

Comparative Study: Rhetorical Moves Of Research Article Abstracts Written by American and Indonesian Authors

Nur Alfin Karimah¹, Ahmad Munir², Syafiul Anam³
^{1,2,3} Language and Literature Education Department, Postgraduate School,
 Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia

Article Info

Article history:

Submitted November 24, 2022

Revised February 07, 2023

Accepted September 11, 2023

Published November 20, 2023

Keywords:

Comparison
 Rhetorical moves
 Abstract
 Research article

ABSTRACT

Research in Research Article (RA) abstract written by native English authors has been widely conducted. Yet, a comparison of RA abstracts written by American authors and Indonesian authors has not been conducted. This paper reports a study on the analysis of research article abstracts written by American and Indonesian authors published in two reputable journals. Data presented are move sequences of 20 Research Article (RA) abstracts from the latest six years issue (2021-2016). The abstracts were selected from a particular discipline, English language teaching and learning, to control the variability. The findings reveal that the salient move sequences of two groups have reflected the stipulated framework of the rhetorical abstracts. The American authors and Indonesian authors complete the moves occasionally within 3 units, 4 units, or 5 units. The similarity and differences of expressions used in writing abstracts in each move have been detected. The article concludes by highlighting the status of Indonesian authors in writing the RA abstracts compared to the native English authors.

Corresponding Author:

Nur Alfin Karimah,

Language and Literature Education Department, Postgraduate School,
 Universitas Negeri Surabaya

Jl. Lidah Wetan, Lidah Wetan, Kec. Lakarsantri, Kota SBY, Jawa Timur 60213

Email: nur.18029@mhs.unesa.ac.id

INTRODUCTION

This research was inspired by the status of English as an international language that gives a lot of effects in research, including the practice and policy of publication. Doing publication in the local language makes authors receive inferior citations than doing it in English (Liang, Rousseau, & Zhong, 2013). Researchers who do not have English language background will possibly get difficulty to gain the essence of the intended research article written in English. The spread of research information even wider to all around the world through publication on which the importance of abstract also becomes a point of importance (Melander, Swales, & Fredrickson, 1997).

A well-known phenomena rise when there was a policy from the journal editors for researchers to complete their articles with English abstracts if the article were written in other languages (Ventola 1994). This policy made 'variability' in writing abstracts for nonnative English speakers, especially in the rhetorical moves. Moves refer to a stretch of text that has a particular job to reveal different information classification inside it (Swales & Feak, 2009).



Many non-Indonesian researchers conducted comparative research as a follow-up to that variability issue. Melander et al. (1997) found that there are differences in the rhetorical structure in the research article (RA) abstracts written by Swedish and American. In a similar vein, Li (2020) found differences in rhetorical moves pattern in Chinese RA abstracts compared to English RA abstracts by some native authors such as USA, UK, Australia, New Zealand, and Canada.

Martin-Martin & Burgess (2004) analyzed academic criticism inside RA abstracts written in English and Spanish. Their findings showed that English RA abstracts have higher academic criticism than Spanish RA abstracts; English texts prefer using an impersonal and indirect way; Spanish texts convey the personal and direct way to establish academic criticism.

Bonn & Swales (2007) did exploratory studies for English research article (RA) abstracts published in English and French journals, concluding that there are three different levels based on the voice choice, linguistic forms (personal pronoun, sentence length, and transition word selection), and research report style.

Kafes (2012) traced the rhetorical moves of RA abstracts written by native authors (American), Turkish, and Taiwanese. The results showed that results, purpose, and methods are the most common moves appearing in RA abstracts for the three groups; American authors have more complete abstract units than Turkish and Taiwanese authors. Li (2020) explored the differences in English RA abstracts rhetorical moves produced by native authors and Chinese. He worked with wider subjects of the native authors than Kafes (2012) did. The natives are from the USA, UK, Australia, New Zealand, and Canada. If the preceding research used the Swalesian approach as the fundamental framework, Li (2020) used the framework by Hyland (2004). The finding revealed that product and method are the most frequent moves that occur inside native English RA article abstracts than Chinese's.

To the best of our knowledge, there is a limited number of comparative research about rhetorical moves in RA abstracts written in English published by Indonesian journals. For example, Andika, Safnil, & Harahap (2018) analyzed RA abstracts from three different groups based on Swales' (2009) model. The groups were postgraduate students in their local institution journal website, national authors in Indonesian national journal website, and international authors in two international journal websites. By doing the comparative analysis with three groups, there were some differences. Move 1 (introduction/background/situation) was rarely found in first group's abstracts. The first group also showed frequent use of past tense than present tense and hedges (meta-discourse device) compared to the second and third groups did. Although their research brought the 'international' term, they did not clarify whether the English abstracts were written by native English or not.

