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Abstract
This descriptive study sought to examine the structural features of Thesis Acknowledgements (TA) from two disciplines in two Ghanaian Universities. Forty TAs were sampled from the fields of Chemistry and English. Hyland’s (2004) generic move structure was modified in analyzing the sampled TAs. The data was also examined on the basis of the two institutions’ academic style guides for conformity. The findings indicate that the structural features of TAs from the two fields differ. It also revealed that out of the seven steps identified in the obligatory Elaborative Move, DoC writers generally use three steps, and DoE writers mostly use four steps. It is further revealed that while writers from the DoC mostly acknowledged contributors for their technical support, writers from DoE acknowledged their helpers for providing materials for the research. It was revealed that the data followed the institutional style guide. The paper argues that though the contextual difference in the TAs from both fields is minimal, subtle variances and parallels still exist between the two fields. Therefore, it is suggested that these variations in linguistic forms that account for the discursive styles of the TAs should be further examined. Finally, additional analysis by corpus analytic tools applied to large data from the research context could complement this study.
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Introduction
The growing focus of researchers, in recent times, on occluded genres such as the preface (Tökösy de Zepetnek, 2010; Mohsenzadeh, 2013) blurbs (Basturkmen, 2009), and acknowledgments (Hyland, 2004; Afful, 2016; Al-Ali, 2010) against well-known academic genres such as journals, books, and thesis stem from the ideal role these genres play in the professional and academic discourse communities (Swales, 1988). However, these occluded genres’ scholarly attention cannot be compared to well-known genres (Hyland, 2004; Al-Ali, 2010; Kuo, 2018) attributes this to the fact that these genres are not considered part of the main text of professional or academic genres. Though not considered part of the main text, the acknowledgment section is integral to scholarly interaction in the discourse community (Yang, 2013). It is a fact that most
published works contain an acknowledgment as part of the content (Hyland, 2003). For Brodkey (1987), acknowledgment is a formal property of scholarly texts. This is because the impression a writer creates in the acknowledgment affects the entire work, as this section may be the beginning phase of the whole work (Cronin & Overfelt, 1994).

Thesis acknowledgment, which is referred to as a “part genre” by Giannoni (2002) and a “Cinderella genre” by Hyland (2003), is strictly not academic and entirely not personal but belongs to the institutional group (Hyland, 2003). Its presence in texts dates back to decades when acknowledging the rich and famous was a prerequisite for publication; the current social, economic and political atmosphere has not changed its importance (Hyland, 2003). It enables researchers to formally appreciate the roles their mentors played, show love to their loved ones for their sacrifices, and share their experiences in the research writing process (Hyland, 2003). It shows the personal and interpersonal relationships in the discourse community. The stronger this network, the stronger the influence of experts on a particular piece of work (Cheng & Kuo, 2011). Cronin and Overfelt (1994) believe acknowledgments are not inconsequential meta-fictional superfluities but recognized accounts of substantial scholarly impact. This notion means that the totality of the research is not the writer’s product alone but rather a representation of the collective efforts of other experts who contributed to the production of the text. The acknowledgment section shows the writer’s journey and their collaborations, associations, and credibility in the discourse community. Giannoni (2002) describes the thematic concerns of the acknowledgment as the awareness of interpersonal relationships that help the researcher develop; the appreciation of helpers to show decorum and gratefulness; building an expert identity, and appreciating colleagues for their intellectual support. This collaborative role of shared appreciation reflects important values in academia (Hyland, 2004).

