

## An Analysis of Rhetorical Moves and Cohesion in Abstracts of Literature Journal Articles

*Sirawich Tampanich*

Faculty of Humanities, Srinakharinwirot University

Email: sirawich@g.swu.ac.th

Received 8 July 2021; revised 17 September 2021; accepted 8 February 2022;

Online 14 September 2022

### Abstract

An abstract is considered as the essential part of an article. However, the textual organization of the abstracts in diverse genres may differ, which is likely to cause confusion and concern among novice EFL scholars. Also, so far there have been few practical models available on how to write a well-composed literature research article (LRAs) abstract. Therefore, to fill in this missing piece, the present researcher conducted an analysis of abstracts in LRAs, with the main focus on rhetorical moves and generic patterns together with grammatical cohesion. With the top-down corpus-based approach of move analysis, the move structure model was modified from the models proposed by Doró (2013), Santos (1996), Swales and Feak (2009), and Tankó (2017). The corpus consisted of 88 abstracts from two international journals. The abstracts were analyzed and coded by considering the functional roles of each structural unit which variably fell into different ‘moves’ and ‘submoves’, and grammatical cohesion. Two research instruments were employed including: MS Excel 2013 and AntConc Version 3.5.8.0. The results indicated that, of eight moves, the Findings (M6) was the most frequent move, and LRA abstracts revealed five generic patterns with three stable moves functioning as Research Presentation (M4), Methodology (M5), and Findings (M6). Regarding grammatical cohesion, the reference type of cohesive devices was the most utilized in LRA abstracts. The findings could serve as a practical guideline for novice EFL scholars providing detailed information as to how LRA abstracts should be composed and organized to meet the standards for literary research publications.

**Keywords:** abstracts, move analysis, grammatical cohesion, literature research articles, corpus-based approach

## การวิเคราะห์อรรถภาคและการเชื่อมโยงความในบทคัดย่อ ของบทความวิจัยสาขาวรรณคดี

สิริวิชญ์ ธรรมพานิช

คณะมนุษยศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยศรีนครินทรวิโรฒ

Email: sirawich@g.swu.ac.th

รับบทความ 8 กรกฎาคม 2564 แก้ไขบทความ 17 กันยายน 2564 ตอรับ 8 กุมภาพันธ์ 2565

ออนไลน์ 14 กันยายน 2565

### บทคัดย่อ

บทคัดย่อเป็นส่วนสำคัญในการนำเสนอบทความวิจัย แต่การจัดเรียงข้อความในบทคัดย่อของผลงานแต่ละประเภทแตกต่างกัน ซึ่งอาจทำให้เกิดความสับสนและความกังวลต่อนักวิชาการมือใหม่ที่ใช้ภาษาอังกฤษเป็นภาษาต่างประเทศ กระทั่งปัจจุบันต้นแบบการเขียนบทคัดย่อของบทความวิจัยสาขาวรรณคดีที่มีรูปแบบการจัดเรียงข้อความที่ดีมีจำนวนไม่มาก ดังนั้นเพื่อเติมเต็มองค์ความรู้ดังกล่าว ผู้วิจัยจึงวิเคราะห์อรรถภาค การเรียงลำดับของอรรถภาค และการเชื่อมโยงความทางไวยากรณ์ ในบทคัดย่อบทความวิจัยสาขาวรรณคดี ต้นแบบโครงสร้างอรรถภาคปรับจากการศึกษาอรรถภาคของ Doró (2013), Santos (1996), Swales and Feak (2009) และ Tankó (2017) ด้วยวิธีการด้านภาษาศาสตร์คลังข้อมูลแบบ top-down คลังข้อมูลภาษาประกอบด้วยบทคัดย่อบทความวิจัยสาขาวรรณคดีทั้งหมด 88 บทคัดย่อ จากวารสารนานาชาติ 2 ฉบับ นักวิจัยได้วิเคราะห์หน้าที่ของหน่วยโครงสร้างแต่ละหน่วยซึ่งประกอบด้วยอรรถภาคและอรรถภาคย่อย รวมถึงการเชื่อมโยงความทางไวยากรณ์ในบทคัดย่อบทความวิจัยสาขาวรรณคดี เครื่องมือวิจัย 2 ชิ้น คือ MS Excel 2013 และ AntConc Version 3.5.8.0. ผลการวิเคราะห์พบว่าอรรถภาคผลการวิจัย (M6) พบมากที่สุดจาก 8 อรรถภาค และมีการเรียงลำดับของอรรถภาคในบทคัดย่อบทความวิจัยสาขาวรรณคดี 5 รูปแบบ ประกอบด้วย 3 อรรถภาคในทุก ๆ รูปแบบ คืออรรถภาคการนำเสนองานวิจัย (M4) อรรถภาคระเบียบวิธีวิจัย (M5) และอรรถภาคผลการวิจัย (M6) จากการวิเคราะห์การเชื่อมโยงความทางไวยากรณ์ พบว่ามีการใช้คำเชื่อมโยงความประเภทการอ้างถึงมากที่สุดในบทคัดย่อของบทความวิจัยสาขาวรรณคดี ผลการวิจัยครั้งนี้อาจนำไปใช้เป็นแนวทางการเขียนและเรียบเรียงบทคัดย่อสำหรับนักวิชาการมือใหม่ที่ใช้ภาษาอังกฤษเป็นภาษาต่างประเทศ เพื่อให้ได้มาตรฐานในการนำเสนอบทความวิชาการสาขาวรรณคดี

**คำสำคัญ** บทคัดย่อ การวิเคราะห์อรรถภาค การเชื่อมโยงความทางไวยากรณ์ บทความวิจัยสาขา  
วรรณคดี วิธีการบนฐานภาษาศาสตร์คลังข้อมูล

## 1. Introduction

Conducting research is one of the most common practices in the scholarly world. It is a way to conduct a fact-finding inquiry and to further develop specific knowledge and theoretical insight. Thus, to efficiently convey the discovered knowledge or facts from a research paper to academic communities, researchers or scholars should know how to write academically and have a clear picture of what good research looks like.

In general, the research paper (RA) includes four sections: Introduction (I), Methods (M), Results (R), and Discussion (D), or IMRD (Swales & Feak, 2012). Each section is closely related; that is, Introduction and Discussion are strongly connected, and Methods is linked to Results and vice versa (Swales & Feak, 2012). Another very important section of the RA is an **abstract**, the first section of the article, because it functions as not only a brief overview of the essential content of the article but also an indispensable opening section of any research study (American Psychological Association, 2020; Swales & Feak, 2009).