Amalia, Kadarisman, & Laksmi (2018) did a comparative research, but the participants were all Indonesian. They compared undergraduate and master thesis abstracts based on Samraj's (2002) framework, concluding that some of the students with a low GPA can write complete moves; not all students with high GPA write complete five moves; regardless of their GPA, some students show overlap moves. Another comparative research was conducted by Mirahayuni (2002) who investigated textual structures of the introduction and discussion section in the research articles by following Swales' (1990) CARS model. The result showed differences in both the form and function of rhetorical moves in texts written by native English and native Indonesian authors.

Indonesian researchers have brought the issue of rhetorical moves discussion in a single group of a discourse community. Luthfiyah, Alek, & Fahriany (2015) investigated cohesion and rhetorical moves in thesis abstracts written by English Language Education students based on the concept of Halliday & Hasan (2013) for cohesion and Swales & Feak

(2009) for rhetorical moves. They concluded that the abstracts fall to a medium level of cohesion usage and most of the abstracts are not well-organized.

Wahyu (2016) examined rhetorical moves and explored the use of verb tense in RA abstracts by adopting Samraj's (2002) model. The findings revealed that there are three frequent moves namely Move 2 (purpose), Move 3 (method), and Move 4 (result); the dominant tense in all five moves is present tense; past tense is mostly used in Move 3.

Siyaswati & Rochmawati (2017) examined undergraduate thesis abstracts using Hyland's (2000) model in five classifications. Half of the RA abstracts omitted the introduction move and discussion of the findings. Suryani & Rismiyanto (2019) examined English bachelor abstracts written by social science department students using Hyland's (2000) model. They found that most of the abstracts did not follow the five models as presented in Hyland's model.

The studies above show that there is no comparative research between RA abstracts produced by native English and Indonesian. The present study aims to compare rhetorical moves in English research article abstract written by native English authors (American) and non-native English authors (Indonesian). Specifically, this study investigates the following question: What are the differences and similarities in the rhetorical moves in English research article abstracts written by native English authors and Indonesian as non-native English authors?

THEORY AND METHOD

This study investigated rhetorical moves of English research abstracts written by Americans and Indonesians from two reputable journals, *Cakrawala Pendidikan* and TESOL quarterly. 20 Research Article (RA) abstracts from the latest six-year issues (2021-2016) were selected in this study.

To do an in-depth analysis, there were some considerations for selecting corpora: the disciplinary difference, the prestige of the journal, the identity of the author, and the type of the articles. Further explanations are described as follows.

This study took RA abstracts from a particular discipline, English language teaching and learning, for controlling the variability among disciplines. The RA abstracts were gained from an Indonesia journal as corpus A, *Cakrawala Pendidikan*, and an international journal as corpus B, i.e. TESOL quarterly. TESOL quarterly has a high quartile of Scopus, Q1, from Q4 to Q1 as how it is described in Scimago Journal Rank (SJR) website. *Cakrawala Pendidikan* also has a high score classification journal by *Sinta Indonesia*, S1, from S6 to S1. Thus, this consideration could be a fair criterion to select journals.

The researchers focused on RA abstracts written by native English authors (American) as corpus A because the availability of articles by American authors is larger compared to other native English from England, Canada, Scotland, Australia, and New Zealand (Kafes, 2012). The identity of American authors was determined based on their name and the status of their affiliation. Although identifying American authors' names to determine their first language status is hazardous, the Indonesian author's name is quite indicative in corpus B.

In this study, only RA abstracts from empirical studies were used either qualitative, quantitative, or mixed methods. Non-empirical study articles mean that the articles contain concepts or further issue should be finished for further research. It makes the structure of non-empirical study articles is different from the empirical study. So, a non-empirical study was eliminated.

This study used content analysis as a technique of data analysis. Content analysis is a suitable technique to gather valid inferences from texts based on a particular context (Krippendorff, 2004). In the analysis process, the researchers labeled each sentence in the

abstracts with a sequence of numbers and classified them on which they represent rhetorical moves based on Swales & Feak's (2009) framework in Table 1. When a move appears or repeats more than once, those sentences are identified as the same moves. A sentence may contain more than one move. In this case, the sentence is classified as the most salient move that will be assigned (Crookes, 1986). The abstracts were analyzed based on their completeness within five moves, the frequency occurrence of each move, the rhetorical moves pattern manifested inside, and the expressions in each move.

Table 1. Rhetorical Moves classification of an abstract in the research article by Swales & Feak (2009)

Move	Typical Labels	Implied questions
Move 1	Background/introduction/situation	What do we know about the topic? Why is the topic important?
Move 2	Present research/ Purpose	What is this study about?
Move 3	Methods/ materials/ subjects/ procedures	How was it done?
Move 4	Results/ findings	What was discovered?
Move 5	Discussion/conclusion/ implications/ Recommendations	What do the findings mean?