Thesis acknowledgments allow student researchers to coordinate personal accomplishments and communal onuses gained in writing a project Hyland (2003). The last few decades have witnessed an increase in the interest of academics in genre-based studies. This interest has led to an upsurge in research by genre analysts, discourse analysts, language teachers, communication experts, and rhetoricians, among others in the area (Bhatia, 2002). Despite the interest in analyzing such genres, researchers’ attention is tilted towards the more elaborate sections of the research work and the other well-known genres Hyland (2004). Comparatively, relatively few studies have investigated the rhetorical structure of TAs, especially in the African context (Nkemleke, 2006; Afful, 2016; Afful & Mwinlaaru, 2012). Afful (2016) has noted this in his study of undergraduate students’ TAs. Internet surfing was also done to check for related works in this area. Again, the institutional repositories of some five public universities were searched for related works on TAs. The search yielded few results (Afful, 2016; Afful & Mwinlaaru, 2012; Kudorje, 2010; Afful & Awoonor-Aziaku, 2017). At the same time, all these studies came from one socio-cultural context. Although these studies contribute to such a context, there is a need for further
investigation into the numerous facets of the genre. The current study fills the gap in previous studies regarding the structure of TAs across disciplines. Based on the socio-cultural contexts in Ghana, the study examines the structural patterns in the TAs written by postgraduate researchers in the fields of Chemistry and English, where the writing style guide of the institutions is also examined to determine writers’ conformity to the outline in the manual. The study will assist future researchers with a significant opportunity to express and organize their appreciation in a more organized, context-appropriate, and accepted disciplinary format.

Giannoni (2002) conducted the first known research on acknowledgments from a socio-pragmatic perspective in research articles written in English and Italian. He pointed out that authors preferred their acknowledgments centered on generic complexities, individual participation, peer-referencing, and authorial accountability (Giannoni, 2002). Giannoni’s study is significant because it is the first research that systematically investigates the structure of acknowledgments in research articles. However, the study is limited to acknowledgments in RAs and not TAs. The two are not the same, as experts write RAs while TAs are written by students who are non-experts. In addition, the authorial roles, individual tenacities, and author-reader dynamics in TAs and RAs are different, as are the freedom of expression and sincerity (Cheng, & Kuo, 2011). Hyland (2004) conducted a study on Postgraduate dissertation acknowledgments by second-language speakers of English in Hong Kong and outlined a three-tier model: Reflecting Move, Thanking Move, and Announcing Move. Hyland’s (2004) study is significant to this current study because of the analytical framework used; however, the framework had to be modified to suit the present study because of some differences between Hyland’s and the current study’s data. While Hyland employs master’s and doctoral students, this study uses only master’s students. Although these studies focused on English as a second language, the social and cultural settings of the studies are different and, as such, have a significant influence on the findings. Al-Ali (2010) modified Hyland (2004) model to propose an eight-tier model incorporating the socio-cultural aspects of acknowledgments. Although Al-Ali (2010) focused on non-native users, such studies on social and cultural settings cannot be overlooked (Cheng, 2012).

A comparative study conducted by Yang (2013) examined one hundred and twenty acknowledgments within a common culture (Chinese and Hong Kong writers) and identified a new step called “making a confession”. The study’s findings revealed variations between the studied disciplines due largely to the study’s aim, academic conventions, the researcher’s proficiency in the language used, and the study’s socio-cultural context.

Further research from a cultural perspective in the African setting by Nkemleke (2006) reveals that students use garrulous and decorative language to express their gratitude. He concludes that the construction of TAs by Cameroonian students is due to respect for age and the communal tendencies in the African culture. Kudjordjie (2010) compares two hundred TAs written by undergraduates from the University of Cape Coast in Ghana and
concludes that TAs from the English department were lengthier than those from the Entomology and Wildlife department. However, the linguistic choices of the two groups were similar. This study is relevant to the present research because of English TAs. In contrast, its focus is on undergraduate TAs; the present study focuses on TAs at the postgraduate level. Afful and Mwinlaaru (2012) conducted a study on TA focusing on sub-disciplinary variation. The study reveals some sub-disciplinary differences between Education, Guidance Counselling, and Educational Administration Management. The study conforms to the move structure identified in previous studies (Al-Ali, 2010; Hyland, 2004). The review of these studies has provided the needed insight to put the present study into perspective.

There has been an increase in scholarship on the concept of a discourse community, probably because it helps an individual to understand the nature of academic discourse, particularly for non-expert writers. Swales (1990) identifies a discourse community as “a broadly agreed set of common public goals” (Swales, 1990:24). Swales believes such goals are general but could be “high level or abstract” (Swales, 1990:25). In a particular academic context, such goals could be seen in the community’s content and structure of research work. The goals are ‘common’ because a common purpose is to exchange knowledge and information in a particular field of study.

