

## AUTHORS' AFFILIATION INFLUENCE TOWARDS RHETORICAL MOVES AND LINGUISTIC FEATURES OF REJECTED RAAs

**Ayu Intan Harisbaya**

*English Education Department, Faculty of Language and Literature Education,  
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Bandung, Indonesia*  
Email: ayuintan16@upi.edu

**Eri Kurniawan**

*English Education Department, Faculty of Language and Literature Education,  
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Bandung, Indonesia*  
Email: eri\_kurniawan@upi.edu

**Arif Husein Lubis**

*Korean Education Department, Faculty of Language and Literature Education,  
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Bandung, Indonesia*  
Email: lubis\_ah@upi.edu

APA Citation: Harisbaya, A. I., Kurniawan, E., & Lubis, A. H. (2023). Authors' affiliation influence towards rhetorical moves and linguistic features of rejected RAAs. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, 11(1), 171-182. <https://doi.org/10.25134/erjee.v11i1.7579>

Received: 13-10-2022

Accepted: 25-12-2022

Published: 28-02-2023

**Abstract:** An abstract is the selling point of a research article (RA), due to the fact that it can help the readers and particularly journal reviewers in selecting which RAs are remarkable to be read further and accepted. A plethora of research has analyzed the rhetorical moves and linguistic features of accepted RAAs. Nevertheless, almost none of them have explored the rejected one, based on the authors' affiliation. Invoking Hyland's (2000) rhetorical move model as the main instrument, this study intends to dismantle and fill up those lacunas by utilizing 31 rejected RAAs in total from Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics (IJAL), submitted in 2019, 2020, and 2021. The data were then separated into the same affiliation (13 abstracts) and different affiliation (18 abstracts) groups in order to find the commonality and discrepancy in the rhetorical move and linguistic features (i.e. tenses, voice, and grammatical subjects). As a result, the authors' affiliation had some influences on the structure of rhetorical moves of RAAs and the accommodation of linguistic features in each move. It also appeared that there were some primary shortcomings found in the rejected abstracts as compared to the accepted ones. This study can be adopted as the reference for future research in rhetorical moves analysis, specifically regarding the authors' affiliation and rejected RAAs.

**Keywords:** authors' affiliation; linguistic features; research article abstracts; rejected; rhetorical move analysis.

### INTRODUCTION

Each year, the academic world is always bombarded by the prevalent genre in academic writing, which is research articles published in reputable journals (Kaya & Yağız, 2020; Swales & Feak as cited in Qurratu'aini, 2022). Through research articles (RAs), scholars can try to contribute more in increasing public knowledge based on their respective fields of study, reflecting on their previous research in order to enrich their comprehension through other related RAs, broadening both national and international research collaborations, and legitimating their noteworthy claims in an academic and professional career (Hyland, 2000; Kanoksilapatham, 2005).

While research articles (RAs) are used as the media for the authors in analyzing current phenomena and expanding the findings of previous studies in particular fields, research article abstracts (RAAs) tend to help the readers of RAs in determining whether a research article is worth further reading (Amnuai, 2019; Kaya & Yağız, 2020). An abstract is a reflection and the miniature of a research article because it has to present the whole contents of an RA comprehensively yet as compactly as possible due to the limitation of words. The essential role of abstract has also been the main concern of study in some research (e.g., Amnuai, 2019; Fauzan *et al.*, 2020; Kaya & Yağız, 2020). Salager-Mayer (as cited in Hyland, 2000) stated that abstracts

should reflect the moves which are “fundamental and obligatory” (p. 64) in a research article. In a similar vein, Amnuai (2019) also agreed that move-based analysis has been widely used as the main tool in dismantling the parts of the research article abstract.

A plethora of research in RAAs has applied rhetorical move analysis to identify not only the moves of abstract but also the steps of it. Moves exhibit the communicative purposes of abstract, while steps that are integrated into moves provide narrower strategies in organizing and explaining the concise ideas of the author of RAs (Harisbaya *et al.*, 2021; Yoon & Casal, 2020). Furthermore, linguistic features also take a role in rhetorical move analysis to set the functional boundaries in helping the researchers classify the potential moves and steps of RAAs (Andika *et al.*, 2018; Yoon & Casal, 2020) and even denoting authorial stance (Pho, 2008). Consequently, it is important for the authors of RAs to be aware, learn, and master the skill of conventional rhetorical organization of RAAs (Amnuai, 2019; Kanoksilapatham, 2005; Pho, 2008). Nevertheless, Hyland (2000) contended that the perfect model of rhetorical moves is rarely found in his data of analysis. Despite the fact that many research articles (RAs) have been published hitherto in reputable journals, the awareness of writing a well-constructed RA, specifically its abstract as the foremost part-genre of RA is still low (Kaya & Yağız, 2020). Many writers of research article abstracts still fail to communicate their notions through the ideal form of rhetorical moves. Thus, again, Hyland (2000) emphasized that “more than summarising is taking place” (p. 68).