After analyzing RA abstracts, it was continued to display the results into some tables and interpret them. Then, the researchers conducted the inference process: reporting research results in the result section and matching the results with some related theory in the discussion section.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Results

Table 1. Rhetorical Moves Variation of Two Groups

	American authors	Number of articles	Indonesian authors	Number of articles
1	M1-M2-M3-M4	2	M1-M2-M3-M4-M5	4
2	M1-M2-M4	1	M1-M2-M3-M4	1
3	M2-M3-M4-M5	1	M2-M3-M4	2
4	M2-M3-M4	2	M2-M3-M4-M5	3
5	M1-M2-M3-M4-M5	1		
6	M2-M4-M5	1		
7	M3-M4-M2	1		
8	M2-M3-M4-M3-M5	1		

Table 2. Cumulative Rhetorical Moves Pattern of Two Groups

	Move Sequence	American authors	Indonesian authors	Cumulative
1	M1-M2-M3-M4	2	1	3
2	M1-M2-M4	1	0	1
3	M2-M3-M4-M5	1	3	4
4	M2-M3-M4	2	2	4
5	M1-M2-M3-M4-M5	1	4	5
6	M2-M4-M5	1	0	1
7	M3-M4-M2	1	0	1
8	M2-M3-M4-M3-M5	1	0	1

Table 3. The completeness of Rhetorical Moves in RA abstracts

	Authors	5 units	4 units	3 units
American authors	1 author		4 authors	5 authors
Indonesian authors	4 authors		4 authors	2 authors

Table 4. Rhetorical Moves Manifested in RA Article by American authors

American authors	Moves Frequency of RA abstract in corpus A					Note	Moves Pattern of RA abstract in corpus A
	Move 1 (M1)	Move 2 (M2)	Move 3 (M3)	Move 4 (M4)	Move 5 (M5)		
A1	2	1	1	2	0	M5 is absent	Linear M1-M1-M2-M3-M4-M4
A2	2	1	0	2	0	M3 & M5 are absent	Linear M1-M1-M2-M4-M4
A3	0	1	3	1	1	M1 is absent	Linear M2-M3-M3-M3-M4-M5
A4	1	1	1	3	0	M5 is absent	Linear M1-M2-M3-M4-M4-M4
A5	0	1	2	3	0	M1 & M5 are absent	Linear M2-M3-M3-M4-M4-M4
A6	0	1	2	3	0	M1 & M5 are absent	Linear M2-M3-M3-M4-M4-M4
A7	2	1	3	2	1	Complete	Linear M1-M1-M2-M3-M3-M3-M4-M4-M5
A8	0	1	0	2	1	M1 and M3 are absent	Linear M2-M4-M5
A9	0	1	2	1	0	M1 & M5 are absent	Non-Linear M3-M3-M4-M2
A10	0	1	2	1	1	M1 is absent	Non-Linear M2-M3-M4-M3-M5
Total occurrence	7	10	16	20	4		

Table 5. Rhetorical Moves Manifested in RA Article by Indonesian authors

Indonesian Authors	Moves Frequency of RA abstract in corpus B					Note	Moves Pattern of RA abstract in corpus B
	Move 1 (M1)	Move 2 (M2)	Move 3 (M3)	Move 4 (M4)	Move 5 (M5)		
B1	2	1	1	2	1	Complete	Linear M1-M1-M2-M3-M4-M4-M5
B2	1	1	4	1	0	M5 is absent	Linear M1-M2-M3-M3-M3-M3-M4
B3	0	2	6	3	0	M1 & M5 are absent	Linear M2-M2-M3-M3-M3-M3-M3-M3-M4-M4-M4
B4	0	1	3	3	1	M1 is absent	Linear M2-M3-M3-M3-M4-M4-M4-M5
B5	2	1	2	2	1	Complete	Linear M1-M1-M2-M3-M3-M4-M4-M5

B6	2	1	2	6	1	Complete	Linear	M1-M1-M2-M3-M3-M4-M4-M4-M4-M4-M5
B7	1	1	1	2	1	Complete	Linear	M1-M2-M3-M4-M4-M5
B8	0	1	8	1	1	M1 is absent	Linear	M2-M3-M3-M3-M3-M3-M3-M3-M3-M4-M5
B9	0	1	2	1	0	M1 & M5 are absent	Linear	M2-M3-M3-M4
B10	0	1	1	1	1	M1 is absent	Linear	M2-M3-M4-M5
Total occurrence	8	11	30	22	7			

In this study, both American and Indonesian authors have variations of rhetorical moves based on Swales & Feak's (2009) model. American authors have more variation of move sequence than Indonesian authors. Table 1 in the Appendix provides the variation of the two groups. The rhetorical moves variation of American authors' have covered the variation of Indonesian authors' moves, but the rhetorical moves variation of Indonesian authors are not always covering the variety of native English.

The most salient rhetorical moves patterns in both two groups are M1-M2-M3-M4-M5, M2-M3-M4-M5, M2-M3-M4, and M1-M2-M3-M4. The complete pattern has manifested in five articles of two groups. The second salient variation has the absence of Move 1 while the third salient variation has the absence of Move 1 and Move 5. But, both of the variations have the same number of occurrences. The variations occur in four abstracts of the American and Indonesian authors. The last variation does not include Move 5. It occurs in three abstracts of two groups. Further detail of the cumulative rhetorical moves pattern is in Table 2 of the Appendix.