The second feature is the “mechanism for intercommunication between members” (Swales, 1988:212). According to Swales, participation refers to being formally identified as an active member. Bazerman (1985) believes that the affiliates in a particular community may actively exchange and accumulate knowledge throughout their lives. The third characteristic of a discourse community is the information dissemination mechanism between members. This process may take varied forms, such as meetings, emails, blogs, and newsletters, to enable networking within the community. Freed and Broadhead (1987) suggest that this communication mechanism is governed by institutional norms generated by the discourse community. Zappen (1989) believes that institutional norms that govern rhetorical decisions should conform to acceptable practices within a profession or discipline. This issue implies that membership in a particular discourse community involves active interaction to achieve common goals. According to Berkenkotter and Huckin (1995), gaining entry to the research community and maintaining memberships is acquired and supported by learning the appropriate generic conventions, which will help non-expert writers learn the genres, values, beliefs, and conventions that the community’s members usually use. This issue allows non-experts to learn the ethics of their disciplines by studying and collaborating with experienced researchers in their disciplinary fields (Bazerman, 1985). According to Swales, a discourse community develops and preserves prospects shaped by the genres that articulate the operation in the community (Swales, 1990). So, this acquisition of specific lexis is “determined by the desire for effective communication among experts” (Swales, 1990:26), and this is the fifth feature of a discourse community. The common realizations of the specialized lexicon, like jargon and acronyms, are unique to the community. Since this technical terminology is
shared among the discourse community members, new members must learn this specialized language. In the case of postgraduate writing, the supervisors or mentors who represent that community might play this disciplinary role. It is important because the supervisors or mentors examine whether the novice displays the knowledge of the specialized features of the discourse community in their works.

Lastly, there is a threshold for members with an appropriate, relevant degree of expertise (Swales, 1988). According to Swales, memberships may change with time, so the continuous stay of the community is mostly dependent on the ratio between the new entrants and experts. Therefore, a vibrant discourse community must continually admit new members to preserve and grow expertise in the discourse community. Discourse community as a concept is not without challenges in terms of application. The challenges result from the criteria for practical application and discipline-based variations in writing. First, the notion of discourse community lacks a detailed description of how each feature is measured. For example, the idea of generalizing the ‘common public goal’ is not specified and may result in different interpretations. Also, the growth of discipline-specific research in writing may imply variations in the application of the concept. Still, its application to other variables makes it useful to the current study, which focuses on the acknowledgments section of the master’s thesis. The discussion so far indicates that academic writing takes place in an academic discourse community, and according to Swales (1988), genres are the properties of discourse communities. Therefore, the thesis acknowledgment, which is part of the academic genres, can be seen as part of the academic discourse community. Thus, the concept is useful for the present study to analyze the discourse community’s acknowledgements.

Tertiary institutions as a discourse community have house styles that writers in the discourse community follow to produce suitable texts which members of the community will accept. An academic house style is an important document that defines an institution’s brand. It is a set of rules regarding the writing and presentation of documents produced by an institution (e.g., thesis or dissertation). Most institutions of higher learning have such manuals to serve as a guide for writers. This guide has all the important information for writers to produce materials that best represent the institutions. In addition, the guide serves as a reference from which writers make their choices.

The objective of codifying what should be written may differ from regulating the image of an establishment by maintaining set standards and following set conventions; to a need for accuracy and precision. It serves as a reference from which writers make their choices.

Academic house style provides information on issues concerning grammar and spelling and information on the structure of research papers, capitalization, abbreviation, italicization, documentation resources, and content of the research paper, including the preliminary sections: dedication, acknowledgment, table of content, and abstract (Waddingham, 2014). According to Sekyi-Baidoo (2003), institutions adopt specialized academic house styles. Notable
among them are the Modern Language Association (MLA), the American Psychological Association (APA), and the Chicago Manual of Style (Chicago style).

The differences in the writing style of various institutions may result from the style guide used in writing tasks. There are different instruction manuals for writers in various tertiary institutions in Ghana. Each institution has a unique style and may demand students to write to reflect their unique styles. One of the interesting areas of these guides for research is the acknowledgment instructions section. Afful and Mwinlaaru (2012) report that student participants in their study are prohibited from acknowledging the supernatural in their acknowledgments; however, the current study’s instruction manuals do not explicitly prohibit students from acknowledging the supernatural (UG-Graduate Handbook, 2014; KNUST Graduate Handbook, 2016).