The abstract is considered as a crucial part of an article. Evidently, when searching through journals or e-journals, the abstract comes along with its article. In the abstract, enough details allow readers to review the article and decide whether to read or ignore the whole article (Martín, 2003). After reading the abstract, the readers can more or less perceive the value of an article (Santos, 1996). Thus, a well-composed abstract impacts on the chance of the article being accepted for publication (Swales & Feak, 2009). Among big-name journals, the article's quality may be evaluated through the abstract. By reading the abstract alone, some journal committees may decide to reject a study due to the presence of unprofessional research writing styles or the researchers not mentioning the research merits in their abstracts.

The well-arranged abstract normally appears in a single paragraph, typically 150-250 words long, providing readers with specific data about the

article. An effective abstract should be precise, concise, and cohesive (American Psychological Association, 2020). Swales and Feak (2012) suggested two main approaches to writing an abstract. The first one is the *result-driven* abstract underscoring the descriptions of research findings and a conclusion. The other is the *RP summary* abstract providing a-few-sentence synopses of each section in a paper. An effective abstract can result from a combination of the two approaches comprising *Background, Aim, Method, Results, and Conclusion* (Hyland, 2000; Santos, 1996; Swales & Feak, 2009). Likewise, as reported in several pieces of move analysis in the humanities and social sciences field (Doró, 2013; Pasavoravate, 2011; Pho, 2008; Santos, 1996; Tankó, 2017), the five most common components in abstracts are *background, aim, method, results, and conclusion*. Similarly, the discourse units of the abstracts in scientific genres have almost identical patterns to those in humanities research. Nonetheless, the move analysis done by Doró (2013), Marefat and Mohammadzadeh (2013), and Tankó (2017) revealed that the components and the patterns in LRA abstracts are somewhat different from those in other genres; the majority of LRA abstracts cover both common abstract elements and the usual account of why the research conducted is worth reading and how the anticipated research findings would fulfill or expand the existing body of knowledge in the field. Significantly, the ideas in LRA abstracts are typically organized in a complicated and non-hierarchical way, which characterizes the distinct nature of the LRA abstracts. The overall picture of abstract components and their patterns in different genres is summarized in Table 1.

**Table 1**  
*Studies of Move Analysis in RA Abstracts in Several Academic Genres*

Researchers (year)	Disciplines/ Corpus	Framework(s)	Moves and their Patterns
Santos (1996)	Applied Linguistics/ 94 abstracts	Swales (1990), Dudley-Evans (1986) and Crookes (1986)	Situating the research, Presenting the research, Methodology, Results, Discussion
Martin (2003)	Experimental Social Sciences/ 160 abstracts	CARS and IMRD	Introduction, Methods, Results, Conclusion
Pho (2008)	Applied Linguistics & Educational Technology/ 30 abstracts	Santo (1996)	Situating the research, Presenting the research, Methodology, Results, Discussing the Research
Tseng (2011)	Applied Linguistics/ 90 abstracts	Swales and Feak (2009) & Santos (1996)	Background, Aim, Method, Results
Pasavoravate (2011)	Linguistics/ 70 abstracts	Swales (1990, 2004)	Background, Presenting the Research, Methodology, Results, Discussion
Marefat & Mohammadzadeh (2013)	literature/ 90 abstracts	IMRD  CARS	Introduction, Method, Result, Discussion Establishing Research Territory, Establishing a niche, Presenting Present Research
Suntara & Usaha (2013)	Linguistics & Applied linguistics/ 200 abstracts	Hyland, 2000	Purpose, Method, Product, Conclusion
Doró (2013)	Linguistics & Literature/ 40 abstracts	Santo (1996)	Situating the research, Presenting the research, Describing the methodology, Summarizing the findings, Discussing the findings
Kanoksilapatham (2013)	Civil Engineering/ 60 abstracts	Swales (1990, 2004)	Background, Purpose, Methodology, Result, Discussion
Tankó (2017)	Literature/ 135 abstracts	the topic-down approach	[Topic/Background], Niche, [Purpose/Method], Outcome, [Conclusion/Implications]

In addition, to tie each element in the abstract together, the whole text is formed using textual cohesion of each component, showing diverse functional units. Regarding the discourse structure, each unit is devised according to its communicative functions, each of which uses specific structures, word orders, and word choices (Tankó, 2017). Once these units are linked together in grammatical, lexical, and semantic ways, cohesion is formed which can be perceived through the interrelation of individual ideas in the abstract (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014). As Biber et al. (2007) stated, cohesion is a linguistic device making information flow. Cohesion ties the text together as discourse rather than an accidental sequence of sentences.

Over the past 30 years, it can be seen from a number of previous research studies that EFL scholars and researchers have paid little attention to moves in abstracts in the literature field. Most of them have conducted move analysis on abstracts in scientific disciplines, such as biology (Samraj, 2005), biochemistry (Kanoksilapatham, 2005), protozoology (Cross & Oppenheim, 2006), computer sciences (Lon et al., 2012), or civil engineering (Kanoksilapatham, 2013). Some studies in the fields of linguistics or applied linguistics by Santos (1996) or Lorés (2004) were found. Several studies by Pho (2008), Samraj (2005), or Stotesbury (2003) compared two related studies from different disciplines. However, there were a few studies on move analysis in LRAs, such as Doró (2013), Marefat and Mohammadzadeh (2013), and Tankó (2017). Thus, to fulfill the lack of knowledge and understanding on structures and language functions used in LRA abstracts, this study focuses on the move analysis of LRA abstracts.

Owing to the scarcity of empirical evidence and practical models in writing effective LRA abstracts, many inexperienced scholars in the field of literature have faced a wide range of problems when writing abstracts for their literary studies. Also, it is common knowledge that LRA abstracts always employ complicated structures and textual organizations which differ from those in other genres. As seen in some review papers in the

literary field, researchers might begin their abstracts by providing background knowledge of a particular topic and then move to the conclusion without making any references to the research gaps, research questions, purposes, conceptual framework, methodology, and implications. For example, Tankó's study (2017) revealed eight moves in LRA abstracts, organized as shown in Table 1. Namely, literary researchers always allocate a large text space for stating research merits or value to convince the readers to agree with a certain point of view or issue explored. This unique writing style and textual organization in LRA abstracts seems to have caused confusion and concern among novice EFL scholars. Hence, this problem associated challenge underlies the rationale for the current study.