Rhetorical moves analyses have been extensively established in the area of research article abstract; however, scant attention has been paid to analyzing RAA based on authors' affiliation. Harisbaya *et al.* (2021) and Kanafani *et al.* (2021) conduct similar research through their proceedings regarding the effect of authors' affiliation collaboration in constructing RAAs. Their findings are interesting, yet still require to be discussed further. Most researchers just explore research article, MA thesis, or dissertation in the area of English native and non-native speakers (e.g. Jawad, 2018; Noorzadeh-Honami & Chalak, 2018; Sadeghi & Alinasab, 2020), novice and expert authors (e.g. Fatma & Yağız, 2020; Nabilla *et al.*, 2021; Ye, 2019) various disciplines of study (e.g. Bhatti *et al.*, 2019; Gani *et al.*, 2021; Huang, 2018; Omidian *et al.*, 2018; Qurratu'aini, 2022), or national and/or

international authors (e.g. Arsyad *et al.*, 2020; Nurcik *et al.*, 2022). From the perspective of linguistic features, Tseng (2011) only focused on verb tenses and found that present and past tenses dominantly appeared in applied linguistics journals. Meanwhile, some other previous studies identified grammatical subjects and/or voice (e.g. Nurcik *et al.*, 2022; Pho, 2008; Kafes, 2015) in analyzing linguistic features of RAAs. Pho emphasized that grammatical subjects contributed more in distinguishing moves, Nurcik *et al.* (2022) claimed that the voice from all data was apparently similar, whereas Kafes referred to Pho's findings yet with few discussions of grammatical subjects.

Moreover, using rejected research article abstracts as the source of data analysis is also still scarce to be found in rhetorical moves research that has existed so far because the data is not accessible for public in any national or even international journals. Some related previous studies of rhetorical move analysis have been carried out, but the main data are the accepted and also rejected conference abstracts (CAs), not rejected RAAs (Yoon & Casal, 2020). In order to occupy those lacunas, this research presents the comparative study of rejected research article abstracts based on Indonesian authors' affiliation from the perspective of rhetorical move analysis and some linguistic features i.e. tense, voice, and grammatical subject. The authors' affiliation will be divided into two groups, which are the same affiliation and different affiliation. Using Hyland's (2000) rhetorical moves model which was also employed in some previous studies (e.g. Amnuai, 2019; Kurniawan *et al.*, 2019; Harisbaya *et al.*, 2021; Tamela, 2019; Wahyuni *et al.*, 2021; Pratiwi & Kurniawan, 2021) as the basis of analysis, this research is expected to produce clear answers for the following questions: (1) How is the rhetorical organization of the rejected RA abstracts manifested across two groups of affiliation? (2) What linguistic features were dominantly exhibited in both groups?

## **METHOD**

A comparative approach using quantitative and qualitative research methods was applied in this research, in order to discover similarities and disparities of rhetorical moves and linguistic features on selected rejected RA abstracts based on the same and different affiliations. The qualitative method had the function of describing and elaborating the quantitative data of analysis that were provided in the form of percentages.

This research analyzed 31 abstracts from rejected research articles that were submitted to Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics (IJAL) in 2019, 2020, and 2021. IJAL was chosen due to its reputation as the only Applied Linguistics journal in Indonesia that has been indexed by Scopus (Q2). Those abstracts were selected based on two groups: group “SA” which consisted of authors from the same affiliation, and group “DA” which consisted of authors from different affiliation. Authors’ affiliation in this research was based on higher education institutions in Indonesia. 31 RAAs were divided into two groups: the first group had 18 abstracts from authors of different affiliation, while the second group consisted of 13 abstracts from authors of the same affiliation. The RA abstracts were mostly collected from English language and English education fields of studies.

