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Abstract
This study aims at analysing moves and steps of public and private universities’ English Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and finding similarities and differences in both corpora. Two corpora comprising of 47 public universities’ MOUs and 10 private universities’ MOUs were analysed based on two previous frameworks. However, for analytical purposes, these universities’ information related to their identities such as a university’s name and a logo, a program’s name, an authorized person’s name, and a signature were blinded to preserve confidentiality. The findings revealed that the most frequent moves and steps in both sets of data were Move 1 (Title), Move 3 (Date of agreement), Move 4 (Parties’ identity), Step 4.1 (Parties’ names), Move 6 (Content), Step 6.1 (Scope of understanding), Move 7 (Signatures), and Step 7.1 (Name), followed by Move 5 (Aim of the MOU) and Step 6.4 (Implementation and termination). Moreover, Move 2 (Background), Move 8 (Focal points), and Move 9 (Additional annexes as required) were more important moves in the private universities’ MOUs. The frequency of these moves may be because of an awareness of the importance of a private university’s motive to exist. Therefore, in order to base their existence on making profits, stating the benefits of the MOU, agreed on work plans, budgetary matters are likely to be found in the private universities’ MOUs. Furthermore, Step 6.3 (Confidentiality) was prominent in the MOUs of the private universities. This may be because private universities aim to overtake their competitors and maximize their profit. Consequently, they give confidentiality importance more than public universities do. This paper is, therefore believed to contribute to writers and readers, especially those from non-English backgrounds to facilitate their MOU writing and reading. It also has some pedagogical implications for academic writing courses for students who from non-English backgrounds.
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Introduction
Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) has been used broadly for building collaboration. It is “the document contains mutual understanding between the parties before the agreement is made” (Rajagukguk, 1997, p. 46). Muhammad (1990) explained that MOU is an agreement between two or more persons who tied themselves to do something in term of wealth. The essential aim of MOU is to show the determination of parties indicating content and details in MOU which is agreed concurrently. However, it is widely recognized that MOU is difficult to write and troublesome for both native and non-native speakers. Since MOU needs to be signed it is important to avoid misleading or inaccurate statements (Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology University, n.d.). Moreover, MOU writers need to meet the cognitive demands of MOU and have skills for writing in the directive and commissive styles (Cavalieri, 2013).
There have been some studies investigating MOU in the existing literature. For example, Mashuri (2013) studied MOU’s social function, schematic structure, and linguistic features. Kyriacopouloua, Tsakanikib and Tziafab (2013) used a corpus-based analysis for analysing MOU on financial agreements. For Cavalieri’s (2013) study, it explored the differences in the use of modal verbs when performing illocutionary acts in the case of three legal genres: MOU, the Letter of Intent, and a contract. Cavalieri (2013) focused on the directive and commissive speech acts, which were very common in these types of official documents. However, there have not been previous studies, which analysed moves and steps of English MOU of public and private universities. Consequently, this research’s main purpose is to analyse moves and steps of MOUs in both corpora.

**Research objectives**

For the above reasons, this paper first aims to investigate moves and steps between English MOUs of public and private universities in Thailand. Then, it examines whether there are similarities and/or differences in moves and steps of English MOUs of these two different contexts (public universities and private universities). In the hope that this study’s findings may, to a certain extent, be valuable to inexperienced writers when writing MOU. In addition, the differences found between the two corpora may raise practitioners’ awareness about moves and steps of English MOU, which will assist them to write MOU in an acceptable form.

**Research Questions**

Based on the above objectives, the research questions of this study are addressed as follows:

1. What are the moves and steps of English MOUs of public and private universities in Thailand?
2. What are similarities and differences between English MOUs of public and private universities in Thailand?

**Literature Review**

**Genre Analysis**

Genre has been a widespread outline for analyzing the form and function of discourse. According to Hayati, Shokouhi, and Hadadi (2011), genre analysis, as an important approach to text analysis, especially in ESP, has been developed by the studies of Swales (1990). Swales (1990) suggested that a genre is a class of communicative events, revealing some shared set of communicative purposes, which are recognized by members of the specific professional or academic community in which the genre occurs. In conclusion, it could be said that genre analysis is the way to analyze the form and feature as well as pattern of language. Bhatia (1993) recommended that for analyzing unfamiliar genres, it is necessary to consider some or all of the seven steps: (1) Placing the given genre-text in a situational context, (2) Surveying existing literature, (3) Refining the situational/Contextual analysis, (4) Selecting corpus, (5) Studying the institutional context, (6) Levels of linguistic analysis, and (7) Specialist information in genre analysis. For this study, Bhatia’s (1993) steps were employed.