Due to the presence of various moves, divergent move patterns in LRA abstracts and scarceness of move analysis studies on the LRA abstracts, the present study aims to fill the gap and provide greater clarification on components, patterns, and linguistic features of abstracts in the field of literature. The aims of this study are to identify rhetorical moves and describe their generic patterns as well as to investigate grammatical cohesion found in the LRA abstracts.

In the following sections, the background knowledge of this study is provided on the topic of move analysis and the concept of cohesion.

### **1.1 Moves and Move Analysis**

A move is defined as a textual unit displaying its own purpose and serving a specific communicative function. The concept of move analysis was originally developed from genre analysis (Swales, 1990). Its aim is to label the communicative purposes of a text by classifying different discourse units within the text. Biber et al. (2007) summarize the process of move analysis using a corpus-based approach (see Table 2).

**Table 2**

*General Steps Often Used to Conduct a Corpus-Based Move Analysis*

---

Step 1	Determine rhetorical purposes of the genre.
Step 2	Determine rhetorical function of each text segment in its local context; identify the possible move types of the genre.
Step 3	Group functional and/or semantic themes that are either in relative proximity to each other or often occur in similar locations in representative texts. These reflect the specific <i>steps</i> that can be used to realize a broader <i>move</i> .
Step 4	Conduct pilot-coding to test and fine-tune definitions of move purposes.
Step 5	Develop coding protocol with clear definitions and examples of <i>move types</i> and <i>steps</i> .
Step 6	Code full set of texts, with inter-rater reliability check to confirm that there is clear understanding of move definitions and how <i>moves/steps</i> are realized in texts.
Step 7	Add any additional <i>steps</i> and/or <i>moves</i> that are revealed in the full analysis.
Step 8	Revise coding protocol to resolve any discrepancies revealed by the inter-rater reliability check or by newly 'discovered' <i>moves/steps</i> , and re-code problematic areas.
Step 9	Conduct linguistic analysis of move features and/or other corpus-facilitated analyses.
Step 10	Describe corpus of texts in terms of typical and alternate move structures and linguistic characteristics.

---

(Biber et al., 2007 p. 34)

As seen in Table 2, the researcher firstly selects a theoretical framework to analyze moves. Then sample texts are segmented into moves and sub-moves. Third, each move in the corpus is classified according to its function. Finally, the linguistic features of each move are analyzed to examine their syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic characteristics.

### **1.2 Cohesion and its Types by Halliday and Hasan (1976)**

Cohesion is the logical weaving of the ideas within the text, which encircles the unison of spoken or written prose or verse, dialogue or monologue. The elements in the text are entwined at all four levels: words, phrases, sentences, and paragraphs. Cohesion occurs when two or more interconnected ideas in the text are joined together to describe the same subject matter in a meaningful manner. In so doing, transition words, such

as *however, therefore, furthermore, similarly, accordingly*, have to be utilized to function as a logical bridge of thoughts within and between phrases, clauses, sentences, and paragraphs as in the sentence, ‘*They were not able to get funding and **therefore** had to leave the project.*’ The word *therefore* here is used to identify the relationship of ideas between the preceding and the following sentences. With the utilization of this transition word, the two sentences make sense in a *cause and effect* manner.

Cohesive devices function within two major domains including grammatical and lexical zones as shown in Table 3. To establish cohesion, four main cohesive devices are employed including *Conjunction, Reference, Substitution and Ellipsis*, and *Lexical Cohesion*.

**Table 3**

*Types of Cohesion in Grammatical and Lexical Zones*

General type	Grammatical zone	Lexical zone
transitions between messages	(1) <i>conjunction</i> [unit: clause]	
statuses of elements	(2) <i>reference</i> [unit: nominal, adverbial group]	(4) <i>lexical cohesion</i> [synonym, hyponymy]
	(3) <i>ellipsis &amp; substitution</i> [unit (complex): clause, nominal group, adverbial group]	[repetition, collocation]

(Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014, p. 608)

(1) **Conjunctions** are linking devices that semantically connect sentences or clauses in a written text. Although they contain little lexical meaning compared to content words, they can be used to establish grammatical and semantic relations between words and sentences constituting the whole discourse. Accordingly, conjunctions are regarded as a vital component to make a given text meaningful. Conjunctions are divided into

four types: *additive*, *adversative*, *causal*, and *temporal*. Each type has different sub-types as shown in Table 4.

**Table 4**  
*Types and Sub-Types of Conjunctive Expression*

	Types of Conjunction	Words or Expressions
1. Additive (C1)	simple (C11)	and, and also, nor, or, or else
	complex, emphatic (C12)	furthermore, moreover, besides, alternatively
	Complex, de-emphatic (C13)	incidentally, by the way
	apposition (C14)	that is, I mean, in other words, for instance
	comparison (C15)	likewise, similarly, on the other hand, by contrast
2. Adversative (C2)	adversative 'proper' (C21)	yet, thought, only, but, however, nevertheless
	contrastive (Avowal) (C22)	in fact, actually, as a matter of a fact
	contrastive (C23)	but, and however, on the other hand
	correction (C24)	instead, rather, on the contrary, at least, rather
	dismissal (C25)	in any case, anyhow, at any rate, however it is
3. Causal (C3)	general (C31)	so, then, hence, therefore, consequently
	specific (C32)	for this reason, on account of this, as a result
	reversed causal (C33)	for, because
	causal, specific (C34)	it follows, on this basis, arising out of this
	conditional (C35)	then, in that case, under the circumstances
	respective (C36)	in this (other) respect(s), in this regard, otherwise
4. Temporal (C4)	simple (C41)	(just) then, next, after/before that, hitherto
	conclusive (C42)	finally, in the end, at last
	correlative (C43)	first...then, at first...in the end, next, secondly,
	complex (C44)	at once, soon, next time/day, meanwhile,
	here and now (C45)	up to now, at this point, here from now,
	summary (C46)	to sum up, in short, to resume

(Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014)

(2) **Reference** is referring back to the previously stated item in a text using such referring devices as pronouns, demonstratives, and comparatives. Referential devices could be categorized into three major types and each includes various sub-types, illustrated in Table 5.

(3) **Substitution & Ellipsis** are one of the most common methods to avoid repetition in sentences. *Substitution* is the replacement of one

word or phrase by another. Three main types of substitution are nominal, verbal, and clausal. *Ellipsis* is the omission of the preceding item already referred to in a text, which has three types including nominal, verbal, and clausal.