Considering RAAs as prominent writing in the academic world and motivated by the limited previous studies that unraveled rejected RAAs as

the main data, this research applied a systemic rhetorical move analysis from the perspective of Hyland (2000). There were some reasons in deciding Hyland’s model as the main instrument of rhetorical moves analysis in this study, as cited and in accordance with Kurniawan and Sabila’s (2021) research: (1) Move 5 – Conclusion in Hyland’s model more thoroughly dismantled the discussion and recommendation or implication compared to Santos’ (1996) model. Move 5 of Santos’ model only highlighted the discussion of the findings; (2) The introduction and purpose parts of an abstract in Hyland’s were precisely divided into Move 1 and Move 2, while Swales (1990) combined them into one move only; (3) 800 RAAs from the various discipline of studies has been verified using Hyland’s to acquire its generic patterns (Hyland, 2000); and (4) In the most current research, Hyland’s has been the most utilized framework for rhetorical moves analysis (Lubis & Kurniawan, 2020).

Table 1. Hyland’s (2000) five-model of rhetorical moves

Move	Step
Move 1 - Introduction (I)	Step 1 – Arguing for topic significance Step 2 – Making topic generalization Step 3 – Defining the key term(s) Step 4 – Identifying gap
Move 2 - Purpose (P)	Stating the research purpose
Move 3 - Method (M)	Step 1 – Describing participants/data sources Step 2 – Describing instrument(s) Step 3 – Describing procedure and context
Move 4 - Product (Pr)	Describing the main results
Move 5 - Conclusion (C)	Step 1 – Deducing conclusion Step 2 – Evaluating the significance of the research Step 3 – Stating limitation Step 4 – Presenting recommendation or implication

Pho (2008) stated that there were seven classes of grammatical subjects as the part of linguistic features applied in rhetorical moves, including the epistemic classes.

Phenomenal classes (i.e. the things that the researcher studies):

Class 1. Objects of research and their attributes (including nouns referring to people or objects studied and their ‘attributes, properties, action, behavior, or motivations and thoughts’: *the participants, variables, these strategies, scores for the 3-criterion variables,...*).

Epistemic classes (i.e. nouns ‘belonging to the researcher or referring to the reasoning of academics’)

Class 2. Self-reference (to the author(s) of the paper): *I, we, the author, the researcher,...*

Class 3. Other-reference (including 4 subcategories: (3a) specific names of other researchers or citations of the author’s own previous studies: *Hyland (2000)...*; (3b) previous research or studies in general without referring to any specific researchers: *previous researchers, previous studies, numerous research,...*; (3c) general topics in the field: *self-efficacy, communication across cultures, educational practitioners,...*; and (3d) specific research objects or outcomes mentioned in previous research: *the notion of “accommodation”,...*).

Class 4. Audience (including words involving the readers/audience): ‘*we*’ (i.e. ‘we’ that refers to both the author and the reader),...

Class 5. Reference to writer’s own work – macro-research outcome (including words referring to the study or the paper): *this study, this*

*research, this investigation, this paper, this article, this report, . . .*

Class 6. Reference to writer's own work – micro-research outcome (referring to details of the study, research instruments, and research-related events/processes): *the findings, the results, the purpose of this study, questionnaire, discussion, a quasi-experimental with one time series design,...*

Class 7. Anticipatory *it* and existential *there*.

The process to collect and analyze the main data went through several steps. First, a letter was made for IJAL in order to ask permission in accessing the rejected manuscript. Second, the data was sorted and an online consent form for asking permission in accessing and analyzing the abstracts was sent through email to the potential

participants which presumably were suitable with the data criteria. After that, the abstracts which were allowed to be used as the main data began to be analyzed by breaking down the abstracts into sentences and labeling each sentence to the compatible move and step. Furthermore, the linguistic features of the data (i.e. voice, tenses, and grammatical subjects) were also dismantled in this study as illustrated in Table 2.

Z-Test was utilized in order to analyze the equality of steps proportion based on these hypotheses:  $H_0$  : There is no difference between the proportion of steps occurrences in SA and DA groups.  $H_1$  : There is a statistically significant difference between the proportion of steps occurrences in SA and DA groups.

Table 2. *Rhetorical moves and linguistic features labeling*

	Move	Step	Tense	Voice	Verb	GS
The aim of this research is to investigate the Culture-Specific Items (CSIs) and the techniques of translation applied to translate them from Indonesian into English in the booklet of Yogyakarta Calendar of Event 2020.	2	-	simple present	active	is	Class 6

In order to check the reliability of the analysis done in this present study, the inter-coder reliability assessment was chosen as the best tool. An experienced lecturer who put a high concern in rhetorical move analysis was enlisted as the inter-coder. Afterward, the corresponding author of this study and the inter-coder independently checked and coded 41 sentences randomly obtained from the main corpus. The results of the inter-coder agreement were 90.24% for steps analysis and 100% for move analysis. It could be seen that the agreement attained a satisfactory level of inter-coder reliability. Some previous studies also conducted the inter-coder reliability in rhetorical moves and attained agreement (e.g. Fauzan *et al.*, 2020; Rashidi & Meihami, 2018).