**Memorandum of Understanding Genre**

The genre analysis of MOU has been hardly ever done. Based on reviewing literature, there were four templates for writing MOU from three previous studies (Warnika, 2002; Salim, 2007; Suhardana, 2008) and World Meteorological Organization’s (2012) MOUs template. For this study, the analysis framework of English MOUs of public and private universities’ moves
and steps was based on Salim’s (2007) study and World Meteorological Organization’s (2012) MOUs template in order to able to analyze the MOUs in more detail as follows:

Move 1 Title
Move 2 Background
Move 3 Date of agreement
Move 4 Parties’ identity
   Step 4.1 Parties’ names
   Step 4.2 Parties’ addresses
   Step 4.3 Parties’ status or positions
Move 5 Aim of the MOU
Move 6 Content
   Step 6.1 Scope of understanding
   Step 6.2 Mutual expense and reliance
   Step 6.3 Confidentiality
   Step 6.4 Implementation and termination
   Step 6.5 Modifications
   Step 6.6 Governing law and jurisdiction
Move 7 Signatures
   Step 7.1 Name
   Step 7.2 Position
   Step 7.3 Logo of the company
Move 8 Focal points
Move 9 Additional annexes as required

Move and Step Analysis

Based on Salim (2007) and World Meteorological Organization (2012), each move and step functions differently. Move 1 presents the term or identity of MOU. Move 2 provides the context and general objectives and benefits of MOU, a brief summary of the circumstances leading to the creation of MOU, and the status of MOU in relation to other existing agreements. Move 3 involves day, date, month, and year where MOU is made. Move 4 consists of three steps, (1) “parties’ names”, (2) “parties’ addresses”, and (3) “parties’ status or positions”. Move 5 is referred to the expected outcomes of MOU, including intended societal benefits. Move 6 consists of six steps, (1) “Scope of understanding”, (2) “Mutual expense and reliance”, (3) “Confidentiality”, (4) “Implementation and termination”, (5) “Modifications”, and (6) “Governing law and jurisdiction”. The first step represents the boundaries of MOU – what is included and what is excluded in it, while the second is the charges that may be incurred by both parties who hold mutual funds and interdependence on one another and having the faith, confidence, and trust shared between both parties. The third step indicates confidence or intimacy; imparting private matters. The fourth step presents the carrying out, execution, or practice of a plan, a method, or any design, idea, model, specification, standard or policy for doing something and signifies the final determination of the action. For the fifth step, it refers to mutually agreed changes or alterations made to MOU. The sixth step specifies which legal system will apply to the interpretation of the agreement and its effect if a dispute arises, and a jurisdiction clause agreeing which party will have jurisdiction to hear disputes arising from MOU. Move 7 consists of three steps, (1) “Name”, (2) “Position”, and (3) “Logo of the company”. Move 8 represents information on the names and contact details of nominated people to handle technical, managerial and/or administrative aspects of MOU. Move 9 functions as supplementary material that provides more detail on relevant matters, including such things as agreed work plans, milestones, timelines, budgetary matters (if required), etc.
Methodology

Research Design

Descriptive qualitative research which describes the subject, or the object of the research based on the fact or reality was used as a research design. Moreover, the researcher employed Bhatia’s (1993) seven steps as described below.

1. Placing the given genre-text in a situational context

The researcher increased her knowledge of English MOU and how to write them from various sources such as books, previous studies. This helped her to understand what MOU is, its outline, and how to write it in general.

2. Surveying existing literature

Research or studies conducted on a similar genre of English MOU in a similar context and similar professional setting as the public and private universities has been scarce and was unavailable at the moment when this study was conducted.

3. Refining the situational/contextual analysis

The writers of English MOUs were officers of public and private universities in Thailand. In the MOUs, the officers outline the intent of one party toward another with regard to an agreement. Then the MOUs must be signed by all parties to be valid.