Interestingly, the salient moves as aforementioned are prioritized by Indonesian authors. No other variation appears when they employ the moves. The American authors also have interesting points. An abstract seems to have a recycle move, M3-M4-M3, between Move 2 and Move 5. Another author places Move 2 at the end of the abstract after Move 3 and Move 4.

The completeness of the five moves is manifested by some authors of the two groups. Three American authors employ five moves while half of the Indonesian authors complete the abstracts within five moves. The American author gives more details of the research findings or results in their abstract. It causes the highest occurrence to occur in Move 4. On the contrary, Indonesian authors have more explanations for how they conducted the research. Move 3 reaches the highest proportion in this group. However, both of the groups agree on the presence of Move 5. The move can be concluded as a move with a minority position in two groups. Table 4 and Table 5 in the Appendix show other moves' frequency occurrence.

The varied way and the expression used to write Move 1 to Move 5 by American authors and Indonesian authors are discussed as follows. The American authors wrote Move 1 in three different ways. The idea indicates that there is a degree of importance for the topic being investigated: "Academic language skills support", "The critical importance of the second language ... is considered the most fundamental", "Instructional scaffolding ... to help students. Move 1 also occurs to indicate that the present research topic is well-established. Some researchers used expressions such as "Research over the past decade has demonstrated", "Recently, scholars have begun to". Another style of the author was by

stating a gap in the topic research: "To date, scarce research", "Yet little systematic research".

Indonesian authors had varied expressions while writing Move 1. The most common introduction in English abstracts written by Indonesian authors was rising gaps in the study. They used such expressions: "However, there is a lack, "The practice of ... has not been well managed and standardized", "...limited research-based article.". These expressions indicate that there is something to be finished. The expression of indicating a gap is sometimes followed by another expression of Move 1 in a different sentence. The expression, "The number of ... improves significantly ..." was used to underline the significant or well-establish research area.

Other expressions show that the Indonesian author emphasized the importance of the study such as "Blended learning can be applied", "The urgency for developing students". Sometimes Indonesian author wrote Move 1 twice not only emphasizing the importance of the study but also showing relevant way between particular theory and different field of study, "Polytechnic has characteristic ... application of practical aspects supported by appropriate theory", or highlighting topic would be discussed in the study, "...highlights the role of language as a way of thinking...".

Since presenting the purpose of the research is a must to avoid bias, all of the American authors included Move 2 in their RA abstracts. The expressions used are "This study examined", "This article discusses", "This article explores", "This intervention-based study asked", "This article present findings", "This article presents an action research", "... this study analyzes", "This study investigated", "The article discusses", "This study examines". There are no Indonesian authors who missed Move 2. All of the American authors wrote Move 2 with 'main verb' in the simple present or past tense and so did Indonesian authors. Indonesian authors wrote: "This research examines", "This study describes", "This study explores", "The present study was aimed".

Indonesian authors also wrote Move 2 by using the 'to infinitive' pattern. "This study attempted to investigate", "The study objectives were to examine ...", "It seeks to investigate", "The study aims to design and develop", "The study aims to develop", "The objective of the research is to identify".

Move 3 also appears in all abstracts of American authors and Indonesian authors. In general, the authors provided information to move 3 by giving information about subjects involved in the study, kinds of study, materials (data source or kind of data collected), method, and procedure to establish the study. Almost all of the American authors and Indonesian authors combined the kind of information as aforementioned to write Move 3. There were a few authors who wrote Move 3 in a single sentence. Some expressions of Move 3 are written as follows.

The expressions used by American authors to inform the subjects of research are: "The study participants", "In this study, 12 preservice teachers" while the Indonesian author wrote "Forty-five English Education sophomore students". The kind of study was written in "A longitudinal 15 week", "Case studies of two teachers" by American authors. Indonesian authors wrote it in "This experimental study", "This qualitative research", "This research development".

American authors wrote the data source of research in the following expression: "Data presented are from 2-year ethnography", "The data include recordings of", "Data include video recordings". Indonesian authors used the expressions such as "Students' descriptive writing", "The data were collected from", and "The data are in the form of essay written by" to explain the data source.

The expressions, "The study documents", "The author engaged in", "Using content analysis", are used by American authors to tell the readers of how the research is conducted while Indonesian authors used such expressions: "This study employed a mix-method", "The research design was a mix method design", "The analysis is based on

Stapleton's criteria of", "Descriptive qualitative design was used", "This research adapted the design and development by Lee and Owens (2004)".