**Table 5**  
*Types and Sub-Types of Reference*

Types of Reference		Words or Expressions
1. Pronominals (R1)	singular, masculine (R11)	he, him, his
	singular, feminine (R12)	she, her, hers
	singular, neuter (R13)	it, its
	plural (R14)	they, them, their, theirs
2. Demonstrative and Definite Article (R2)	demonstrative, near (R21)	this, these, here
	demonstrative, far (R22)	that, those, there, then
	definite article (R23)	the
3. Comparative (R3)	identity (R31)	same, identical(ly), equal,
	similarity (R32)	similar(ly), additional, likewise, such, so
	difference (R33)	different(ly), other, else, otherwise
	comparison, quantity (R34)	more, fewer, less, so-, as- equally- + quantifier
	comparison, quality (R35)	as...as, comparative adjectives and adverbs

(Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014)

(4) *Lexical Cohesion* concerns the writer's choice of lexical items which indicate the relation between words and phrases in a text. Lexical cohesion covers two main types. *Reiteration* is the repetition of a particular vocabulary of the similar meaning in a written text as in *John encountered the tiger. The tiger was bulgy. Collocation* is a group of two or more words that often co-occur. For example, the combination of adjective and noun as in 'heavy rain', or a verb and noun as in 'run out of energy'.

## 2. Methods

### 2.1 Creation of the Corpus of LRA Abstracts

#### 2.1.1 Journal Selection

To retrieve the desired LRAs for this study, the journals were assessed against the theoretical criteria by considering the following factors: SCImago Journal Rank (SJR) indicator, H Index, Journal Quartile Score (Q), Impact Factor (IF), and Eigenfactor Score. Two journals were selected as the samples; namely, *Men and Masculinities* (MM) and *Poetics* (PS). Regarding SJR values, they weighed 1.271 and 1.129, respectively. H Index was 49 for MM and 54 for PS. Also, the quartile score of each journal in the field of literature and literary theory was evaluated. The Q score of MM was Q1 from 2000 to 2018; PS from 1999 to 2018. Also, the IF of MM is 1.923 with an Eigenfactor Score of 0.001660; the IF of PS is 1.522 with an Eigenfactor Score of 0.002070.

#### 2.1.2 The Corpus of LRA abstracts

As stated in the selected journals, all RAs were selected by the above criteria. They were distributed over all the issues of each journal for the year 2019. The MM articles were in Volume 22 including five issues, 42 abstracts. The PS articles were in Volumes 72-77, 46 abstracts. In total, the researcher obtained 88 LRA abstracts, with a total corpus size of 3,330 word types and 15,141 word tokens, as shown in Table 6.

**Table 6**  
*The Corpus of LRA Abstracts*

Journals	Volume / Issues	No of LRA Abstracts	Word Types	Word Tokens
Men and Masculinities (MM)	volume 22 / issue 1	12	1,925	6,709
	volume 22 / issue 2	13		
	volume 22 / issue 3	6		
	volume 22 / issue 4	5		
	volume 22 / issue 5	6		
Poetics (PS)	volume 72	8	2,225	8,432
	volume 73	8		
	volume 74	6		
	volume 75	8		
	volume 76	9		
	volume 77	7		
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>88</b>	<b>3,330</b>	<b>15,141</b>

## 2.2 Data Analysis

### 2.2.1 Move Analysis in LRA Abstracts

The process of the top-down corpus-based approach by Biber et al. (2007) was used to decide the move types. To do the analysis, the move types in LRA abstracts relied on previous studies identifying move types in RA abstracts; the studies of Santos (1996) and Swales and Feak (2009) were applied as the framework for the current study because it had been used in numerous previous studies. Doró (2013) and Tankó (2017) were followed as examples because of their relationship to the literary discipline. After the findings from these studies were regarded, together with the analyses of LRA abstracts, a total of eight move types, some of which contain submoves, were labeled (see Table 7).

**Table 7**  
*Move Structure Model and Code in LRA Abstracts*

<b>Move1 (M1) Topic</b>	<b>Move4 (M4) Research Presentation</b>	
<b>Move2 (M2) General Information</b>	Submove41A (SM41A)	Main Purpose
Submove 21 (SM21) Current Knowledge	Submove41B (SM41B)	Main Feature
Submove 22 (SM22) Previous Research	Submove42 (SM42)	Research Questions or Hypothesis
<b>Move3 (M3) Problem Statement</b>	<b>Move5 (M5) Methodology</b>	
Submove31 (SM31) Gap Indication	<b>Move6 (M6) Findings</b>	
Submove32 (SM32) Conflict Indication	<b>Move7 (M7) Discussion</b>	
Submove33 (SM33) Question Posing	<b>Move8 (M8) Conclusion and Implication</b>	
Submove34 (SM34) Appraisal of	Submove81 (SM81)	Final Comment
Previous Research	Submove82A (SM82A)	Recommendations for Future Research
	Submove82B (SM82B)	Significance of the Findings

### 2.2.2 Inter-Rater Reliability

This analysis was based on the distribution of the text function, but such move identification can be subjectively reviewed. To erase this concern, once every 10 abstracts were examined, the analysis results from the researcher and the inter-rater, who possesses extensive experience and expertise in the literature field, were compared. When any divergence was found and the middle-ground could not be established, the rater, a native speaker, was asked to provide constructive opinions on the differences of analysis results.

### 2.2.3 Organization of Generic Patterns of Move Types

When rhetorical moves in the corpus had been identified, the move organization was examined. The move patterns were grouped by ordering move types according to the occurrence of the first three most frequent moves. The other orders were called ‘*others*’. Also, the move types occurring in the same order were reinterpreted by taking the sub-patterns into consideration. Finally, the frequency of each pattern was calculated to make inferences about move patterns in LRA abstracts.

### 2.2.4 Analysis of Grammatical Cohesion in LRA Abstracts

To analyze the cohesion in abstracts, the current study focused on cohesion in the grammatical zone. There were three types of grammatical cohesion: (1) *conjunction (C)*, (2) *reference (R)*, as well as (3) *ellipsis (E) and substitution (S)*, as in Table 3. Three of them make diverse contributions to the text creation and interpretation. Each type was identified, counted, and classified into its own type manually after the corpus of LRA abstracts were processed using AntConc Version 3.5.8.0. Then the utilizations of each type of conjunction were analyzed in order to find some representative examples of real use by scholars in LRA abstracts.