Most tertiary institutions have in-house-style protocols to guide writers. However, there are few studies on the in-house style of institutions in Ghana, which may be a challenge for students and other scholars with similar interests.

Method

This descriptive study with a qualitative research paradigm supported by quantitative parameters explores forty MPhil TAs in English and Chemistry from the University of Ghana and Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology. Ten TAs selected from each discipline made a total of twenty TAs from each university. The TAs collected were published from 2007 to 2018. Purposive sampling was applied to select disciplines and TAs. To select the text that could represent TAs from the two disciplines, ample time was taken to go through the online institutional repositories of the two institutions to look at the list of masters’ theses on the website. A total of eight thousand three hundred and fifty-nine (8359) master’s thesis were found on the KNUST institutional repository; English had 30 TAs, and Chemistry had twenty-two (22) TAs on the website. UG had a total of four thousand three hundred and six (4301) TAs; forty (40) of the TAs came from Chemistry and forty-two (42) from English.

The TAs were copied and printed for coding. Two photocopies of each TA were made and assigned unique numbers such as KC 1-10 (where-KC stands for Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology-Chemistry). The TAs from English were assigned serial numbers KE 1-10 (where KE stands for Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology –English). TAs from the UG -Chemistry were assigned serial numbers UC1-10 (where UC stands for University of Ghana - Chemistry). Finally, the TAs from English were assigned serial numbers UE 1-10 (where UE stands for University of Ghana – English). To ensure privacy regarding names used in the TAs, the letter Z was used to replace names in the data.

Hyland (2004) generic model for DA analysis was modified as the analytical framework for the study. The three-tier move structure employed in the study was the Opening Move, Elaborating Move, and Closing Move. In discussing the steps, a distinction is made between technical and material resources.

The technical resources refer to the technical expertise needed to carry out the research work; for instance, at the laboratory
(technicians), while the material resource refers to the books and other reading materials. The writers in Hyland (2004) study and the current study differ slightly in terms of focus. For instance, whereas writers in Hyland’s study have a step for the dedication of their projects, there is no such step in the current study. There is also a difference in the naming of the first move. Again, in Hyland’s model, there are four steps in the thanking move, but the same cannot be said for the current study. Therefore, it is vital to devise a model that will be more suitable for the present study. Hence, it is required to adapt Hyland’s model to cater to this data set. Al-Ali (2010) believed that the difference in realizing the moves and steps stems from the socio-cultural contexts of these texts and the fact that analysts want to be innovative and explorative Samraj (2002). Bruce (2010) believes that the observed differences could result from the epistemology of the disciplines and their way of writing. Table 1 is the modified framework to aid in analyzing the sampled data.

### Table 1

**Move Structure of Acknowledgements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>MOVE</th>
<th>STEPS/ACTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>OPENING MOVE</td>
<td>Step 1.1 Reflecting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ELABORATIVE MOVE</td>
<td>Step 2.1 Presenting Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Step 2.2 Thanking God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Step 2.3 Thanking supervisor (s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Step 2.4 Thanking Academics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Step 2.5 Thanking for Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thanking you for the Technical/Material support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thanking for Financial Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thanking you for clerical Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>CLOSING MOVE</td>
<td>Step 3.1 Reiterative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Step 3.2 Commissive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Modified from Hyland 2004 Model*

The TAs were analyzed to identify the structure. The analysis was done twice within a four-week interval with the help of one researcher with experience in Genre Studies to ensure its reliability.

Some sentences that did not contribute to any of the moves were not considered to ensure a clear and agreeable identification process.
Findings and Discussion

The data reveals that the structural patterns of TAs from the two disciplines are varied. The DoE has a three-level structure: Opening, Elaborative, and Closing Moves; the DoC has a two-level structure: Elaborative Move and Closing Move. The following outcomes were revealed in the study. The Opening Move, which is an optional move, has one step (reflective step).

This move serves as an introductory section to the acknowledgment. However, writers in this study rarely utilized this move, as only 5% of the acknowledgments from English contained the move. The writers who employed the reflective step were interested in recounting their “... difficult but very educative” (KE-7) “... lessons in perseverance” (KE-6). It is also clear that writers from English may include a reflection on their experiences in the research (Hyland, 2004). Other studies such as Afful (2016), Afful & Mwinlaaru, 2012; Yang (2012); Hyland (2004), and Al-Ali (2006) identified this step in their data, although these previous studies recorded higher figures than this current study. Also, the usage context differs in this data set, as all the writers who utilized this step came from one geographical context (KNUST).