Both groups wrote the procedure of the study to complete the information of Move 3. American authors wrote: "The reading project was carried out ..., and participants had the opportunity", "As EBs read and discussed texts, teachers used a wide range of planned scaffolds". Indonesian authors explained the procedure of the research as in the following statement, "... they were quantitatively analyzed through ...", "Students descriptive were measured through", "The research validity was done by ...credibility...", "...storytelling tests, open-ended questionnaire, interview...".

The crucial move, Move 4, were written in all abstracts of two groups. Some of the American authors presented Move 4 results or findings in a single sentence. Others wrote the results in a series of the sentence from general to specific. Sometimes they signaled specific results with fixed phrases such as "Specifically, findings reveal", "Moreover, findings show", "In addition, data reveal", "...revealed on ...", "...no ... difference". 'That clause' is found in all abstracts to introduce the results or findings: "Result revealed that", "This study suggests that", "Findings suggest that", "The findings suggest that", "...participant also agreed that", "...results of this study suggest that ...", "...overall findings showed that", "Findings show that".

Using 'that clause' was also a common way for Indonesian authors to introduce results or findings of the research: "The findings revealed that", "The results show that", "The findings indicate that". Sometimes it was combined with the numerical way in a series of sentences, "The results reveal that (1)..., (2)...", or combined with an exact number as quantitative study result, "...principal component analyses that ..., positioning 31%, 27.3% ...". The numerical way was also used without the presence of that clause: "The results were (1) ... (2) ...". Other Move 4 which do not follow those patterns still use common main verbs such as "show" and "reveal" in the following sentences: "The result of data analysis showed no significant differences", "Findings of this research reveal issues".

Not all of the American authors and Indonesian authors included Move 5 in their abstracts. Three of six American authors presented Move 5 by writing the implication of the study and the rest is the conclusion. All of them presented both implications and conclusions inductively. The expression "Findings inform teacher educators ... who seek to improve ..." implies the contribution of the research to others. Another author stated the implication explicitly, "Implication for teacher education". Two authors presented the conclusion in a quite obvious way: "The article concludes". Another author presented Move 5 implicitly, "...indicating that DWCF may be an effective pedagogical ... to improve ...".

Seven of ten Indonesian authors closed their abstracts with the presence of Move 5. It contains recommendations, a conclusion, and implications. "Several recommendations ...", "This study, therefore recommends the relevant ..." are expressions used by some authors to introduce recommendations from their studies. To conclude the research, the expressions are "The interpretation of those components is coherent ..., in which the component 1 shows the positive effect ... component 2 ... indicates the negative affects item". The use of adjective words concludes that the results of their studies are coherent, positive, and partially negative. For introducing the research implications, their expressions are "The study had implications on the learning process ...", "The results are expected to give ...", "With respect to English education, this study provides a grounding portrait for ...". Another author combined the implications and recommendations: "Some implications and recommendations are also discussed".

Discussions

The complete framework of RA abstracts of Swales & Feak (2009) consists of five moves: Move 1 (background/introduction/situation), Move 2 (purpose), Move 3

(methods/materials/subjects/procedures), Move 4 (results/findings), and Move 5 (discussion/conclusion/implications /recommendations). The results of this research show that both groups have similarities and differences in terms of the Move variation, Move unit, and expressions used to write the Moves.

Native English has more variation of rhetorical moves than native Indonesian authors indeed, but the abstracts of Indonesian authors have employed the salient sequence of rhetorical moves. The move sequence, M2-M3-M4-M3-M5, of an American author seems to have a cyclicity pattern, but the patterns are not pure. The absence of the combination and repetition of the same move makes the pattern contains a sudden jump from one move to another. After move 3 appears, there is move 4. Move 3 is repeated, but it is followed by Move 5. The cyclicity pattern usually occurs between Move reviewing items of previous research and indicating a gap (Swales, 1990).

This study finds four salient moves in both groups: M1-M2-M3-M4-M5, M2-M3-M4-M5, M2-M3-M4, and M1-M2-M3-M4. The comparative research of native English and non-native English conducted by Kafes (2012) found the move sequence, M2-M3-M4, as the most salient rhetorical move between native English and non-native English. The rhetorical moves manifested in RA abstracts of Indonesian authors indicate that they have been familiar with the framework in writing English abstracts and able to write RA abstracts in a linear fashion.

The dissertation of Asari (2018) revealed the linear though pattern of Indonesian authors while writing RA abstracts in national reputable journals. There are four moves used frequently by the authors. Those moves are Move 1 (background), Move 2 (aim), Move 3 (method), and Move 4 (result). The Indonesian authors follow consistently the format of B-A-M-R to write RA abstracts leaving Move 5 (conclusion). Another move, recommendation, was considered as the additional move because it does not cover in Swales & Feak (2004). Move 1 was shortly written and used to introduce the main issue of the research. Move 2 was presented in the second sequence. The objective of the study was clearly written in this move. Move 3 appears immediately in RA abstracts after Move 2. It covered the subject, population, sample, instrument, and procedure of the research. These variables were written in a short space due to the maximum capacity of RA abstracts that is normally written in 150 to 200 words. Sometimes Move 3 only presents the data used in research and it is quite sufficient to explain Move 3. Move 4 is stated clearly by using common words.