### 2.3 Research Instruments and Statistical Device

Two research instruments were used to analyze moves and grammatical cohesions in LRA abstracts. Firstly, MS Excel 2013 was used to collect and analyze the moves and create the frequency table of each move and move patterns. Second, AntConc Version 3.5.8.0 was applied to count and sort the different types of grammatical cohesion in the corpus. Descriptive statistics, frequency, and percentages were used to analyze the moves and grammatical cohesion.

## 3. Results and Discussion

### 3.1 Rhetorical Moves in LRA Abstracts

Of 88 abstracts, a total of eight moves (*M*) were identified. *M6* occurred most often (28%), followed by *M4* (16.55%), *M5* (16.55%), and *M2* (15.64%), respectively. *M3* and *M1* were found to be the two least frequent moves, with occurrence rates of just 5.82% and 0.72%, respectively. Table 8 shows the frequency of all moves and submoves.

**Table 8**  
*Frequency of Rhetorical Moves in LRA Abstracts*

Moves	<i>f</i>	%
<b>Move1 (M1) Topic</b>	4	0.72
<b>Move2 (M2) General Information</b>	86	15.64
Submove21 (SM21) Current Knowledge	63	
Submove22 (SM22) Previous Research	23	
<b>Move3 (M3) Problem Statement</b>	32	5.82
Submove31 (SM31) Gap Indication	20	
Submove32 (SM32) Conflict Indication	3	
Submove33 (SM33) Question Posing	3	
Submove34 (SM34) Appraisal of Previous Research	6	
<b>Move4 (M4) Research Presentation</b>	91	16.55
Submove41A (SM41A) Main Purpose	6	
Submove41B (SM41B) Main Feature	73	
Submove42 (SM42) Research Questions or Hypothesis	12	
<b>Move5 (M5) Methodology</b>	91	16.55
<b>Move6 (M6) Findings</b>	154	28.00
<b>Move7 (M7) Discussion</b>	52	9.45
<b>Move8 (M8) Conclusion and Implication</b>	40	7.27
Submove81 (SM81) Final Comment	22	
Submove82A (SM82A) Recommendations for Future Research	4	
Submove82B (SM82B) Significance of the Findings	14	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>550</b>	<b>100</b>

**Topic (M1)** regards the subject matter to be explored later in the RA. To decide if a structural unit could be coded as *Topic*, a specific keyword, concept, or proper name should emerge elsewhere in a sentence examined, as in (1).

- (1) The article explores Darwyn Cooke's 2004 comic DC: .... [MM18]

*M1* occurred the least often and emerged at the beginning of the abstract. Mentioning the names of a fictional work or theory, such as novels, literature, or theoretical papers was found to be a common occurrence for *M1*.

**General Information (M2)** involves the provision of general background about the topic in question, which would establish the boundary of what is to be studied or reviewed in the study. This move consisted of two *SMs*: current knowledge and previous research.

**Current Knowledge (SM2)** is an overview of relevant theories, principles, concepts, notions, facts, or the current body of scholarly knowledge of a particular topic that has evolved over time, as in (2).

- (2) **Authenticity** is a critical feature of a brand's quality, .... Scholars maintain that craft companies face a **legitimacy crisis** .... [PS41]

The *SM* onset was found to typically set itself off by mentioning a keyword, in a *noun* or a *compound noun*, representing the focal issue or underlying problems to be explored further in the study. Also, other key terms were found to be mentioned in other parts of this *SM*. These keywords could also be interpreted as an indirect reference to the questions or problems of the study.

**Previous Research (SM22)** reviews previous research studies, reports, reviews, conference proceedings, or books that explained or justified the phenomena in society, as in (3).

- (3) **Previous work** has studied the exclusive nature .... [PS19]

*SM22* was found to be characterized by the presence of such words indicating what has been done in the past as *previous*. Moreover, this may suggest that most literary scholars give more priority to the explanation of complex literary concepts than reference to prior research in the field.

**Problem Statement (M3)** refers to problematic issues addressed by a study. It seems to introduce convincing and persuasive arguments related to a particular socio-cultural issue, with aims to indicate gaps or conflicts, from which research questions could be formed.

*M3* was found to be a rare move in LRA abstracts. This seems to indicate few authors did not consider abstracts the site for intense scholarly debate. Rather, the clarification of the explored theme should be provided in abstract space. *M3* can be arranged into four *SMs*.

**Gap Indication (SM31)** indicates an issue that has not been thoroughly explored by any of the prior literary research. The gaps in most of the literary research are always any under-explored or undocumented issue in the field, as in (4).

- (4) Despite the fact that millions of men engage in self-help reading, there has been little scholarly research about .... [MM36]

**Conflict Indication (SM32)** is a continuing unsettled debate on particular social issues and an inadequate reporting or explanation of some aspects in previous research, as in (5).

- (5) ...; though this history takes into account certain problematic aspects of 1950s American culture...the comic does not in any way produce a critique of normative American masculinity. [MM18]

**Question Posing (SM33)** concerns raising the issues from the previous research in the form of a thought provoking question, as in (6).

- (6) ..., we are presented with an empirical question. ... is also linked to potential risks, how do we talk about it? [PS37]

**Appraisal of Previous Research (SM34)** is a systematic analysis of the value of previous LRA research in order to evaluate if the research provides any knowledge insight in the field, as in (7).

- (7) Evaluating the males of different species side by side can be enlightening. And it is often entertaining. [MM10]

Of these four *SMs*, *SM31* occurred the most frequently; most literary researchers gave gap indications the highest priority since the gaps in previous research represent the need of a study to be conducted or reflect controversial or problematic issues in society.

**Research Presentation (M4)** is associated with literature research objectives. This move is closely connected to *M3* because it indicates the focus of a study and the anticipated findings that could more or less fill the research gaps or settle the unresolved conflicts in the field. This move consisted of three *SMs* as follows.

**Main Purpose (SM41A)** concerns the main research purpose. This *SM* is characterized by the use of purposive signal words [1] as *purpose*, *aim*, *objective* *explore*, *examine*, *investigate*, *review* and to-infinitive [2] (Tampanich and Soranastaporn, 2018), as in (8).

- (8) The purpose [1] of this research was to explore [2] the association between preferences for dark fictional characters, .... [PS20]

Also, *SM41A* was found to frequently co-occur with *M5* in one syntactic unit in LRA abstracts, as in (9).

- (9) We used content analysis methodology (M5) to examine (M4) the reasons newspaper articles (n = 121) provide for .... [MM24]

**Main Feature (SM41B)** describes the main feature of the study. This move reports the story of the research. It is typically demonstrated through the collapsed structure (Santo, 1996; Swales, 1990), as in (10).

