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ABSTRACT

This study aims to find out moves in the discussion section of research articles. The data sources were four journal articles taken from research articles accredited by Directorate General of Higher Education (DIKTI). The data were gathered and analyzed by using theoretical framework proposed by Yang & Allison (2003). The results of the analysis showed that Indonesian English writers are recognized to the moves structure of English research articles with regard to the discussion framework from Yang & Allison (2003)
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INTRODUCTION

Writing of such kind of academic genre requires the deep knowledge of writing and also they must have the ability in using the language in order to be more formal and academic. Hyland (2009: 29) points out that to know how move is work on the text it should be known the analysis in it. In addition, Swales and Feak (1994: 67) states that move analysis is “a text representing a genre consists of smaller units called ‘moves’ sequenced in a particular order, forming a pattern. Each move possibly consists of sub-units called ‘steps’. A move or step has its own communicative function that can be recognized by a set of linguistic features. Nwogu (1997: 32) defines that move is “a text part made up of a bundle of linguistic features (lexical meanings, propositional meanings, illocutionary forces, etc.) which give the part a uniform orientation and signal the content of discourse in it”.

Moritz, Meurer, & Dellagnelo (2008) in Amnuai & Wanaruk (2013: 1) stated that using a move-based approach is “due to the recognition of the need for an awareness of the structural format of the research articles”. Thus, by using move analysis to identify the moves
of research articles has some advantage and solution for novice writer by making the ‘moves’ will help to present stance of the text clearly and credibly.

In order that the reason of recognizing the moves is to facilitate the writers like as students, practitioners, and academician getting way how to produce good writing and force the readers in order to get the points from their writing. They able to establish the field or topic, identify a problem, and define the scope of the problem by identifying the key matter to be addressed.

Additionally, Amnuai and Wanaruk (2013) stated that discussion section is share claims about how to integrate with and contribute to the knowledge of the discipline that take a broad to look at the findings as a whole, trying to move the reader back of specific information.

METHOD

The method used in this study is content analysis. Content Analysis is a qualitative research technique to analyse text data by which inferences are made. It is a systematic, replicable technique for compressing words of text into fewer content categories (Barelson, 1952; Weber, 1990). Holsti (1968) argued that content analysis is “any technique for making inferences by systemically and objectively identifying special characteristic of message”.

The procedure to employ this study consists of some steps as follows:

1. Collecting published research journal articles
2. Separate up-date journal by the year of publishing
3. Compiles and separate the appropriate data
4. Analyzing the data
5. Representing, interpreting the data and concluding the data.

In this study qualitative data of clauses from four articles were collected from Discussion sections of the research journal articles certified and accredited by Directorate General of Higher Education (DIKTI) they are Cultural and English Language Teaching (CELT) and teaching of English as a foreign language in Indonesia (TEFLIN) journals. The clauses of articles are as theoretical sampling that used in this study to gain sufficient number of data. Coyne (1997) stated, “Sampling procedures in qualitative research are not so rigidly prescribed as in quantitative studies. This flexibility in sampling, however, may be confusing
for some researchers and mistakes may be made. The thought is that the researcher collects data from any individual or any group of people who can provide the appropriate and relevant data for the generation of their theory. This sampling technique mentioned by Creswell (2008:217) as verifying and not verifying sampling which is “a purposeful strategy used during study to summarize on specific cases to test or explore further specific findings”. Since this sampling happen when data collection is being started, this sampling allows the researchers to suspend the data collection if the data analysis does not show the features.

The data are collected by the following procedures:

1. Convert the articles into document in Microsoft word program
2. Specify the clauses from the articles as the basis of the unit of analysis
3. Identify the move and step of the clauses
4. Present the clauses into the analysis table.

Data analysis procedure in this study used textual/document analysis, the clauses used in particular parts of the articles are analyzed and interpreted based on move analysis to find out the rhetorical moves of Research articles Introduction and Discussion sections. In this step, the identification of rhetorical move is conduct through underlining the typical features (words, statement, or phrase) of move elements. Furthermore, to find out the prominent move elements in Introduction and Discussion sections, each paragraph and clause in the text were analyzed in detail to find out the position.

The writer used the theory proposed by Yang & Allison (2003). The move model proposed by Yang and Allison (2003) was used as the framework for the move identification because it was developed from the analysis of research articles (RAs). The Yang and Allison (2003) framework, though not the only available framework, is the most comprehensive one. There are several other frameworks for move analysis (e.g., Hopkins & Dudley-Evans, 1988; Kanoksilapatham, 2005). The Yang and Allison’s move model is, however, preferred for several reasons. The Yang and Allison’s move model is the most suitable framework for applied linguistics research (Holmes, 1997; Kanoksilapatham, 2005; Nwogu, 1997). Moreover, this model is an extension and modification of several other models, and its developers have found it to be the most comprehensive model for move analysis in Applied Linguistics (Nodoushan, 2011).
FINDING AND DISCUSSION

As shown in Table the most frequent was existed in native English writers is move II (reporting result) with percentage 21.2 %. Refers to yang and Allison theory point out that move II is as obligatory with focus on relevant evidence such as statistics and example of research result.

