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ABSTRACT

Research article (RA) is one of academic writing regarding a contribution to knowledge in various disciplines. As a part of RA, an abstract is presented to describe the entire RA in deciding whether readers will keep reading the RA or not. Thus, the structure of an abstract determines its value in outlining the whole RA. This study investigates the rhetorical moves and steps of English Language Teaching RA abstracts. The objective of this study is to reveal whether Sinta levels impact the rhetorical moves and steps of RA abstracts, also to enhance the writing skills for researchers in the field of English Language Teaching. The study analysed 120 abstracts of ELT RAs abstracts taken from 6 Sinta levels that consisted of 12 journals (10 abstracts per each) by using Antmover. A descriptive qualitative approach was applied in exploring and comparing the data by the theory of Hyland (2000). The result revealed similarities and differences in the realization of moves and steps from ELT RA abstracts across Sinta levels. In conclusion, Sinta levels do not fully impact the rhetorical moves and steps. The study can be a guideline for researchers of ELT in improving their writing skills regarding the recent trends of rhetorical moves.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Academic writing has been considered as a genre and popular in genre analysis. It refers to the style or expression which is used by researchers in defining boundaries of their respective areas in expertise or disciplines. It has a main role in the academic field globally, as the writer will share the knowledge with others. Academic writing can be presented in various types of writing, one of them is Research Article (RA). It is considered as a written text, reporting some investigation or observation that is carried out by its author. Moreover, the RA will usually relate its findings with other findings and examines issues of theory or methodology (Swales, 1990). This extensive attention is given to the RA in presenting new ideas in certain fields of study to be read by the readers. So, the writers should target their work to be read by a large number of people which affects the quality that represents by a level or quartile position of the journal.

Abstract is one of the most important sections of the RA because it can determine the acceptance or rejection of an article for selection by readers (Al-Khasawneh, 2017). Therefore, it may convince readers to decide to continue or stop reading the research article. Thus, the research abstract gains an important role in describing academic information as the readers’ doorway to view an article, journals’ selection for contributions, and conferences to accept or reject the article (Lorés, 2004). According to Hyland (2000), he divided the abstract into a series of communicative categories or moves which representing the realization of specific overall communicative purposes. The term “move” is “a functional term that refers to a defined and bounded communicative act that is designed to contribute to one main communicative objective of the whole text” (Lorés, 2004). Each rhetorical move consists of a number of smaller rhetorical elements, Swales (1990) calls these small elements as steps.

Since rhetorical moves of abstracts have become an important study, some researches have been conducted on this topic. Move analysis in cross-disciplinary of some researches (Darabad, 2016; Ghazanfari, Mohtasham, & Amirsheibani, 2016) about the structure of the rhetorical moves realized in cross-disciplinary abstracts from some different disciplines. The studies about the comparison of the different speakers (Behnam
& Golpour, 2014; Al-Khasawneh, 2017) investigated the abstracts written by native and non-native English writers. Then, the rhetorical structure of abstracts (Lorés, 2004) focused on the rhetorical organization and thematic structure. Hence, the present study focuses on the rhetorical moves of RA abstracts from different ranks of national journal articles.

Besides, the study about research article abstracts in national journal is considered as a major topic of move analysis. Many studies have been conducted on rhetorical moves analysis in RA abstracts such as Behnam and Golpour (2014) who investigated English and Iranian International RA abstracts in Applied Linguistics and Mathematics. Then, Tankó (2017) investigated 135 Literature Research Article (LRA) from International Journal. Thereafter, Amnuai (2019) showed the comparison of international and Thai corpus abstracts.

Those recent studies examined the research article abstracts in finding differences of rhetorical moves and some features which are applied in abstracts from international and national journal with various disciplines. Thus, there is a limited field of study in which other research can be conducted a similar study with different data. For this reason, this study analyses the rhetorical moves of RA abstracts indexed by Sinta (national journal) in the field of English Language Teaching (ELT) RA that within six different Sinta levels. Sinta stands for Science and Technology Index, it is a portal online system regarding performance measurement of science and technology (Onwardono, 2018). Also, it is one of national indexation journal articles consist of six ranks. Consequently, this study aims to investigate whether Sinta level affects the realization of the rhetorical moves of ELT abstracts since the previous studies focused on the abstracts of international and national journals in either exploring or comparing the moves structure among different journals indexations.