4. Selecting corpus

The selected corpus was English MOUs prepared by officers in public and private universities in Thailand. The MOUs were used to establish cooperation in research and in academic/cultural activities between universities.

5. Studying the institutional context

For this study’s institutional context, they were 47 public universities and 10 private universities in Thailand. These universities were ranked in the list of Ranking Web of Universities (2018). This ranking web’s indicators are not based on the number of visits or page design but on the global performance and visibility of the universities.

6. Levels of linguistic analysis

The moves and the steps of English MOUs in public and private universities were identified.

7. Specialist information in genre analysis

Although the goal of qualitative research is to discover how people think or feel on a topic, it is necessary to ensure that this subjective data is analyzed objectively and analytically and provides valid and/or accurate findings. Therefore, for this study, the inter-rater reliability of the codes of the moves and steps would be obtained. The researcher asked three experts in applied linguistics to do the inter-rater reliability. This helped to distinguish if the coding schemes were successfully classifying the data, and also if the coders were consistently applying the schemes to the data.

Source of Data

The researcher found English MOUs from the ranking list of universities in Thailand from Ranking Web of Universities. Since 2004 and every six months this website provides reliable, multidimensional, updated and useful information about the performance of universities from all over the world based on their web presence and impact (Ranking Web of Universities, 2018). From the ranking list, there were 177 universities including 89 public universities, 64 private universities, and 24 autonomous universities. In this study, English MOUs were from public and private universities which are the majority of university’s types Thailand. However, autonomous universities can use the study’s findings for understanding and writing their MOUs. Out of 153 MOUs of public and private universities, there were 47
MOUs of public universities and 10 MOUs of private universities, sought through internet accessibility. Therefore, they were selected as a corpus for analysis in this study. However, for analytical purposes, these universities’ information related to their identities such as a university’s name and a logo, an authorized person’s name, a program’s name, a signature was blinded in order to preserve confidentiality. Moreover, the universities were re-named and numbered not based on the ranking list. For example, Pub1 and Pri1 stand for the first public university and first private university respectively.

Data Collection
The data of this study were collected by using the following steps:

1. Firstly, the researcher searched public and private universities in Thailand from Ranking Web of Universities (2018).
2. Secondly, the researcher searched English MOUs from each university. If they could be accessible, they would be saved in a computer. The MOUs were separated into two folders: a public university and a private university. There were 47 MOUs of public universities and 10 MOUs of private universities as a corpus for analysis.
3. Thirdly, all MOUs have blinded their identities, re-named, and numbered.

Data Analysis
After the data were collected, they were analyzed by using the following steps, each MOU was classified its content into moves and steps proposed by Salim (2007) and World Meteorological Organization (2012). All moves, and steps were counted, grouped according to similarities and put into percentages. The counting process of moves and steps was done manually. First, the researcher read all 57 MOUs and categorized the contents using the mentioned framework as a criterion. When the researcher found any moves and steps that emerged or shared similar to the criteria framework, she coded and kept their records. The researcher analyzed 57 MOUs one by one in order to prevent any mistakes that could affect the results of the analysis. Once new moves and steps were identified new codes would be given to accommodate them. The codes were counted and grouped into the same categories. Three weeks after the first analysis of moves and steps, all MOUs were re-analyzed by the researcher once again for the intra-rater reliability. In order to verify the content validity of these categorizations, the analyzed corpus was double-checked by three experts in the field of applied linguistics for the inter-rater reliability. Finally, the moves and the steps of the public and private universities’ MOUs were compared.

Findings
The Moves and Steps in the MOUs in the Two Corpora
As shown in Table 1, the most frequent moves of both datasets were Move 1 (Title), Move 3 (Date of agreement), Move 4 (Parties’ identity), Step 4.1. (Parties’ names), Move 6 (Content), Step 6.1 (Scope of understanding), Move 7 (Signatures), and Step 7.1 (Name), followed by Move 5 (Aim of the MOU) and Step 6.4 (Implementation and termination). The frequent occurrence of Move 1, Move 3, Move 4, Step 4.1, Move 6, Step 6.1, Move 7, and Step 7.1 in the present study confirmed Mashuri’s (2013) study that in MOUs, there were Title, Date of agreement, Parties, Parties identity, Content, and Signatures.
Table 1
Frequency of moves and steps found in the MOUs in the two corpora