According to Li (2020), the absence of Moves gives impact to other functional moves. The author may tend to focus on some moves rather than involve all of the moves because some of the moves are considered as the moves that cover more substantial information of their research. The group of native English and native Indonesian showed similarities in composing the RA abstracts. Not all of the American or Indonesian authors completed their RA abstracts within 5 units as suggested by Swales & Feak (2009). Table 3 in the Appendix has presented further detail. The groups have a different view for completing the abstracts within 5 moves. 5 American authors wrote the abstracts in 3 units, 4 authors involved 4 units, and 1 author had the completed 5 units. 4 of Indonesian authors followed 5 units, the other 4 authors wrote in 4 units, and 2 authors had 3 units of Moves. The results have a slight discrepancy in other previous studies. American authors are possible to have a higher or lower proportion to complete the units when the abstracts were compared to non-native English.

Kafes (2012) found that 11% of American authors, 2% of Turkish, and 15% of Taiwanese wrote the 5 units. The number of the authors to complete the Move for 4 units is 67% American, 37% Turkish, and 33% Taiwanese. Over 70% of RA abstracts written by Turkish authors include 3 units while American authors 26% and Taiwanese authors 43%. The other comparative research was conducted by Martin (2003). 67.5%, 26.25%, 3.75%, and 2.5% of native English completed the 4 units, 3 units, 2 units, and 1 unit based on four

units (I-M-R-C). Meanwhile, 25%, 51.25%, 16.25%, and 12.5% of Spanish authors completed the 4 units, 3 units, 2 units, and 1 unit.

In this study, we found the absence of Move 1, Move 3, and Move 5. The absence was interpreted from two main considerations. First, the Move is literally absent. Second, a move was written with the other moves within a sentence. This research follows Crookes (1986) to classify the presence of a move. A sentence may contain more than one move. The sentence can be classified as the most salient move that will be assigned. American authors were very often to elaborate Move 3 (data source/method/procedure/subject) and Move 4 (result/finding). In this case, we interpreted what the authors want to convey inside of the complex sentences to reveal the Move. This written style is quite different from Indonesian authors. They tended to write a simple sentence and placed each Move independently.

Martin (2003) has the same finding for such a combination of Move 3 (result) and Move 4 (finding) within a sentence. He revealed that 48.4% of native English authors Move 3 as an independent unit. The percentage of Spanish authors to write methods as an independent unit is higher, i.e. 50.7%. Furthermore, he revealed that an English author preferred to write the big chunks of methods with the reports of results and conclusions.

The Moves can be concluded as the obligatory or optional moves based on the total occurrence. The label of the fundamental or obligatory move can be proved with the total occurrence of each move from two groups. Total occurrence indicates the degree of importance for a move (Irawati, Saukah, & Ruslan, 2018; Mirahayuni, 2002; Martin, 2003). Move 3 (methods/materials/subjects/procedures) and Move 4 have a higher frequency occurrence in RA abstracts written by the American and Indonesian author compared to the other three Moves. On the contrary, Move 1 (background/introduction/situation) and Move 5 (discussion/conclusion/ implications/recommendations) less occurred nearly in both two groups.

The linguistic abstracts that are written by Swedes and English devoted very little space to the introduction and conclusion because they tend to focus on methods and results (Melander et al., 1997). Move 2 (purpose), Move 3 (method), and Move 4 (results) could be regarded as the obligatory Moves while the other Moves, Move 1 (Introduction) and Move 5 (Conclusion) are the optional Moves (Kafes, 2012). The three moves were used frequently in RA abstracts than the last two moves by American and Turkish authors.

Martin (2003) founded that Move 3 occupying the niche including Step 1a (outlining purpose) is an obligatory move in writing abstracts. The Move has the highest frequency occurrence compared to other Moves. However, an obligatory move should not be over exist especially Move 3. The author should ensure that their Move 3 is not too long (Swales & Feak, 2009). It can be written no more than 30 words to balance the space of other Moves. The American authors and Indonesian authors have covered who the subjects of the research, what kinds of the study, what the materials or data source, and how the procedure of the research is conducted. Move 3 of Indonesian authors have more lengthy sentences than American authors. Sometimes the Indonesian authors wrote Move 3 from five to eight sentences.

Asari (2018) revealed that most Indonesian authors can simplify this Move, although the sentences contain complex variables. The move frequency of Move 3 among three groups, American, Turkish, and Taiwanese, in Kafes' (2012) study were different. But, overall Move 3 was written in one or two sentences through a brief description of subjects, data sources, materials, methods, and procedures.