2. METHODS

This study applied a descriptive qualitative approach in exploring and comparing empirical facts about moves realization of Research Article abstract in Sinta indexed national journal in different levels. Qualitative research focuses on understanding a research question as a humanistic or idealistic approach and its method is applied to comprehend people’s beliefs, experiences, attitudes, behaviour, and interactions (Pathak, Jena, & Kalra, 2013).

The data were collected from Research Article abstracts in the field of English Language Teaching taken from Science Journal indexed SINTA as the national indexation journal. Twelve journals from six different Sinta levels were chosen due to the existence and the year publication limitation, in order to represent the data result of each level. Also, the data were selected based on the substance of ELT discipline since this study also chose some journals’ titles that are not on the ELT theme, but they also contain ELT research articles. A total of 120 abstracts (10 per each journal) from the most recent RA was taken from those journals with publication period from 2018-2020. Further, the data was taken by accessing the website of each journal. The total of selected data is considered enough in representing the pattern of abstracts. Then, the Table 1 shows the data information.

Table 1. Description of research data sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Journal</th>
<th>SINTA score</th>
<th>Publication year</th>
<th>Number of abstracts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics (IJAL)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2018-2020</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEFLIN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of English Education and Linguistic Studies (JEELS)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics (IJETAL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics (JELTL)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of ELT Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of English Language Teaching in Indonesia (ELTIN)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEAS : Journal on English Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Languages and Language Teaching (JOLLT)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Applied Linguistic and Literacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of English Language Teaching (ELT Forum)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris Undiksha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Hyland’s model of rhetorical moves in research article

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Move</th>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction (I)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Arguing for topic significance or prominences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Making topic generalization: what is currently known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Defining the key term(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Identifying gap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose (P)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Stating general and specific purpose of research including hypothesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method (M)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Describing Participant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Describing instruments(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Describing procedure and context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product (Pr)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Describing the main specific findings of the research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion (C)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Deducing conclusions from results by commenting on or interpreting the results, or deducing claims from the results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Evaluating the significance or contribution of the research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Stating limitations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Presenting recommendation or implication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This research employed Hyland’s (2000) model as the guideline to discover rhetorical moves, structures, and steps of RA abstracts. Model of moves and steps that are illustrated in Table 2.

In Hyland’s (2000) model, Move 1 is Introduction - establishes the context of the paper and motives for the research or discussion; Move 2 is Purpose - indicates purpose, thesis, and outlines the intention behind the paper; Move 3 is Method - provides information on design, procedures, assumption, approach, and data; Move 4 is Product - states the main findings and the arguments of a study result; and Move 5 is Conclusion - interprets or extends results beyond scope of the paper, draws inferences, points to applications or wider implications.

Then, the text was separated into a group of sentences. The data analysis used software which is called Antmover. This software breaks down the data of abstracts into a structure of sentences automatically. After that, the sentences were labeled by Antmover with the number option of moves step. In this part, the Antmover will give some options if there any correction because this software has 70% accuracy in labeling the sentence. Beforehand, the result of the analysis process from Antmover was compiled into a table on Microsoft Office Excel.

Table 3. General findings on the realization of rhetorical moves

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moves Data</th>
<th>Steps Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1027 Moves</td>
<td>1039 Steps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The analysis indicates the total number of moves and steps occurrences realized in all abstracts. In total, there are 1027 moves and 1039 steps in 120 abstracts of ELT RA abstracts indexed by Sinta in six levels. Table 3 reveals the general finding of this analysis and shows the total number of moves data and steps data. The total number of moves data is relatively less than the steps data, since some sentences in certain journals used more than one step in describing the abstract.

This study showed that all abstracts from each level almost applied five moves proposed by Hyland (2000). Table IV illustrates the total moves of each Sinta level.

Table 4 above suggests that the moves occurrences varied across Sinta levels. Moreover, it can be seen that the total moves of Sinta 1 to Sinta 3 had relatively fewer moves than Sinta 4 to Sinta 6. Figure I presents the percentage of moves realization in ELT RA abstracts within six levels. Overall, the highest number of moves that was most used by abstracts from all groups was M3 (Method). M4 (Product) was the second highest number. The other moves, namely M1 (Introduction) and M2 (Purpose) occurred variously in these journals. Meanwhile, M5 (Conclusion) became the least number of occurrences.