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moves and Steps</th>
<th>Public University (N=47)</th>
<th>Private University (N=10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Move 1 Title</strong></td>
<td>47 (100%)</td>
<td>10 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Move 2 Background</strong></td>
<td>10 (21%)</td>
<td>4 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Move 3 Date of agreement</strong></td>
<td>47 (100%)</td>
<td>10 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Move 4 Parties’ identity</strong></td>
<td>47 (100%)</td>
<td>10 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 4.1 parties’ names</strong></td>
<td>47 (100%)</td>
<td>10 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 4.2 parties’ addresses</strong></td>
<td>6 (13%)</td>
<td>3 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 4.3 parties’ status or positions</strong></td>
<td>9 (19%)</td>
<td>2 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Move 5 Aim of the MOU</strong></td>
<td>46 (98%)</td>
<td>9 (90%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Move 6 Content</strong></td>
<td>47 (100%)</td>
<td>10 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 6.1 Scope of Understanding</strong></td>
<td>47 (100%)</td>
<td>10 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 6.2 Mutual expense and reliance</strong></td>
<td>39 (83%)</td>
<td>9 (90%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 6.3 Confidentiality</strong></td>
<td>3 (6%)</td>
<td>2 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 6.4 Implementation and termination</strong></td>
<td>46 (98%)</td>
<td>10 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 6.5 Modifications</strong></td>
<td>24 (51%)</td>
<td>7 (70%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 6.6 Governing law and jurisdiction</strong></td>
<td>10 (21%)</td>
<td>3 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Move 7 Signatures</strong></td>
<td>47 (100%)</td>
<td>10 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 7.1 Name</strong></td>
<td>47 (100%)</td>
<td>10 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 7.2 Position</strong></td>
<td>47 (100%)</td>
<td>9 (90%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 7.3 Logo of the company</strong></td>
<td>10 (21%)</td>
<td>2 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Move 8 Focal points</strong></td>
<td>5 (11%)</td>
<td>4 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Move 9 Additional annexes as required</strong></td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (20%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The function and realizations of each move/step found in the present study are shown below. The criteria for justifying and classifying the frequency of each move and step are defined according to Kanoksilapatham (2005). If a particular move/step occurs in every MOU (100%), it is regarded as ‘obligatory’, if the occurrence ranges from 60-99%, the move/step will be classified as ‘conventional’, and if the occurrence of a move/step is below 60 %, it is ‘optional’. Moreover, within the typical examples presented in this paper, the distinct clues that are regarded as the keywords, phrases, and clauses for each example are given in the bold text.

**Move 1: Title**
This move is used to present the term or identity of MOUs. Move 1 was an obligatory move in both corpora, occurring at a frequency of 100%. To realize this move, its position is always at the top of MOUs.
Examples:
1) **MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING** Between “1st party name” And “2nd party name” (Pub6)
2) **MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (MOU) BETWEEN** “1st party name” AND “2nd party name” (Pri8)
Move 2: Background

This move provides the context and general objectives and benefits of MOU. Move 2 is an optional move in both corpora, occurring at a frequency of 21% in the public universities’ MOUs and 40% in the private universities’ MOUs. This move occurs after the title of MOU.

Examples:
1) In accordance with their mutual interests in a program of cooperation and exchange, “1st party” and “2nd party” join this agreement with regard to educational and scientific cooperation. (Pub9)
2) With a longstanding friendship and collaboration of 30 years, dating back to 1977, with “1st party name” providing tuition waivers to “2nd party name”, both institutions agree that an official agreement would further enhance their successful relationship. (Pri3)

Move 3: Date of agreement

This move involves day, date, month, and year where MOU is made. Move 3 was an obligatory move in both corpora, occurring at a frequency of 100%. This move can frequently be found after the title of MOU and after signing of the authorized person. Examples:
1) This MOU shall enter into force on the date of its signing. Date: “Signed Date” (Pub32)
2) This agreement will be effective from the date of the last signature for an initial period of five years. Date: “Signed Date” (Pri8)

Move 4: Parties’ identity

This move shows the information of both parties such as name, address, status, and position. Move 4 was an obligatory move in both corpora, occurring at a frequency of 100%. This move can frequently be found after the title of MOU.