The manifestation of the Creating a Research Space (CARS) principle by Swales & Feak (2012) appeared when the American authors and Indonesian authors wrote the RA abstracts. Moves 1 was written by the authors to explain the importance of the research topic, prove that the present research is well-establish, mention the gap of the study. The information in rhetorical moves of RA abstracts for Move 1 relates to the background,

introduction, or situation of the study (Swales & Feak, 2009). It explains what the researcher knows about the topic and the degree of importance for the study.

The information inside the background of the research article is covered in three moves: Move 1 (establishing a research territory) contains centrality claims (why the present research is important, central, interesting, problematic, or relevant in some way) and a review of previous works of literature, Move 2 (establishing a niche) shows the gap of the study, and Move 3 (occupying the niche) executes the gaps with various ways such as outlining the research purpose, list of hypothesis or research question, announcing principal findings, stating the value of the current research, or showing a structure of the research article (Swales & Feak, 2012).

In brief, particular points were adapted from the CARS model as a framework in composing the background section of a research article by the authors to strengthen their information in the background of the research article abstracts. Besides, the appeal of claiming centrality, a well-established research area, represents the salient appeal of Swales (1990). In this study, the “appeals” were written in a word, phrase, or sentence both implicitly and explicitly.

Martin (2003) discussed the CARS principal embed in RA abstracts. The fundamental framework of his analysis followed Salager-Meyer (1990). The framework covered four units of rhetorical moves for RA abstracts: Introduction (I), Method (M), Result (R), Conclusion (C). Martin (2003) gave a deep analysis for the Introduction (I) unit.

The postulate analysis of Martin’s (2003) comparative research for the Introduction unit in RA abstracts was verified by using Swales (1990). The findings showed that the rhetorical move of the “research background” was similarly manifested in the Introduction unit of RA abstracts. Step 1a (outlining purpose) and Step 1b (announcing present research) under Move 3 occupying the niche based on Swales’ (1990) model was dominantly used by native English and Spanish authors to open the abstracts or introduce their current research. More than half of Move 1 establishing a territory, including Step 1 claiming centrality, Step 2 Making topic generalizations, and Step 3 reviewing items of previous research was found to establish the authors’ study relevancy in the social science community. Move 2 establishing a niche was the minority move found in the background of RA abstracts. Step 1b indicating a gap was the rhetorical step that most commonly written in Move 2 to point out a particular topic that needs to be conducted for further research.

Since Martin (2003) followed the framework of Salager-Meyer (1990) to analyze RA abstracts in general, sentences contained the conclusion of the study can be considered as the additional Move. The framework excludes conclusion as a part of rhetorical moves in RA abstracts.

The expressions of Moves in RA abstracts written by the American and Indonesian authors were generally found in other studies. The use of deictic, ‘the’ and ‘this’, referred to ‘study’ or ‘paper’ was used frequently to introduce research purpose (Move 2) and it was followed by dominant verbs such as ‘investigate’, ‘discuss’, and ‘analyze’ (Kafes, 2012). The American, Turkish, and Taiwanese wrote the Move in the past tense. Those verbs have manifested in RA abstracts written by the American and Indonesian authors. The common verbs used to show Move 2 in two groups are “examine”, “explore”, and “investigate”. Move 2 was written in simple past, past tense, and to-infinitive pattern.

Kafes (2012) found that Move 4 (results/findings) were characterized by the verbs, including ‘show’, ‘reveal’, ‘indicate’, and ‘provide’ that followed the inanimate subjects such as ‘the findings’, ‘the result’, and ‘the analyses’. The inanimate subjects were used in RA abstracts of the American and Indonesian authors. The verbs ‘show’ and ‘reveal’ were found in both groups, except the verbs ‘indicate’ and ‘provide’.

Asari (2018) mentioned that Move 4 uses a common word to reveal the findings of the study. The words were elaborated within ‘that clause’: “The study has shown that”,

“The results show that”, “It revealed that”, “The findings show that”. The ‘that clause’ is also used commonly to introduce research findings or result in RA abstracts written by the American and Indonesian authors. In addition, the expression “no ...difference” is found in both groups.

The typical verbs employed in Move 5 are ‘suggest’, ‘indicate’, ‘imply’, ‘reveal’, and ‘conclude’ (Martin, 2003). The verb ‘conclude’ was used in RA abstracts of American authors. The two groups, the American and Indonesian authors, have included explicitly the key point of Move 5: “Implication for ...” and “The study had implications ...”.

The expression of Move 1 and Move 3 is quite varied in literature. However, the American and Indonesian authors meet the similarities. The “fixed-phrase” was used to indicate a gap as a part of the background or Move 1. They used expressions such as “scarce research”, “little systematic research”, and “limited research”. The same precise expression for Move 3 in RA abstracts of American and Indonesian authors is “...data include”.

CONCLUSION

The RA abstracts have more similarities than differences in terms of rhetorical moves variation, the involvement of obligatory and optional moves, and the expressions used to present five Moves. In general, the rhetorical move of American and Indonesian authors follow the linear convention of Swales & Feak’s (2012) model. The salient rhetorical moves manifested in the Indonesian abstract have covered in the American authors’ abstract, but not all of the rhetorical moves of American authors appear in RA abstracts of Indonesian authors. The soul of the non-native authors will always want to be aligned with the natives when they write in the target language. The findings of this study can be the indicator that Indonesian authors have been successful authors in writing RA abstracts.