- (10) This article explores the commercial and creative impact of diversified corporations on artistic production. [PS44]

This pattern of (10) is congruent with the purposive pattern using the impersonal noun phrase as a subject (Pattern II) (Tampanich & Soranastaporn, 2018).

Another structure, as in (11), referred to as an uncollapsed structure (Santo, 1996; Swales, 1990), is compatible with the purposive pattern using the personal noun phrase as a subject (Pattern I) (Tampanich & Soranastaporn, 2018).

- (11) In this article, I explore the case of China .... [MM22]

Likewise, this move concurred with *M5*, as in (12).

- (12) Using the Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and the Positive Discourse Analysis (PDA) approaches (*M5*), the study examines (*M4*) the paragraphs that precede the recipes .... [PS22]

Here, the literary scholars expressed their research objective as the main feature rather than the main purpose since they were required to describe what they kept doing in their studies.

**Research Questions or Hypothesis (SM42)** is concerned with the expectation of possible results. Literary scholars put forward the research questions or hypotheses regarding unsettled debate or argument or lack of supporting evidence, as in (13).

- (13) So, we ask two **questions** here: First, what are the main axes ... and how do they develop over time? Second, how does the association ... evolve over time? [PS17]

In this study, the literary researchers normally raise research questions rather than state hypotheses.

**Methodology (M5)** involves the information of the research design and methodology. The analysis of LRA abstracts showed that not many

literary scholars employed a straightforward technique in writing their methodology, as in (14).

- (14) We **conduct** a content analysis of **458 articles and 2115 keywords** from 1998 to 2017. [MM1]

Moreover, *M5* was found to be an embedded move appearing immediately after *M4*. The researchers stated *M5* alongside *M4* in one syntactic unit, as in (15).

- (15) Using **data from the 2012 Survey (M5)** of Public Participation in the Arts, **Examine (M4)** the association .... [PS42]

In (15), the author's writing style can be considered an instance of two-move merge in a complex sentence boundary, with one part indicating *M5* and the other indicating *M4*.

Interestingly, the frequency of this move was almost the same as that of *M4* because this move appears immediately after research purposes or in the same statement of research purposes.

**Findings (M6)** deals with the results of the research from the analyzing, reviewing, and synthesizing of selected fictional works. This move was found to be the most frequent in LRA abstracts.

- (16) **Our findings indicate** similar numbers of women .... [MM1]

As in (16), the author(s) devoted a large text space in the abstract to reporting the findings, which was common in LRA abstracts.

**Discussion (M7)** encompasses the statement of consistency between the findings and those found in previous research or theories proposed by scholars in the field.

- (17) It contributes to debates on political masculinities .... The analysis suggests that police masculinities and public policing take shape in line with the degree of commitment .... [MM28]

As in (17), the characteristic feature of *M7* was to end the abstract by justifying the value and validity of the research through mentioning the contribution and the alignment of research result with the theory.

**Conclusion and Implication (M8)** is the summary, implication of the conducted literary research, significance of the research outcomes, and recommendation for future research. *M8* was divided into three *SMs* as follows:

*Final Comment (SM81)* involves the researcher's summative comments towards the subject matter investigated to bring closure to LRA abstracts, as in (18).

- (18) We conclude that the role of law in justification is limited to situations that are oriented to private redress .... [PS12]

*Recommendations for Future Research (SM82A)* involves suggestions as to what issues should be further studied or addressed. From the analysis, recommendations occurred in last few sentences of LRA abstracts, as in (19).

- (19) In the conclusion I outline future research opportunities in the study of food stratification and .... [PS10]

Keywords such as *future* in (19) were found to commonly appear in the discourse units stating recommendations. *SM28A* is in agreement with Santo's Giving Recommendations move (1996), and Implications move (Tankó, 2017). Moreover, within both *SM81* and *SM82A*, several words or phrases used to signal a conclusion such as *conclude* (V), *suggest* (V), *conclusion* (N), or *in conclusion* (cohesive device), and these were found to commonly appear in research abstracts in other disciplines.

***Significance of the Findings (SM82B)*** deals with the explanation of why a literary research study is needed and what contributions the study makes to fulfilling the gaps or addressing controversial issues in the field, as in (20).

(20) Our findings shed **important insight** .... [MM36]

Example (20) showed that the audience could find this piece of research valuable since it provided a deep understanding of the investigated issue, as can be seen from the word *insight*.

In short, the findings indicate that *M6* occurred the most frequently. It could be interpreted that most literary scholars were convinced that research findings possessed the potential to be well representative of the research value. As such value cannot be realized and measured in numbers, insightful information tended to be highlighted in the LRA abstracts in order to help the readers recognize the academic merit of the literary research. As Santo (1996) mentioned, the research findings play a vital role in the possibilities of publication of a particular paper, which is considered as documentary evidence which must be accurate and understandable (Swales, 1990). Moreover, *M2*, *M4*, and *M5* were found at almost the same frequency of occurrences. These four moves also were in harmony with four main previous studies used as the framework of this study (Doró, 2013; Santo, 1996; Swales & Feak, 2009; Tankó, 2017), as well as abstracts in other disciplines, as seen in Table 1. This may indicate that these moves could be the main moves in all abstracts.

However, despite almost equal importance in the LRA abstracts, these moves could be arranged in various patterns. These are discussed in the next section.

### **3.2 Generic patterns of rhetorical moves in LRA abstracts**

It is considered that the accepted structures from the analysis could be as guidance for novice authors in order to write their abstracts effectively.

According to the order of the first three moves, there were five patterns of rhetorical moves in LRA abstracts as shown in Table 9.