Step 4.1 Parties’ names
This step shows the names of the parties. It is frequently found in the area of parties’ identity. Step 4.1 was an obligatory move in both corpora, occurring at a frequency of 100%.

Examples:
1) “1st party name” and “2nd party name” hereinafter referred as “parties”. (Pub32)
2) This Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is made between “1st party name” (hereinafter referred as “XXX”) and “2nd party name” (hereinafter referred as “XXX”) (Pri7)

Step 4.2: Parties’ addresses
This step shows the addresses of the parties. It is frequently found in area of parties’ identity. Sometimes, it occurs in other areas of MOU. Step 4.2 is an optional move in both corpora, occurring at a frequency of 13% in the public universities’ MOUs and 30% in the private universities’ MOUs.

Examples:
1) “1st party name” (hereinafter referred to as XXX), having its address at “1st party address” and “2nd party name” (hereinafter referred to as XXX), having its address at “2nd party address” (Pub25)
2) “1st party name” (hereinafter referred to as XXX), located at “1st party address” and “2nd party name” (hereinafter referred to as XXX) located at “2nd party address” (Pri1)
**Step 4.3: Parties’ status or positions**

This step shows the status or position of the parties. It is frequently found in the area of parties’ identity. Step 4.3 is an optional move in both corpora, occurring at a frequency of 19% in the public universities’ MOUs and 20% in the private universities’ MOUs.

Examples:
1) “1st party name” and “2nd party name” hereinafter also referred to as “parties”. (Pub33)
2) hereinafter also referred to individually as a “Party” and collectively as the “Parties” (Pri5)

**Move 5: Aim of the MOU**

This move is referred to the expected outcomes of MOU, including intended societal benefits. Move 5 is a conventional move in both corpora, occurring at a frequency of 98% in the public universities’ MOUs and 90% in the private universities’ MOUs.

Examples:
1) ...to promote close cooperation and academic exchange between the two institutions. (Pub7)
2) WHEREAS “1st party” and “2nd party” wish to promote academic exchange and develop academic collaborations to be mutual benefits to their students and institutions. (Pri7)

**Move 6: Content**

This move consists of the scope of understanding, mutual expense and reliance, confidentiality, implementation and termination, modifications, governing law and jurisdiction. Move 6 was an obligatory move in both corpora, occurring at a frequency of 100%. This move can be frequently found after the aim of MOU.

**Step 6.1: Scope of understanding**

This step shows MOU’s boundaries – what is included and what is excluded from it. Step 6.1 was an obligatory move in both corpora, occurring at a frequency of 100%.

Examples:
1) The following types of collaboration will be pursued:
   - Exchange of students;
   - Exchange of visiting research scholars;
   - Joint (M.S./Ph.D.) programs in all fields of XXX;
   - Joint research projects in all fields of XXX;
   - Participation in annual XXX/XXX joint conference, international conference, seminars, symposia, workshops, and other activities agreed by both parties; and
   - Exchange of academic materials and other information. (Pub1)
2) ARTICLE II: SCOPE
   The areas of cooperation will include all programs offered at each institution, which is determined to be desirable and feasible for the achievement of these objectives. However, any specific program shall be subject to the availability of funds and the mutual agreement of the institutions. (Pri1)

**Step 6.2: Mutual expense and reliance**

This step states charges that may be incurred by both parties who hold mutual funds and interdependence on one another and having the faith, confidence, and trust shared between both parties. Step 6.2 is a conventional move in both corpora, occurring at a frequency of 83% in the public universities’ MOUs and 90% in the private universities’ MOUs.

Examples:
1) This MOU expresses the intentions of the parties and places no financial obligations or supplementary funding commitments on either party. (Pub1)
2) However, any specific programs shall be subject to availability of funds and the mutual agreement of the institutions. (Pri1)

Step 6.3: Confidentiality
This step indicates confidence or intimacy; imparting private matters. Step 6.3 is an optional move in both corpora, occurring at a frequency of 6% in the public universities’ MOUs and 20% in the private universities’ MOUs.