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

*RQ1: The manifestation of the rhetorical organization from the rejected RA abstracts across two groups of affiliation*

This section delineated the results concerning the manifestation of move-step occurrences, move-

step salience, and linguistic features of the data from the perspective of grammatical subjects, tenses, and voice. This section also provided the answers to the research questions: (1) to compare and explain the rhetorical organization of the rejected RA abstracts manifested across two groups of affiliation, and (2) to compare and identify the linguistic features that dominantly appeared in both groups.

There were two uncommon steps found in both SA abstracts and DA abstracts, which were *step previous research* labeled as 2\* in Move 1 - Introduction and *step design* labeled as 1\* in Move 3 - Method. Due to the fact that sentence was the main focus of rhetorical moves analysis in this research, some phrases and/or clauses indicated as potential embedded moves and grammatical subjects were considered not to be discussed further.

*Move-step occurrences*

Table 3. *Move-step occurrences*

Abstracts								Z-test for Equality of Proportion (Steps)	
SA				DA				Z	P (2-tailed)
Moves	Steps	Moves	Steps	Moves	Steps	Moves	Steps		
1	18.75%	1	12.50%	1	16.03%	1	32%	-1.635	0.102

	2	66.67%		2	36%	2.147	0.032
	3	12.50%		3	12%	0.053	0.957
	4	4.17%		4	12%	-1.001	0.317
	2*	4.17%		2*	8%	-0.559	0.576
2	10.94%		2	17.31%			
3	25%	1	31.25%	3	28.85%	1	24.44%
		2	9.38%			2	15.56%
		3	37.50%			3	42.22%
		1*	21.88%			1*	17.78%
4	34.38%		4	28.21%			
5	10.94%	1	35.71%	5	9.62%	1	33.33%
		2	7.14%			2	13.33%
		3	-			3	6.67%
		4	57.14%			4	46.67%

\*Note: The difference in the proportion of each step is significant at  $p < .05$   $p < .05$ , using the Z test for the difference between two proportions.

This subsection presented the overview of move-step occurrences. The data were obtained by converting the analysis results from numbers into percentages for moves and steps columns. However, in order to provide the exact proportion of steps occurrences, Z-test was also applied in this analysis.

As seen from Table 3, the percentage of Move 4 - Product in group SA was the highest among other moves, while Move 3 - Method reached the highest percentage of occurrence in group DA. Move 2 - Purpose and Move 5 - Conclusion in group SA obtained the same percentage of occurrences, which was 10.94%. Both moves were noted as the least occurring moves compared to the other four moves in group SA, whereas Move 5 in group DA obtained the lowest percentage of occurrence among other moves.

On the other hand, the step occurrences of SA abstracts and DA abstracts seemed atypical. Step 2 of Move 1 (*Making topic generalization*), Step 3 of Move 3 (*Describing procedure and context*), and Step 4 of Move 5 (*Presenting recommendation or implication*) in both groups had the highest percentage of occurrences among other steps. However, when the equality of steps proportion had been analyzed using Z-test, it could be seen from the highlighted parts of the table that there was a statistically significant difference between the proportion of Step 2 of Move 1 occurrence in group SA and that in group DA ( $.032 < .05$ ) ( $.032 < .05$ ). Meanwhile, there was no statistically significant difference in other step occurrences proportion. Therefore, the results of Z-Test for the equality of steps proportion justified that  $H_1$  was accepted only in Step 2 of Move 1. Step 3 of Move 5 (*Stating*

*limitation*) were not found in any abstracts of group SA. Meanwhile, 6.67% of Step 3 of Move 5 still could be found in group DA abstracts with insignificant proportion between group SA and DA.

As previously stated, this research found two uncommon steps: *Step 2\** of Move 1 (*previous research*) and *Step 1\** of Move 3 (*design*). The following excerpts represent the manifestation of the uncommon steps.

Example 1. Some experts analyzed synchronous classroom activities through multimodal discourse analysis. (SA9, Move 1, Step 2\*, Sentence 2)

Example 2. Previous studies suggested that male's masculinity and female's femininity largely remained to conform to their respective biological attributes. (DA17, Move 1, Step 2\*, Sentence 3)

Example 3. A quasi-experimental with one time series design was employed to examine the effectiveness of AMALL to improve the speaking of EFL slow learners. (SA2, Move 3, Step 1\*, Sentence 4)

Example 4. This research uses quantitative with experimental of one group pretest-posttest design. (DA12, Move 3, Step 1\*, Sentence 4).