The distribution of moves/steps Discussion section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moves</th>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Native Indonesian (Frequency)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Move 1 (Background Information)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move 2 (Reporting Result)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move 3 (Summarizing Results)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move 4 (Commenting Results)</td>
<td>Step 1 (A): Interpreting results</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Step 2 (B): Comparing/contrasting results with literature</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Step 3 (C): Accounting for results</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Step 4 (D): Evaluating results</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move 5 (Summarizing the study)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move 6 (Evaluating the study)</td>
<td>Step 1 (A): Indicating limitation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Step 2 (B): Indicating significant</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Step 3 (C): Evaluating methodology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move 7 (Deduction from research)</td>
<td>Step 1 (A): Making Suggestion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Step 2 (B): Recommending Research</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Step 3 (C): Implication</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Move 1: Background information. This move is used to prepare the readers for the report or discussion of results that follows. This includes some main statements such as research questions, the aims and purposes of the study, theoretical background or established knowledge and the study’s research methodology (Wirada & Amnuai, 2013). To realize this move, both present and past simple tenses in the form of active or passive voices were used (Yang & Allison, 2003). Realizations of this move are as follows. Examples:

1) **This study demonstrates** that the students practiced various kinds of out of school English literacy activities.
2) **This study** has attempted to link the debate regarding the language background of English teachers (whether they can or cannot speak the learners’ L1) with the issue of whether English-only instruction is preferable to allowing some switching to L1.
Move 2: Reporting results. The function of this move is to present the results of the study. Move 2 was the first most frequent move in both Indonesian English journals and international English journal were the highest number appeared. Noticeably, the results being presented were also likely to be commented upon. To indicate this move, some linguistic signals or expressions associated with numerical values, reporting verbs, and statements about upcoming outcomes involving graphs, figures, examples, and tables were employed extensively (Yang & Allison, 2003). Both past and present simple tenses were used in this move (Wirada & Amnuai, 2013). Examples:

1. **The study shows that** the English literacy of the majority of the fourth grade students (≥60%) was in early advanced and advanced levels for almost all aspects of reading and writing skills.
2. **This study has filled some knowledge gaps** in the area of faculty/educators’ use of SNSs and their attitudes towards using SNSs as an educational tool.

Move 3: Summarizing results. The function of this move is to sum up the results. Linguistic clues used to identify this move were summarizing verbs/nouns/phrases such as *to sum up, to summarize, in summary, and in brief*, can be concluded. (Holmes, 1997)

Examples:

1. From this it **can be concluded** that the data of the two experimental groups is homogenet. The variance homogenity testing from the attribute categories of the groups in this study was done through the stages used from part (a) above.

Move 4: Commenting on results. The objective of this move is to establish the meaning and significance of the research results in relation to the relevant field. Move 4 is considered as a central move in which the results of the study are commented on through four different steps, including ‘Interpreting results’, ‘Comparing results with literature’, ‘Accounting for results’, and ‘Evaluating results’. The finding conforms to Yang and Allison’s (2003) study in which the occurrence of this move was obligatory, and it could occur repeatedly in the Discussion sections.

Move 4 step 1: Interpreting results. This is the step where the authors make claims or generalizations based on the results of the study. This step was considered conventional for sets of Discussions. Examples:

1. Taking this perspective into account, **it is quite possible that students in the current study** were afraid of losing face, so they avoided asking questions.
Move 4 step 2: Comparing results with literature. This step allows the authors to compare their study’s findings with those of previous works. Some distinct linguistic features were used to realize this step, particularly in the forms of ‘be’ plus some adjectives (e.g. be consistent with, be similar to) or certain words or phrases such as agree with, reported in, consistent with, in line with and these linguistic signals coexisted with citations (Zahra, Amirian, et al, 2008).

Examples:

1. This is highly consistent with the views of many researchers and experts, including Derwing (2009) that teaching pronunciation should be integrated into oral communication skills.

Move 4 step 3: Accounting for results. In this step, the authors provide the readers with further explanation or give the reasons for the observed differences in findings or unexpected outcomes. The rational explanations used to realize this particular communicative purpose were highlighted by the use of words or phrases such as possible explanation for, difference between, etc (Khalili & Maryam, 2015).

Examples:

1. The results of Test 2 show an improvement in both aspects. Figures 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 at the end of this section of the article illustrate clear differences between high, middle, and low performers’ English proficiency.
2. The difference of out-of-school nonacademic English literacy activities between the high, middle and low performers is in the frequency of their engagement and the number of books they have in their home.