REFERENCES

- Amalia, A. S., Kadarisman, E., & Laksmi, E. D. (2018). The Rhetorical Moves in Indonesian EFL Thesis Abstracts across Educational Levels. *Jurnal Pendidikan Humaniora*, 6(2), 99-107. <http://journal.um.ac.id/index.php/jph/article/view/11475>
- Andika, R. P., Safnil, & Harahap, A. (2018). Rhetorical Moves and Linguistic Features of Journal Article Abstracts by Postgraduate Students, National and International Authors in Applied Linguistics. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Literature*, 3(1), 14-27. <https://ejournal.unib.ac.id/index.php/joall/article/view/6539>
- Asari, S. (2018). *Rhetorical Moves in English Language Teaching and Learning Research Articles Written by Indonesian English Academics*. Surabaya: Universitas Negeri Surabaya.
- Bonn, S. V., & Swales, J. M. (2007). English and French Journal Abstracts in the Language Sciences: Three Exploratory Studies. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 6, 93-108. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2007.04.001>
- Irawati, L., Saukah, A., & Ruslan, S. (2018). Indonesian Authors Writing Their Discussion Section both in English and Indonesian Research Articles. *Cakrawala Pendidikan*, 37(3), 447-456. <https://journal.uny.ac.id/index.php/cp/article/view/21536>
- Kafes, H. (2012). Cultural Traces on the Rhetorical Organization of Research Article Abstracts. *International Journal on New Trends in Education and Their Implications*, 3(3), 207-220. <http://www.ijonte.org/FileUpload/ks63207/File/20.kafes.pdf>

- Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content Analysis An Introduction to Its Methodology*. USA: SAGE Publications.
- Li, X. (2020). Mediating Cross-cultural Differences in Research Article Rhetorical Moves in Academic Translation: A Pilot Corpus-based Study of Abstracts. *Lingua*, 238, 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2020.102795>
- Liang, L., Rousseau, R., & Zhong, Z. (2013). Non-English Journals and Papers in Physics and Chemistry: Bias in Citations? *Scientometrics*, 95(1), 333-350. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-012-0828-0>
- Luthfiyah, Alek, & Fahriany. (2015). An Investigation of Cohesion and Rhetorical Moves in Thesis Abstracts. *Indonesian Journal of English Education*, 2(2), 146-159. <http://dx.doi.org/10.15408/ijee.v2i2.3086>
- Martin, P. M. (2003). A genre analysis of English and Spanish research paper abstracts in experimental social science. *English for Specific Purpose*, 22, 25-43. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906\(01\)00033-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(01)00033-3)
- Martin-Martin, P., & Burgess, S. (2004). The Rhetorical Management of Academic Criticism in Research Article Abstracts. *Text*, 24(2), 171-195. https://www.academia.edu/6339980/The_rhetorical_management_of_academic_criticism_in_research_article_abstracts
- Melander, B., Swales, J. M., & Fredrickson, K. M. (1997). Journal Abstracts from Three Academic Fields in the United States and Sweden: National or Disciplinary Proclivities? In A. Duszak, *Culture and Styles of Academic Discourse*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. pp. 251-272.
- Mirahayuni, N. K. (2002). Investigating Generic Structure of English Research Articles: Writing Strategy Differences between English and Indonesian Writers. *TEFLIN*, 13(1), 22-57. <http://journal.teflin.org/index.php/journal/article/view/138>
- Siyaswati, & Rochmawati, D. (2017). Rhetorical Perspectives of Undergraduate Students' Theses Abstracts. *Register Journal*, 10(2), 157-169. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18326/rgt.v10i2.157-169>
- Suryani, F. B., & Rismiyanto. (2019). Move Analysis of the English Bachelor Thesis Abstracts Written by Indonesians. *PROMINENT Journal*, 2(2), 192-199. <https://jurnal.umk.ac.id/index.php/Pro/article/view/4229>
- Swales, J. M., & Feak, C. B. (2009). *Abstracts and the Writing of Abstracts*. USA: The University of Michigan Press.
- Swales, J. M., & Feak, C. B. (2012). *Academic Writing for Graduate Students: Essential Tasks and Skills (3rd edition)*. USA: University of Michigan Press.
- Ventola, E. (1994). From Syntax to Text: Problems in Producing Scientific Abstracts in L2. In S. ČMEJRKOVÁ, & F. ŠTÍCHA, *The Syntax of Sentence and Text*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Wahyu, L. C. (2016). The Rhetorical Moves and Verb Tense in Research Article Abstracts. *Jurnal Pendidikan Humaniora*, 4(4), 187-192. <http://journal.um.ac.id/index.php/jph>