**Table 9**  
*Generic Patterns in LRA Abstracts*

Pattern	Generic Patterns	<i>f</i>	Pattern	Generic Patterns	<i>f</i>
1	M4-M5-M6 (-others)	13	4.1	M2-M3-M4 (-others)	7
1A	M4- <del>M5</del> / <del>M6</del> -M6 (-others)		4.1A	M2-M3- <del>M4</del> / <del>M5</del> (-others)	
1B	<del>M4</del> / <del>M5</del> -M5-M6 (-others)		4.2	M2-M5-M6 (-others)	7
2.	M2-M4-M5 (-others)	11	4.2A	M2-M5- <del>M6</del> / <del>M4</del> (-others)	
2A	M2-M4- <del>M5</del> / <del>M6</del> (-others)		4.2B	M2-M5- <del>M6</del> / <del>M5</del> (-others)	
3.	M2-M4-M6 (-others)	9	5.1	M4-M6-M7 (-others)	4
3A	M2- <del>M4</del> / <del>M5</del> -M6 (-others)		5.2	<del>M4</del> / <del>M5</del> -M6-M8 (-others)	4
			5.2A	M4-M6-M8 (-others)	

From the analysis, the most frequently occurring patterns consisted of three main moves: Purpose (*M4*), Methodology (*M5*), and Findings (*M6*). Move pattern 1 (*MP1*) was found to have the highest frequency of occurrence. For this pattern, two sub-patterns were found. In the sub-pattern 1A (*SP1A*), *M5* and *M6* co-occurred in the second position, while *M4* was found to be accompanied with *M5* in the *SP1B*.

Moreover, *MP2* was found to be the second most frequent pattern. The analysis indicated that *M5* coexisted with *M6* in the *SP2A*; that is, some researchers mentioned methodology alongside findings in a single complex sentence.

Also, *MP3* was the third most frequently occurring pattern. The first two positions of the third move pattern were the same as those of *MP2*, but the third position was different. However, *M4* accompanied *M5* in the *SP3A*.

*MP4* comprised two main patterns with an equal number of occurrences. Both were found to start with *M2*, but the second and third positions were different; *M3-M4* in *MP4.1* and *M5-M6* in *MP4.2*. In the third

position, two moves were found to occur concurrently; namely, *M4/M5* in *SP4.1A*, *M6/M4* in *SP4.2A*, and *M6/M5* in *SP4.2B*.

As for *MP5*, its two patterns appeared to be similar. Namely, while both *M4* and *M6* were found to appear in the first and second positions in the two patterns, the third was different, with the emergence of either *M7* or *M8*. It could be interpreted that in LRA abstracts, both discussion and conclusion and implications were used to mark the end of the abstract.

All five patterns assumed that *M4*, *M5*, and *M6* are likely to be typical moves in LRA abstracts as they appeared in every pattern. The literary scholars still introduced research purposes, methodology, and findings in their abstracts. It is conceivable that the first pattern may be the typical pattern of abstracts as this pattern is parallel to the previous research findings, such as Hyland (2000), Swales and Feak (2012), and Tankó (2017). More interestingly, some statements in LRA abstracts carried on a merger between two moves; for instance, the combination of *M4/M5*, *M5/M6*, or *M4/M6*. The merger between moves is in line with Santo's findings (1996).

### 3.3. The Grammatical Cohesions

It is noteworthy that the authors used plenty of cohesive devices to connect statements in order to present smooth text. Cohesive devices were employed the most often in the results section (Tankó, 2017). Likewise, in this study, cohesion devices were employed the most often in *M6*. A discussion of the findings of grammatical cohesion in LRA abstracts follows next.

Of the 88 LRA abstracts, the cumulative frequency of grammatical cohesions was 2,290. The frequency of each type of grammatical cohesion in LRA abstracts is displayed in Table 10.

**Table 10**

*Frequency of Grammatical Cohesion Types in LRA Abstracts*

Grammatical Cohesion Types	<i>f</i>	%
Reference (R)	1,395	60.92
Conjunction (C)	800	34.93
Ellipsis (E)	77	3.36
Substitution (S)	18	0.79
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,290</b>	<b>100</b>

Four types of grammatical cohesions in Table 10 were found in LRA abstracts including *Reference (R)*, *Conjunction (C)*, *Ellipsis (E)*, and *Substitution (S)*. *Reference* had the highest frequency of occurrence (60.92%), and the second most frequent was *Conjunction* (34.93%). *Ellipsis* and *Substitution* were the two least frequent cohesion types, with a very low rate of occurrence at only 3.36% and 0.79%, respectively. The following provides information about grammatical cohesion which was used most often in LRA abstracts.

Concerning the frequency of referential devices, *R2* appeared the most frequently in LRA abstracts. While *R23* occurred most frequently (57.99%), the *R21* occurrence (13.26%), such as *this*, *these*, and *here*, appeared about 4.4 times less often than *R23*. With nearly the same frequency of occurrence, *R14*, such as *they*, *them*, and *their*, had the third highest rate at 10.54%. The frequency of all referential devices in LRA abstracts is summarized in Table 11.

**Table 11**  
*Frequency of Referential Devices in LRA Abstracts*

Types of Reference		<i>f</i>	%
1. Pronominals (R1)	singular, masculine (R11)	11	0.79
	singular, feminine (R12)	1	0.07
	singular, neuter (R13)	56	4.01
	plural (R14)	147	10.54
2. Demonstrative and Definite Article (R2)	demonstrative, near (R21)	185	13.26
	demonstrative, far (R22)	15	1.08
	definite article (R23)	809	57.99
3. Comparative (R3)	identity (R31)	5	0.36
	similarity (R32)	20	1.43
	difference (R33)	39	2.80
	comparison, quantity (R34)	60	4.30
	comparison, quality (R35)	47	3.37
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>1,395</b>	<b>100</b>

The *R23* occurrence was found to be the highest in LRA abstracts. Scholars in the literature field often made use of *the* to refer back to the specific nouns mentioned earlier in LRA abstracts, which in turn establish cohesive links between texts in the preceding and succeeding discourse (Halliday & Hasan, 1976).

Noticeably, the definite article *the* was used exophorically and endophorically. In (21), *the study* functions as exophoric reference because it is identifiable as a specific situation which the authors and the readers know what *the study* conveyed. Furthermore, Santo (1996) proposed that *the* in (21) is used as ‘standing apart from the abstract’.

(21) **The study** investigates the websites... [PS22]

As the example (22) demonstrates the reference *the field and the journal* in [1] and [2] was found to be endophoric reference serving to be cataphoric. It is the signal of the defining element of *Men and Masculinities Studies* and *of Men and Masculinities*, respectively.

- (22) (M3) In this article we begin to map [1] the field of Men and Masculinities Studies by examining 20 years of publications in [2] the journal of Men and Masculinities. ... (M8) We hope that our discussion of these ... will help (re)shape [3] the field and [4] the journal of Men and Masculinities ... academic space. [MM1]

However, the reference *the field and the journal* in [3] and [4] is anaphoric reference, whereby *the* is a cohesive signal. They referred back to [1] and [2], respectively. Markedly, the references are the same words.