Move 4 step 4: Evaluating results. This is the step where authors evaluate their results by stating the strengths and weaknesses of the results. Move 4 Step 4 was an optional step for both sets of Discussions, as shown in Yang and Allison’s (2003) study. Noticeably no occurs in overall articles.

Move 5: Summarizing the study. The function of this move is to provide the readers with the main findings of the research study. The key words used to signal this move were similar to those found in Move 3; however, some differences were observed. The major difference is that summary or conclusive words or phrases, such as in sum, in conclusion were commonly followed by particular statements related to overall results, while those in Move 3 were followed by specific results (Wirada & Amnuai, 2013). Examples:

1. The use of reflective method in teaching and learning has impact on students’ mastery of suprasegmental features being taught. Sufficient result of doing in-class learning tasks has affected their performance in completing outside class task.
The study uncovers three significant characteristics of the students’ English literacy practices: 1) the students were engaged in more academic English literacy activities; 2) they were engaged in pleasurable light reading and writing; 3) their activities occurred in online, electronic audio visual and print environments.

Move 6: Evaluating the study. The objective of this move is to evaluate the overall study by pointing out the limitations, indicating the contributions or evaluating the methodology.

Move 6 step 1: Indicating limitations. The objective of this step is to describe the limitations of the research being conducted. Examples:

1. It is acknowledged that the study was limited in focus on discovery mode interactions during the peer critique process, with the exclusion of evaluative mode feedback.

Move 6 step 2: Indicating significance/advantage. The function of this step is to allow the authors to point out the strengths of the study which may be significant for applications or implications. Statements in present simple tense, relating to the significance of research conducted, such as value, benefit, fascinate, advantage, essential, encouraged were commonly used. The realizations of this step are shown in the following examples.

1. Reflective learning method using video which was integrated into communicative, meaningful language activities has encouraged student involvement in the learning process.
2. Previously, the “menu” of classroom activity was not appealing; after reflective method was applied, the students perceived that the classroom instruction was fascinating.

Move 6 step 3: Evaluating methodology. This step is used in realizing Move 6, and is used to comment on the strengths or weaknesses of the research methodology. Examples:

1. This revealed that the PF group read significantly more words correctly at pretest than the DE group, F(1, 2) = 29.867, p = .03, but there was no statistically significant difference in performance by the final BPST-III administration.
2. Resolving these questions requires research which not only asks young learners for their perceptions of EO instruction, but also documents their teacher’s attempts to put across meaning in English.

Move 7: Deductions from the research. This is the move where authors draw inference about the results by suggesting what can be done to solve the problems identified by the research, proposing areas for further study or drawing pedagogical implication.

Move 7 step 1: Making suggestions. This step allows authors to highlight how the research contributes to the existing knowledge in the field. Also, Khalili (2008) stated that the
authors provide some guidelines from the research findings for the readers in order to solve the problems identified by the research. Examples:

1. **Students’ concerns must be eased by understanding** that they will not be assigning grades to the projects and that directed peer review (following a rubric) is well suited to students who have limited subject-matter and writing skills (Rieber, 2006).

2. **Instructors must emphasize** collegiality, professionalism and fair play.

Move 7 step 2: Recommending further research. This step states some possible areas for future studies. This step can be signalled by words/phrases such as ‘further studies/research’, ‘future studies/research’, ‘more studies are needed’ (Nodoushan (2011), Wirada & Amnuai (2013), Khalili (2015). Examples:

1. Van Den Berg et al. (2006) **called for further study** of these discoveries mode interactions, and Karegianes et al. (1980) **recommended investigations of peer editing with different types of students**.

2. **Further analysis** of the growth between the initial draft and final proposal revealed that the greatest gains occurred in support, followed by audience focus, writing, and, finally, organization.

Move 7 step 3: Drawing pedagogical implication. This step allows authors to state the pedagogical significance of the study or indicate necessity for pedagogical changes. This may be due to the fact that there is a need to enhance. Research findings may serve this particular need. Examples:

1. **Despite its limitations, this study offers promise that** middle school students with mild cognitive impairments enrolled in classes taught in a nonnative language can still profit from explicit reading instruction.

**CONCLUSION**

The writing styles of native Indonesian writers are able to write the discussion sections in English research articles appropriately. This appears from the findings of rhetorical moves from research articles published in Indonesian journals accredited by DIKTI, they have fulfilled English research article format and did not differ distinctly from those written by native English writers. From the analysis done in the tables those have been described in the previous chapter, the information can be obtained from the findings from how rhetorical moves in all research journal articles are conducted.
REFERENCES


Widiastuti, Sri (2010), *The students’ ability and problems in writing a research proposal*. Unpublished thesis: English Education Program School of Postgraduate studies Indonesia University of Education