This current study renamed the Thanking Move as Elaborative Move and identified seven steps. The changes were meant to differentiate explicit thanking as a move and thanking as a step. All the forty writers, indicating 100%, employed this move, but not all the steps were utilized. Presentation of participants appeared in (7.5%) of the TAs. However, it was more dominant in the acknowledgments from English (5%). The essence of the step was to appreciate the collaborative efforts of the various contributors to the research.

Extract 1
“The successful completion of this study would not have been accomplished without a few people’s guidance, cooperation, and support. Though I can’t pay them back commensurably, I would like to register my appreciation for their contribution to the piece of work” (KE-9).

Unfortunately, it is not possible for me to thank everyone who has contributed to this thesis; If I forget to mention your name, forgive me. (UE-6)

Thanking God as a step occurred in 75% of the TAs. The step is exemplified in the following lines:

Extract 2
My greatest thanks go to the Almighty God for his grace, mercy, love, and protection. (KC-4)

I thank the Almighty God for His grace and mercies for my life and how far He has brought me. (UE-1)

The step frequently occurred in DoE (42.5%) than DoC (32.5%). Appreciating God for the successful completion of the research work indicates the impact of religion on the lives of these writers, which aligns with previous studies (Al-Ali, 2006; Afful & Mwinlaaru, 2012; Hyland, 2004) where writers expressed their gratitude to God due to the intricate link between religion, social and academic aspects of life. Interestingly, previous studies indicated
writers’ use of this step, although such usage is prohibited by the graduate writing guide of the institution (Afful & Mwinlaaru, 2012; Afful, 2016). The two institutions’ writing guide although instruct writers to acknowledge tangible entities do not make any explicit reference. It means that writers’ appreciation to a supreme Being has more to do with their religious tendencies than their strict adherence to the institutional writing guides.

Thanking Supervisors is an obligatory step in the move structure. The step occurred in all the forty DAs. This obligatory step was used to show gratitude to individuals for academic support. The support was in various forms. The writers indicated the various forms of assistance, such as mentorship, guidance, inspiration, and constructive criticism received from supervisors. Supervisors were the first people to be acknowledged for academic assistance. An example is indicated below:

Extract 3
I am also deeply indebted to my Supervisors, Prof. ZZZ and Dr. ZZZ, for their tolerance of me and their constructive criticism, which has shaped my work and enabled me to complete this program successfully. (UE-7)

This step was used to show gratitude to individuals for academic support. For example, acknowledging supervisors for their assistance was the first step in 15% of TAs in DoE and 35% in DoC.

Thanking Academics is also given attention in the TAs as shown in extract 4:
I wish to thank all lecturers at the department of languages ... for sharing their knowledge and experience with me in the spirit of sincerity and conviviality (KE-9).

The step occurred in 60% of the data, that is, most of the writers appreciated the help of other faculty members, which shows scholarly influence on the research work. One reason for the high percentage of this step, according to Hyland (2004), could be the need to stay connected with these professionals who may already be established in the field.

Thanking for Resources has three sub-steps: thanking for technical/material support, financial assistance, and clerical assistance. The step was divided into three parts according to the resource obtained. Seventy-five percent (75%) of writers employed this step. Out of this number, DoC had (52.5%) of writers, and DoE had 22.5% of writers. Thanking for technical/material resources appeared in 47.5% of the TAs. Extract 5 is a typical example of this step:

I would also like to express my sincere appreciation to Mr. ZZZZ, a staff of the CSIR, for assisting me with the laboratory analysis in the laboratory. (UC-1)

My sincere gratitude to Mr. ZZZZZ ... for helping draw some of the diagrams we see in this work. (KE-10)

It is important to note that the DoC acknowledged technical support while DoE acknowledged material support. Fourteen (35%) TAs came from DoC, while five (12.5%) were from DoE. These figures indicate how important this sub-step is to the writers in the DoC. This finding could be due to the disciplines and research conducted.