Table 4. Moves Occurrences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moves</th>
<th>SINTA 1</th>
<th>SINTA 2</th>
<th>SINTA 3</th>
<th>SINTA 4</th>
<th>SINTA 5</th>
<th>SINTA 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>164</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1 Move occurrences across all disciplines.

The figure above shows that all abstracts emphasized more the use of research methodology. The average number was 33.8% of all journals. This finding aligns with Tamela (2020) where her study showed M3 as the most used move in ELT abstracts. The example below shows the explanation about the participant that was involved in the study where the author tried to describe how the data are taken from as one of the research methodologies.

Example 1:

The data of this study were taken from the purposively chosen informants regarding their familiarity and apprehension with the issue of this study. (Abstract 21, JEELS - Sinta 2)

Then, it is overtaken by M4 that its realization was used across journals with variation number. The number of each level indicated the usage of M4 was important enough to describe the study result. As the average number of M4 realization was 29.7%. Example 2 shows the study result as a general finding that was found form the study data.

Example 2:

The results demonstrated that the teachers perceived the rapid development of technology and information as the key feature of the 21st-century learning, which is beneficial to furnish more comprehensive learning (Abstract 21, JEELS - Sinta 2).

However, those moves were contrary to the realization of M5 that less emphasized in Sinta 1 to Sinta 6 that indicated 11.5% as the average number from all levels. Besides, there is a significant difference of M5 application between Sinta 1 to Sinta 3 and Sinta 4 to Sinta 6. The use of M5 on Sinta 1 to Sinta 3 seemed fewer than Sinta 4 to Sinta 6. Since the occurrence of M5 of the first Sinta group appeared less than or equal to 10. Meanwhile, the usage of M5 in the other Sinta group occurred greater than 10. In this move, the author suggested the conclusion that was summarized from the previous move that provided results and findings. Thus, the example below represents the realization of M5.

Example 3:

It is suggested to consecutively provide more courses and training about confronting the 21st-century education to keep teachers voguish of any adjustments, innovations, and modifications in education. (Abstract 21, JEELS - Sinta 2)

Likewise, there is a difference of M1 usage between two Sinta groups. Sinta 1 to Sinta 3 applied M1 more than Sinta 4 to Sinta 6. The total number between both groups showed a significant difference of 36%. Thus, it can be considered that abstracts from Sinta 1 to Sinta 3 paid attention more in describing the study background. The use of M1 is presented in the following excerpt where the study background holds an important role in defining the general topic or motive of the study.

Example 4:

The need for preparing highly qualified teachers with all the quintessential pedagogical competencies has been acknowledged as a preeminent priority in the educational world. (Abstract 21, JEELS - Sinta 2)

Further, in stating the purpose of study, all Sinta levels indicated the use of M2 about 11% to 15% where these numbers were equal, thus the gap of each level was not too significant. The sentence below illustrates M2 realization that presents the purpose or outline intention behind the paper.

Example 5:

This present study is intended to scrutinize the EFL teachers’ perspectives and preferences in the 21st-century pedagogical competence. (Abstract 21, JEELS - Sinta 2)

From the finding, almost all ELT abstracts indexed by Sinta applied five moves model proposed by Hyland (2000). Also, the occurrence of each move was different and varied across journals. It can be concluded that despite the different journal levels, the provision of research methodology was provided more in defining information of design, procedures, and data analysis. Thus, the finding of this study is corresponding with the typology of an informative abstract that describes more the research methodology and it is followed by the study finding statement (Doró, 2013; Tankó, 2017 as cited in Kurniawan, Lubis, Suherdi, & Danuwijaya, 2019).

