of tourism research. *Sustainability*, *13*(2), 906.

Pho, P. D. (2008). Research articles abstracts in applied linguistics and educational technology: a study of linguistic realizations of rhetorical structure and authorial stance. *Discourse Studies*, *10*(2), 231–250.

Pho, P. D. (2013). *Authorial stance in research articles: examples from applied linguistics and educational technology*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Phothongsunan, S. (2016). Thai university academics’ challenges of writing for

publication in English. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *6*(4), 681–685.

Pongsakornrungsilp, S., Pongsakornrungsilp, P., Kumar, V., & Maswongssa, B. (2021). The art of survival: Tourism businesses in thailand recovering from covid-19 through brand management. *Sustainability*, *13*(6690), 1–17.

Posteguillo, S. (1999). The schematic structure of computer science research articles. *English for Specific Purposes*, *18*(2), 139–160.

Prasithrathsint, A. (2015). Linguistic markers and stylistic attributes of hedging in English academic papers written by native and non-native speakers of English. *MANUSYA: Journal of Humanities Regular*, *18*(1), 1–22.

Pupipat, A. (1998). *Scientific writing and publishing in English in Thailand: the perceptions of Thai scientists and editors* [Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University]. Proquest. https://www.proquest.com/openview/b512ffb1b1c16c03022625fd0097a2ed/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y

Sabila, N. A. A., & Kurniawan, E. (2020). Move analysis of tourism research article abstracts in national and international journal articles. In *Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Language, Literature, Culture, and Education (ICOLLITE 2020)* (Vol. 509, pp. 514–520). Bundung: Atlantis Press.

Salar, S., & Ghonsooly, B. (2016). A comparative analysis of metadiscourse features in knowledge management research articles written in English and Persian. *International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning*, *5*(1), 15–27.

Samraj, B. (2002a). Disciplinary variation in abstracts: the case of wildlife behaviour and conservation biology. In J. Flowerdew (Ed.), *Academic discourse* (pp. 40–56). New York: Longman.

Samraj, B. (2002b). 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.

Santos, M. B. Dos. (1996). The textual organization of research paper abstracts in applied linguistics. *Text*, *16*(4), 481–499.

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.

Sheldon, E. (2013). *The Research Article : a rhetorical and functional comparison of texts created by native and non-native English writers and native Spanish writers* [Doctoral dissertation, The University of New South Wales]. Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/1959.4/52810

Sheldon, E. (2018). Dialogic spaces of knowledge construction in research article conclusion sections written by English L1, English L2 and Spanish L1 writers. *Iberica*, *35*, 13–39.

Sieber, J. E. (2009). Planning ethically responsible research. In L. Bickmen & D. J. Rog (Eds.), *Handbook of applied social research methods* (2nd ed., pp. 106–142). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Siraphatthada, Y., Rattanabunsakul, P., & Siraphatthada, P. (2021). The Inno-life Management of Community-Based Tourism in The Digital Economy: Phatthalung. *Turkish Journal of Computer and Mathematics Education*, *12*(12), 348–360.

Skelton, J. (1997). The representation of truth in academic medical writing. *Applied Linguistics*, *18*(2), 121–140.

Sombatsompop, N., Chancheewa, S., Markpin, T., Premkamolnetr, N., Ittiritmeechai, S., Wongkaew, C., Ratchatahirun, P. (2012). Thai -journal Citation Index (TCI) centre: 10 years of experiences, lessons learned, and ongoing development. *Malaysian Journal of Library and Information Science*, *17*(3), 17–33.

Stallman, N. (2012). Finding the clues in theoretical scholarly articles. *The College of Saint Rose Writing Center*. Retrieved from https://www.strose.edu/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/reading-theoretical-scholarly-articles-handout2.pdf

Stotesbury, H. (2003). Evaluation in research article abstracts in the narrative and hard sciences. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *2*(4), 327–341.

Strandberg, C., Nath, A., Hemmatdar, H., & Jahwash, M. (2018). Tourism research in the new millennium: A bibliometric review of literature in Tourism and Hospitality Research. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, *18*(3), 269–285.

Stubbs, M. (2001). *Words and phrases: corpus studies of lexical semantics*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Sultan, A. (2011). A contrastive study of metadiscourse in English and Arabic linguistics research articles. *Acta Linguistica*, *5*(1), 28–41.

Svensson, G., Svaeri, S., & Einarsen, K. (2009). 'Empirical characteristics' of scholarly journals in hospitality and tourism research: an assessment. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *28*, 479–483.

Swales, J. M. (1981). *Aspects of article introduction*. Birmingham: Language Studies Unit, University of Aston.

Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Swales, J. M. (2004). *Research genres: Explorations and applications*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Swales, J. M. (2011). The concept of discourse community. In E. Wardle & D. Downs (Eds.), *Writing about writing: a college reader* (2nd ed., pp. 215–229). Boston, MA: Bedford Book.

Taylor, G., & Tingguang, C. (1991). Linguistic, cultural, and subcultural issues in contrastive discoure analysis: Anglo-American and Chinese scientific texts. *Applied Linguistics*, *12*(3), 319–336.

Thompson, G. (2001). Interaction in academic writing: learning to argue with the reader. *Applied Linguistics*, *22*(1), 58–78.

Thompson, G., & Hunston, S. (2000). Evaluation: an Introduction. In S. Hunston & G. Thompson (Eds.), *Evaluation in text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse* (pp. 1–26). New York: Oxford University Press.

Thompson, G., & Yiyun, Y. (1991). Evaluation in the reporting verbs used in academic papers. *Applied Linguistics*, *12*(4), 365–382.

Thompson, P. (2012). Achieving a voice of authority in PhD theses. In K. Hyland & C. S. Guinda (Eds.), *Stance and voice in written academic genre* (pp. 119–133). Newyork: Palgrave Macmillan.

Tognini-Bonelli, E. (2001). *Corpus linguistics at work*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Tourism Authority of Thailand. (2020). International tourist arrivals to Thailand. Retrieved October 10, 2022, from https://intelligencecenter.tat.or.th/articles/20962

Uba, S. Y. (2017). *Authorial stance in accounting PhD theses in a Nigerian university* [Doctoral dissertation, The University of Leeds]. Retrieved from https://etheses.whiterose.ac.uk/18754/2/Uba_SY_Education_PhD_2017.pdf

Valero-Garces, C. (1996). Contrastive ESP rhetoric: metatext in Spanish-English economics texts. *English for Specific Purposes*, *15*(4), 279–294.

Vande Kopple, W. J. (1985). Some exploratory discourse on metadiscourse. *College Composition and Communication*, *36*(1), 82–93.

Vande Kopple, W. J. (1986). Given and new information and some aspects of the structures, semantics, and pragmatics of written texts. In C. R. Cooper & S. Greenbaum (Eds.), *Studying writing: linguistic approaches* (pp. 72–111). London: Sage Publications.

Vathanalaoha, K., & Tangkiengsirisin, S. (2018). Genre analysis of experiment-based dental research article abstracts: Thai and international journals. *3L: Language, Linguistics, Literature*, *24*(3), 1–14.

Wang, Y. (2012). Differences in L1 and L2 academic writing. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *2*(3), 637–641.

Wannaruk, A., & Amnuai, W. (2016). A comparison of rhetorical move structure of applied linguistics research articles published in international and national Thai journals. *RELC Journal*, *47*(2), 193–211.

Weissberg, R., & Buker, S. (1990). *Writing up research. Modern Management Journal*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall Regents.

White, P. R. R. (2003). Beyond modality and hedging: a dialogic view of the language of intersubjective stance. *Text*, *23*(2), 259–284.

Wiboonwachara, L., & Rungrojsuwan, S. (2020). Hedging in English research articles of Thai academic writers. *The New English Teacher*, *14*(2), 82–98.

Wu, D., & Buripakdi, A. (2021). Writer identity construction in EFL doctoral thesis writing. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, *21*(3), 16–36.

Yağız, O., & Demir, C. (2014). Hedging Strategies in Academic Discourse: A Comparative Analysis of Turkish Writers and Native Writers of English. In *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* (Vol. 158, pp. 260–268).

Yağız, O., & Demir, C. (2015). A comparative study of boosting in academic texts: a contrastive rhetoric. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, *5*(4), 12–28.

Yang, L. (2014). Evidentiality in English research articles of applied linguistics: from the perspective of metadiscourse. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *5*(3), 581–591.

Yang, R., & Allison, D. (2003). Research articles in applied linguistics: Moving from results to conclusions. *English for Specific Purposes*, *22*(4), 365–385.

Yang, R., & Allison, D. (2004). Research articles in applied linguistics: structures from a functional perspective. *English for Specific Purposes*, *23*, 264–279.

Yang, Y. (2013). Exploring linguistic and cultural variations in the use of hedges in English and Chinese scientific discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *50*(1), 23–36.

Yotimart, D., & Abd. Aziz, N. H. (2017). Authorial identity and linguistic features of native English and Thai writers in research articles. *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, *25*(3), 1319–1334.

Zhang, B., & Wannaruk, A. (2016). Rhetorical structure of education research article methods sections. *PASAA: Journal of Language Teaching and Learning in Thailand*, *51*, 155–184.