In LRA abstracts, R21 included selective nominal demonstratives, *this* and *these*, and a demonstrative adverb, *here*.

The nominal demonstratives refer to an item the author mentioned or the recent article. The demonstrative *this* in (23) was used to mark cataphoric reference to the study being done which tended to be mentioned afterwards in LRA abstracts. It was also used to assimilate the abstract into the body (Santo, 1996).

- (23) This article examines the role of cosmetic surgeons.... [PS29]

On the contrary, a demonstrative determiner was also found to serve as an anaphoric referent, as in (24).

- (24) Moreover, the study of taste remains confined to Western Europe and Anglophone countries, while being blind to transnational dynamics. This special issue expands these debates, .... [PS23]

The researcher used the demonstrative *these* in (24) as reference to ideas in the sentence mentioned before in the abstract. The adoption of a plural demonstrative, as in this case, was a textual organization technique to form a logical relation between larger stretches of discourse and the aforementioned text in LRA abstracts.

#### 4. Conclusion

The findings of this study were presented in three main themes: rhetorical moves, move patterns, and grammatical cohesion in LRA abstracts. With respect to rhetorical moves, the *Finding Move* had the highest frequency of occurrence. Most literary scholars allocate more than half of the available text space in the abstract to reporting findings. LRA abstracts are typically divergent from prototype abstracts since the researchers often report their findings to show scholarly critical reflection on complex sociocultural issues, or an explication that is descriptive, reflective, and analytical in nature, which seems to require a much higher text space. Regarding move patterns, *MP1*, comprising three main moves: *M4*, *M5*, and *M6*, were the most frequent. Literary scholars tend to assign high priority to the outcomes of their research as they believe that the value of their research would be well represented through the insight presented in research findings (Tankó, 2017). Interestingly, move merges were found to be salient in typical move sequences. This could very well reflect a prototypical writing style among researchers in the field of literature, with complex sentence structures that are emblematic of the discourse in LRA abstracts. With regard to the use of grammatical cohesions in LRA abstracts, such commonly used cohesive devices such as *this*, *these*, *their*, *they*, *and*, and *but* were employed to establish cohesion in LRA abstracts. Such grammatical cohesions are utilized in quite a different manner to abstracts in other disciplines.

### Implications of the Study

The results of this research would be beneficial for language pedagogy, especially for academic writing courses. The examined LRA abstracts could be selected and exploited as examples to show students and novice literary scholars what well-composed LRA abstracts look like. To provide deeper insight into LRA abstracts, the scope of further studies might be expanded by including more journals that focus on other lexicogrammatical or socio-cultural issues.

### Acknowledgements

I would like to show my profound gratitude to the Faculty of Humanities at Srinakharinwirot University for funding my research project. They provided overwhelming support that made my project possible. I do hope that my work will make a substantial contribution to the future and the development of society as a whole.

### Reference

- American Psychological Association. (2020). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (7th ed.). American Psychological Association
- Biber, D., Connor, U., & Upton, T. A. (2007). *Discourse on the move using corpus analysis to describe discourse structure*. John Benjamins.
- Crookes, G. (1986). Towards a validated analysis of scientific text structure. *Applied Linguistics*, 7, 57-70.
- Cross, C., & Oppenheim, C. (2006). A genre analysis of scientific abstracts. *Journal of Documentation*, 62(4), 428-446.
- Doró, K. (2013). The rhetoric structure of research article abstracts in English studies journals. *Prague Journal of English Studies*, 2, 119-139.

- Dudley-Evans, T. (1986). Genre analysis: An investigation of the introduction and discussion sections of MSc. dissertations. In M. Coulthard (Ed.), *Talking about text* (pp. 128-145). English Language Research, The University of Birmingham.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. Longman.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2014). *Halliday's introduction to functional grammar* (4th ed.). Routledge.
- Hyland, K. (2000). *Disciplinary discourses: Social interactions in academic writing*. Longman.
- Kanoksilapatham, B. (2005). Rhetorical structure of biochemistry research articles. *English for Specific Purposes*, 24(3), 269-292.
- Kanoksilapatham, B. (2013). Generic characterisation of civil engineering research article abstracts. *The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*, 19(3), 1-10.
- Lon, C. E., Tan, H., & Abdullah, A. N. (2012). Conveying communicative intent: Moves and metadiscourse in abstract writing. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 1(7), 56-65.
- Lorés, R. (2004). On RA abstracts: From rhetorical structure to thematic organization. *English for Specific Purposes*, 23(3), 280-302.
- Marefat, H., & Mohammadzadeh, S. (2013). Genre analysis of literature research article abstracts: A cross-linguistic, cross-cultural study. *Applied Research on English Language*, 2(2), 37-50.
- Martin, P. M. (2003). A genre analysis of English and Spanish research paper abstracts in experimental social sciences. *English for Specific Purposes*, 22, 25-43.
- Pasavoravate, Y. (2011). *Genre analysis of thesis and dissertation abstracts in linguistics written by students in Thailand and students in England*. [Unpublished doctoral thesis], Chulalongkorn University.
- Pho, P. (2008). Research article abstracts in applied linguistics and educational technology: A study of linguistic realizations of rhetorical structure and authorial stance. *Discourse Studies*, 10(2), 231-250.

- 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. D. (1996). The textual organization of research paper abstracts in applied linguistics. *Text*, 16(4), 481-499.
- Stotesbury, H. (2003). Evaluation in research article abstracts in the narrative and hard sciences. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 2(4), 327-341.
- Suntara, W., & Usaha, S. (2013). Research article abstracts in two related disciplines: Rhetorical variation between linguistics and applied linguistics. *English Language Teaching*, 6(2), 84-99.
- Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre analysis: Explorations and applications*. Cambridge University Press.
- Swales, J. M. (2004). *Research genres: Explorations and applications*. Cambridge University Press.
- Swales, J. M., & Feak, C. B. (2009). *Abstracts and the writing of abstracts*. The University of Michigan Press.
- Swales, J. M., & Feak, C. B. (2012). *Academic writing for graduate students*. The University of Michigan Press.
- Tankó, G. (2017). Literary research article abstracts: An analysis of rhetorical moves and their linguistic realizations. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 27, 42-55.
- Tampanich S., & Soranastaporn, S. (2018). Word frequency and sentence structure in stating objectives in review articles: Useful findings for EFL learners and novice researchers. *KKU International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 8(1), 91-125.
- Tseng, F. (2011). Analyses of move structure and verb tense of research article abstracts in applied linguistics journals. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 1(2), 27-39.