Examples:
1) IV. Data Protection
Both institutions agree to collect, process, use, disclose and otherwise manage personal information only for the purposes set forth in this MOU. Both institutions agree to ensure that personal information is not used for any purpose other than that for which it is collected. (Pub3)
2) Each party shall not make any public announcement or statement or publish or release any information in relation to any proposed activity or proposed collaboration without the prior written approval of both parties. Each party shall keep confidential any information received from the other party which is marked confidential or which a party notifies the other party is confidential. (Pri2)

Step 6.4: Implementation and termination
This step shows when MOU is made, effective, or executed as well as when it will be terminated, expired, or ineffective. Step 6.4 is a conventional move in corpora of public universities occurring at a frequency of 98% and is an obligatory move in corpora of private universities occurring at a frequency of 100%.

Examples:
1) This general agreement shall become effective for five (5) years as of the date of signature by the Dean of both parties. The amendment or termination of this general agreement shall not be affected without written deliberation between the two parties. (Pub5)
2) This Memorandum of Understanding is valid for 5 years from the date of signing and will be automatically renewed for additional 5-year periods unless either Party notifies the other Party no later than six months prior to the expiration of the preceding term it wishes to change or terminate this Agreement. (Pri3)

Step 6.5: Modifications
This step refers to mutually agreed changes or alterations made to MOU. Step 6.5 is a conventional move in both corpora, occurring at a frequency of 51% in the public universities’ MOUs and 70% in the private universities’ MOUs.

Examples:
1) The amendment or termination of this general agreement shall not be affected without written deliberation between the two parties. (Pub5)
2) The provisions of this MoU may be amended at any time with the mutual consent of the Parties in writing. (Pri1)
Step 6.6: Governing law and jurisdiction

This step specifies which legal system will apply to the interpretation of the agreement and its effect if a dispute arises, and a jurisdiction clause agreeing which party will have jurisdiction to hear disputes arising from MOU. Step 6.6 is an optional move in both corpora, occurring at a frequency of 21% in the public universities’ MOUs and 30% in the private universities’ MOUs.

Examples:
1) VI. Miscellaneous
   This MOU records the understanding between the institutions and is not intended by the institutions to be a legally binding document and will not be enforceable in any court of law. (Pub3)
2) This Memorandum of Understanding shall be governed and constructed under the laws of XXX or XXX depending upon where the activities take place. (Pri1)

Move 7: Signatures

This move consists of name, position, and logo of the company. Move 7 was an obligatory move in both corpora, occurring at a frequency of 100%. This move can frequently be found at the end of MOU.

Step 7.1: Name

This step shows the name of the authorized person who signs in MOU. Step 7.1 was an obligatory move in both corpora, occurring at a frequency of 100%.

Examples:
1) “Signature”, “Name”, “Position”, “Signed Date” (Pub1)
2) “Signature”, “Name”, “Position”, “Signed Date” (Pri1)

Step 7.2: Position

This step shows the position of the authorized person who signs in MOU. Step 7.2 is an obligatory move in corpora of public universities occurring at a frequency of 100% and is a conventional move in corpora of private universities occurring at a frequency of 90%.

Examples:
1) “Signature”, “Name”, “Position”, “Signed Date” (Pub1)
2) “Signature”, “Name”, “Position”, “Signed Date” (Pri1)

Step 7.3: Logo of the company

This step shows the logo or stamp of the parties. Step 7.3 is an optional move in both corpora, occurring at a frequency of 21% in the public universities’ MOUs and 20% in the private universities’ MOUs. This step can frequently be found near the signature of the authorized person.

Examples:
1) “Signature” & “Logo” (Pub3)
2) “Signature” & “Logo” (Pri3)

Move 8: Focal points

This move represents information on the names and contact details of nominated people to handle technical, managerial and/or administrative aspects of MOU. Move 8 is an optional move in both corpora, occurring at a frequency of 11% in the public universities’ MOUs and 40% in the private universities’ MOUs.
Examples:
1) **Contact Person’s Name, Position, Department, University, Address**
   Tel.: XXX ext. XXX, Email: XXX (Pub1)
2) **Position, Department, University, Contact Person’s Name, Address**
   Tel.: XXX ext. XXX, Fax: XXX, Email: XXX (Pri1)

**Move 9: Additional annexes as required**
This move functions as supplementary material that provides more detail on relevant matters, including such things as agreed work plans, milestones, timelines, budgetary matters (if required), etc. Move 9 is an optional move in both corpora, occurring at a frequency of 0% in the public universities’ MOUs and 20% in the private universities’ MOUs. This step was found in the last part of MOU.
Examples:
1) **Appendix One** (Pri2)