Thanking for financial assistance featured prominently in DoC more than DoE. 22.5% of writers had financial support, 15% of which came from Chemistry. The lack of funding in the
DoE could be due to discipline, its research focus and how it is able to attract scholarship (Afful, 2016; Hyland, 2004). Again, there is a difference between the funding sources for these two disciplines. Whereas writers from the DoC enjoyed funding mostly from institutions and rarely from family, writers in the DoE received funding from only family. Afful (2016) believes these results from the immediate result-oriented nature of the sciences over the long-term nature of programs in the Humanities such as English. Thanking for Clerical Assistance was the least acknowledged resource of this step; it was present in just 5% of the TAs. Its occurrence in the TAs was context-specific, as illustrated in extract 6.

Extract 6:
My profound gratitude goes to Mr. ZZZZZ of SSNIT, Adum-Kumasi, and MMrZZZZZ of the University of Education, Winneba, for assisting me in the typesetting (KC-8).

ZZZZZ, my former Teaching Assistant, you have been a huge pillar of support. You graciously offered to type the work. You made me understand why Buchi Emecheta says good men are the salt of the earth! (KE-6)

Most writers’ low patronage for clerical assistance could be that students now have more access to technology and other digital resources than before; however, this is different from Afful and Mwinlairu’s (2012) study, where 71% of TAs contained this substep. Thanking for Moral Support featured prominently in the texts, with 75% of the writers employing it. The support received included encouragement, love and care, emotional and spiritual support, and commitment. There is a contextual variation in the use of this step. In contrast, the graduate school brochure of UG is not specific about whom to thank (UG-Graduate Handbook, 2014); the KNUST graduate brochure mentions the kind of help writers could acknowledge (KNUST Graduate Handbook, 2016). Writers from the DoE were more benevolent with their appreciation than the DoC.

Thanking for other forms of Support is the last step in the Elaborative Move. It talks about the various forms of assistance received from individuals and institutions, implicitly stated in the TAs. This step is present in 30% of the TAs, and its occurrence cuts across the disciplines. For instance, extract 7 is an exemplification of the step., “My final appreciation goes to my siblings: ZZZZZ, ZZZZZ, for their assistance” (KC-8). This step is appreciating individuals who were instrumental in the research but whose roles have not been adequately defined.

The Closing Move has two steps: the reiterative and the commissive steps. The reiterative step is used to reemphasize the writer’s gratitude to all; it occurred in 10% of the data. This step is exemplified in the following text.

Extract 8:
Finally, I extend my warmest appreciation to all and sundry, who contributed in diverse ways to prepare the work (KC-7). Finally, I thank all persons (known or unknown) whose expertise and resources aided me in producing this work (UC-9). To all who have contributed in diverse ways to the success of this project, I say...
a big thank you and God bless you all (KE-10).

... I sincerely thank you all (UE-2).

Writers use this step to thank all who helped them in diverse way to make the project a reality but whose names may not be explicitly mentioned. The lack of acknowledgement for this step may indicate that most of the writers may have exhausted their lists of acknowledges.

The commissive step, which is the second step in the closing move is used to specify the authorial responsibility of the writers for the research. It occurred in 5% of the data. This could mean that majority of writers were not ready to authenticate the authorship of their work. It could also mean that writers did not schematic structure of this genre. The extract 9 examplifies the step:

... I must conclude that I bear sole responsibility for any errors in this thesis (UE-6).

... I am entirely responsible for errors of fact or reasoning in this work (KE-9).

Unlike writers from DoC, who utilized only the reiterative step, writers from DoE used both steps in the Closing Move. The words ‘sole’ and ‘entirely’ show how the writers show ownership of their work. This could be an indication of the investment writers may have put in the work to come out with the best and be able to trust the quality of the work to accept responsibility.

Conclusion

The study has indicated the variance and parallels in the rhetoric of students’ discourse due to the subtle disciplinary and contextual variations, particularly in thesis acknowledgments. It could be concluded that TAs exhibit an overall discursive structure made up of moves and steps, thus further confirming that language as patterned activity is often genre-specific.

The study also established that writers’ socio-cultural and discipline underpinnings influence discourse produced in the community. Furthermore, writers’ adherence to the academic house style could help achieve uniformity which is crucial for most institutions. Finally, additional analysis by corpus analytic tools, which may be applied to large data from the research context, could be done to complement this study.
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