Another finding from this study is step realization, as proposed by Hyland (2000). The analysis focused on the step’s realization of M1, M3, and M5 because M2 and M4 only have one step. Figure 2 explains the percentage of the occurrence of steps in ELT RA abstracts of all Sinta levels. It can be seen that the most used step by all abstracts was M3-S7 (Describing Instruments).
Further, this analysis reveals significant differences that are shown by M1-S1 (Arguing for topic significance), M1-S2 (Making topic generalization), and M1-S4 (Identifying gap). Other analyses that can be presented were M5-S10 (Deducing conclusion) and M5-S12 (Stating limitations), where both of these steps demonstrated significant differences between two groups of Sinta; group one (Sinta 1, Sinta 2, and Sinta 3) and group two (Sinta 4, Sinta 5, and Sinta 6).

M3-S7 was the dominant step that mostly occurred in all Sinta levels. The realization of the average number of this step was 20.5%. Thus, it shows that the authors paid attention to the instrument description that was involved in their abstracts. This finding contradicts with Darabad (2016) where all steps from M3 were employed equally in applied linguistic abstracts. The example of M3-S7 is shown below.

Example 6:
To respond to the scarcity of research in this area, the current study is conducted by using observations and questionnaire as the instruments to portray the implementation of a mentoring program in an English training institution in East Java, Indonesia. (Abstract 17, TEFL Journal - Sinta 1).

It can be seen that the example of M3-S7 showed the author explanation of the instrument to collect the data. This kind of step usually appears as an individual step of M3 or it can be related to other steps from M3 for detailed information.

Besides, this study also examined the variation of M3-S7 realization. This variation was used by some abstracts, where M3-S7 embeds M3-S6 (Describes participant(s)) in one sentence. Accordingly, the abstract delivered the instruments description and participants’ description that was involved in Move 3. These embedded steps only occurred on Sinta 1, Sinta 2, and Sinta 3. The finding is contrary to the result of Kaya and Yaşiz (2020), since they found that M3 is embedded with other moves. The use of embedded step of M3S7 and M3S6 is presented in the sentence below.

Example 7:
To this end, **convenient purposive sampling strategy was used where 50 EFL (postgraduate and undergraduate) international students drawn from Universiti Utara Malaysian EIC program were selected and administered Writing Strategy Questionnaires (WSQ).** (Abstract 45, JELTL Journal - Sinta 3).

The sentence presents the way abstract combined two steps as an embedded step in one sentence to make the description of the research methodology more obvious without additional step out of the sentence.

Then, M1-S1 and M2-S2 had significant differences between Sinta 1 and Sinta 6. The occurrence of both steps showed the highest number which was 8% for M1-S1 and 7% for M1-S2 on Sinta 1. Meanwhile, the realization of both steps in Sinta 6 was the lowest number. They were 1% for M1-S1 and 1% for M1-S2. The example of M1-S1 and M1-S2 is illustrated in these sentences.

Example 8:
The low level of literacy of the Indonesian students has become a major nation-wide concern in Indonesia. (M1-S1 in Abstract 6, IJAL - Sinta 1).

Example 9:
There are some problems faced by teachers when they taught English vocabulary to the children with special needs, they did not pay attention to the teacher, and they lost their interest in English subject. (M1-S2 in Abstract 101, ELT Forum - Sinta 6).

In the excerpt of M1-S1 above, the step referred to M1 as an introduction in arguing the topic significance where it included an important topic to define the background of the study. This kind of step usually appears first to make readers understand the discussed topic of the study. Meanwhile, the sentence of M1-S2 described the generally known topic that related to M1-S1, also this step usually comes after S1 or it can be an individual step. Thus, the abstracts preferred to apply M1-S1 and M1-S2 in describing M1 as the introduction of the study background.

Afterward, the realization of M1-S4 had the number that showed its contrast. Sinta 1 and Sinta 3 had the highest number, 7% for both levels. Then, the rest levels had less than 3%. Thus, Sinta 1 and Sinta 3 dominated the use of M1-S4. The realization of M1-S4 is presented in the following sentence.
Example 10:

Although extensive research has been carried out on the positive effects of flipped learning in a first language context, there remains a paucity of evidence on the impact of flipped learning in a second language context, specifically in Bhutan. (M1-S4 in Abstract 5, IJAL - Sinta 1).

The use of M1-S4 above presents the gap of the study where Example 10 defined the topic that had not been answered yet to be examined in the current study. The research gap occurs as a new idea when the research is outdated or has not been investigated and it needs new research.