**Discussion**
It was found that there were both similarities and differences in terms of move and step occurrences of the MOUs in the two corpora. Two main points are focused on here. First, in regard to move and step occurrences, the most frequent moves and steps in both sets of data were Move 1 (Title), Move 3 (Date of agreement), Move 4 (Parties’ identity), Step 4.1 (Parties’ names), Move 6 (Content), Step 6.1 (Scope of understanding), Move 7 (Signatures), and Step 7.1 (Name). This may be due to the fact that MOU’s main information are title, date where the MOU is made, parties’ names, boundaries – what is included and what is excluded, and signatures. The frequent occurrences of Move 1, Move 3, Move 4, Step 4.1, Move 6, Step 6.1, Move 7, and Step 7.1 in the present study confirmed Mashuri’s (2013) study that the MOUs’ parts were Title, Date of agreement, Parties, Parties’ identity, Content, and Signatures. Move 5 (Aim of the MOU) and Step 6.4 (Implementation and termination) were the second most frequent move and step in the two corpora appearing slightly less frequently than Move 1, Move 3, Move 4, Step 4.1, Move 6, Step 6.1, Move 7, and Step 7.1.
Second, Move 2 (Background), Move 8 (Focal points), and Move 9 (Additional annexes as required) were important moves in the private universities’ MOUs. The frequency of Move 2 (40%), Move 8 (40%), and Move 9 (20%) in the private universities’ MOUs were far greater than in public universities’ MOUs (21%, 11%, and 0% respectively). Also, these moves were the third most frequent moves in the private universities’ MOUs. The reason for this may be an awareness of the importance of a private university’s motive to exist. Private universities base their existence on making profits because they are run by the capital input made by individuals or by shareowners. The income is then retained in the company or a part of it is given out as dividends to the shareowners. In order to base their existence on making profits, stating the benefits of the MOU, agreed work plans, milestones, timelines, budgetary matters are likely to be found in the private universities’ MOUs. Moreover, Step 6.3 (Confidentiality) was prominent in the MOUs of private universities. The frequency of Step 6.3 (20%) in the private universities’ MOUs was greater than in public universities’ MOUs (6%). This demonstrates that private universities preferred stating confidence or intimacy; imparting private matters. This may be due to the fact that private universities do have a goal of overtaking their competitors and maximizing their profit. Therefore, they are concerned about confidentiality more than public universities are.
Conclusion

The findings showed that the MOUs in both corpora conformed to the proposed model in terms of the presence of the moves and steps as stipulated by Salim’s (2007) study and World Meteorological Organization’s (2012) MOUs template. The most cyclical moves and steps in both datasets were Move 1 (Title), Move 3 (Date of agreement), Move 4 (Parties’ identity), Step 4.1 (Parties’ names), Move 6 (Content), Step 6.1 (Scope of understanding), Move 7 (Signatures), and Step 7.1 (Name). The noticeable differences between the two corpora—public and private universities’ MOUs—were the use of Move 2 (Background), Step 4.2 (Parties’ addresses), Step 6.3 (Confidentiality), Step 6.5 (Modifications), Move 8 (Focal points), and Move 9 (Additional annexes as required). That is, in the private universities’ MOUs they tended to have those moves and steps more than in the public universities’ MOUs. Based on the results of the study, important implications can be drawn. Pedagogically, analysing the moves and the steps of public and private universities’ MOUs would be a beneficial guideline for MOU’s writers. For example, to complete the acceptable MOU, the writers need to be aware of the pattern, framework, the wording in MOU by crosschecking with the analysed MOU template. It is expected that the findings will assist both native and non-native writers, those who are working in collaborating or coordinating section, to create their MOUs effectively. For the present study, only moves and steps of public and private universities’ MOUs in education field were analysed in which the results are narrow for only in education. Therefore, further research should compare moves and steps of other fields such as business, law and so on. With this suggestion, it may obtain comprehensive results which may assist with writing MOUs in wider contexts and environments. However, it is beyond the scope of this present study due to the limited time and accessibility. In addition, there were some more details in MOUs which were missed such as university logos at the top of MOUs and abbreviations of universities. Therefore, it will be completed if the further study can add these in analysing.
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