Further, the use of M5-S10 in group one (Sinta 1, Sinta 2, and Sinta 3) had the average number, 2%. Meanwhile, group two (Sinta 4, Sinta 5, and Sinta 6) was 7.6%. Hence, abstracts group two preferred more in deducing a conclusion of the study. The following excerpts represent the realization of M4-S10 from each group.

Example 11:

It is suggested to consecutively provide more courses and training about confronting the 21st - century education to keep teachers voguish of any adjustments, innovations, and modifications in education. (M5-S10 in Abstract 21, JEELS - Sinta 2).

Example 12:

Based on the data analysis, it can be concluded that cooperative learning techniques that facilitated the task-based learning in learning activities can enhance the EFL learners’ self-confidence to talk in front of the class. (M5-S10 in Abstract 103, ELT Forum - Sinta 6).

Those sentences above show the example of M5-S10 usage where the conclusion is provided as a summary statement from the finding that has to be done in the study. This kind of step states the conclusion in a brief statement to make it simpler to read in the abstract, thus it usually deduces claims or commentary of a study result.

For the last step, this analysis presents the difference that quite significant, it is the occurrence of M5-S12 that describes the drawback of the study. In group two, the use of M5-S12 indicated 0% where all abstracts in this group did not state the limitation of the study at all, which contradicted with group one that presented 1% of the M5-S12 realization. The following example indicates the usage of M5-S12.

Example 13:

Limitations of the study, as well as implications for EFL teachers’ professional development (PD) and future research are also discussed. (M5-S12 in Abstract 12, TEFLIN - Sinta 1).

The sentence above shows the use of M5-S12 where Example 13 defined the lack of its study. It can be seen that the author indicated the occurrence of limitations in the study where researchers have the opportunity to write about the problem of the research study.

Overall, the finding of steps realization across Sinta levels supports the theory of Hyland’s (2000) model. All journals almost applied all steps in their abstract; thus the occurrence of each step was varied. From this finding, all abstracts paid attention to the realization of M3-S7 in defining research methodology. Moreover, some significant differences occurred between Sinta levels in certain steps such as M1-S1, M1-S2, M1-S4, M5-S10, and M5-S12, since the steps realization were indicated different numbers. The difference can be considered as the characteristic of each Sinta level.

4. CONCLUSION

From the data, the move analysis indicated that M3 (Method) was the dominant move that occurred across all journals. This move had the highest total number that implied all abstracts emphasized more the research methodology. Also, there are significant differences between Sinta levels regarding other moves. M1 (Introduction) was the most used move on Sinta 1, Sinta 2, and Sinta 3 compared to other levels. However, M5 (Conclusion) was the dominant move on Sinta 4, Sinta 5, and Sinta 6 than other Sinta levels. It can be concluded that the differences become the characteristic as a tendency that appears on Sinta levels.

Regarding the realization of steps, M3-S7 (Describing Instrument) had the highest total number across journals that also embedded M3-S6 (Describing Participant) in some abstracts on Sinta 1, Sinta 2, and Sinta 3. Then, some significant gaps were found on Sinta 1 and Sinta 6. Sinta 1 had the highest number of M1-S1 (Arguing for topic significance) and M1-S2 (Making topic generalization). Meanwhile, Sinta 6 shows the lowest manifestation of both steps. Moreover, the use of M1-S4 (Identifying gap) and M5-S12 (Stating Limitation) indicated its domination on Sinta 1, Sinta 2, and Sinta 3 that contradicted to other levels. However, Sinta 4, Sinta 5, and Sinta 6 paid more attention in stating the study conclusion as the representation of M5-10 (Deducing Conclusion).

In conclusion, the present study reveals that the difference in Sinta levels affect the occurrence of the realization of rhetorical moves within certain aspects. However, among the differences that occurred across levels, similarities of the finding data were also found. Hence, Sinta levels do not fully impact the rhetorical moves. Despite, the rhetorical moves of the data could be the guideline in writing research article abstract to improve writing skills regarding the recent trends of
rhetorical moves in the field of English Language Teaching. Since the findings of this study are still considered lacking, there is a suggestion that can be concluded for future researchers in exploring the analysis of the rhetorical moves of an abstract. The amount of data can be added to obtain more accurate results and comprehensive findings.
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