Based on the findings of this study, Move 4 - Product and Move 3 - Method tended to occur in SA and DA abstracts respectively, whereas the tendency of move occurrence in accepted RAAs was only Move 3. Those findings were partly in line with some related previous studies (e.g. Harisbaya *et al.*, 2021; Kanafani *et al.*, 2021; Kurniawan *et al.*, 2019). In Harisbaya *et al.*'s findings, Move 4 became one of the prior moves, yet the appearance still did not predominate the data. Kanafani *et al.* showed that in the groups of different and same authors' affiliations from accepted abstracts, the first major move was Move 1 - Introduction. Although the general

variable of analysis was similar to this study, which is authors' affiliation, the results were not the same. In addition, only Move 3 had the highest number of occurrences in Kurniawan *et al.*, but it did not apply to Move 4 of the previous findings.

Since Step 2 of Move 1 (*Making topic generalization*) became the most manifested step of rejected RAAs based on the equality of proportion, this result was not in line with some previous studies that collected accepted RAAs as the main source of data analysis (e.g. Kurniawan *et al.*, 2019; Kurniawan & Sabila, 2021; Pratiwi & Kurniawan, 2021). Those previous studies claimed that Steps 3 of Move 3 (*Describing procedure and context*) was the most manifested step. Regarding the uncommon steps (*previous research and design steps*), those were also discovered in Lubis and Kurniawan (2020)'s research which generated the synthesized coding scheme of rhetorical moves from previous studies of RAAs across academic genres.

Move-step occurrences are scarce to be discussed in some research, particularly the occurrence of uncommon steps outside Hyland's (2000) rhetorical organization model. Thus, these findings can shed light on the revelation of move-step occurrences of the rejected RAAs based on authors' affiliation.

*Move-step salience*

Table 4. *Move-step salience in percentages*

Move	SA	DA	Step	SA	DA
1	76.92	77.78	1	23.08	33.33
			2	61.54	38.89
			3	15.38	16.67
			4	7.69	11.11
			2*	7.69	11.11
2	100	100			
3	84.62	94.44	1	69.23	44.44
			2	23.08	33.33
			3	69.23	66.67
			1*	46.15	44.44
4	92.31	94.44			
5	61.54	50	1	30.77	27.78
			2	7.69	11.11
			3	-	5.56
			4	38.46	16.67

This subsection provided the overview of move-step salience from group SA and group DA. The data were obtained by translating the analysis results from numbers into percentages. The consideration to analyze the salience was based on the number of abstracts featuring the moves and steps. If, for example, Move 1 – Introduction

appeared twice in an abstract, then it still counted as one for the salience.

According to Kanoksilapatham (2005), there were some labels related to the salience of move or step: conventional and optional. A move has to reach 60% of all the data to be recognized as a conventional move. If the frequency of a move is considered under 60%, it is labeled as an optional one. However, Amnuai (2019) clarified Kanoksilapatham's criteria by classifying the move or step salience into three parts: obligatory (100%), conventional (60% - 99%), and optional (less than 60%).

From Table 4, it could be seen that the obligatory move both in group SA and DA abstracts was Move 2 - Procedure with a percentage of 100%. There was no optional move in group SA abstracts, but it was found in Move 5 - Conclusion from group DA abstract (50%). The rest of the moves from SA abstracts were labeled as conventional moves: Move 1 - Introduction (76.92%); Move 3 - Method (84.62%); Move 4 - Product (92.31%); and Move 5 - Conclusion (61.54%). Meanwhile, Move 1, Move 3, and Move 4 were indicated as the conventional moves in DA abstract. Both Move 3 and 4 in DA abstracts obtained the same percentage (94.44%), but Move 1 reached 77.78%.

The percentage of step salience from both data were varied, however the obligatory step could not be found in both data. Step 2 of Move 1 (*Making topic generalization*) and Step 1 and 3 of Move 3 (*Describing participants/data sources and describing procedure and context—respectively*) were categorized as a conventional step in SA abstracts, but the rest of the steps from Move 1, Move 3, and Move 5 identified as the optional steps. On the other hand, only Step 3 of Move 3 was categorized as the conventional step of all DA abstracts, and the rest of the steps were considered as the optional steps.

From the perspective of move-step salience, it was detected that the obligatory move from SA and DA abstracts was Move 2 – Purpose. In contrast, there were commonly three obligatory moves that showed in accepted RAAs: Move 2, Move 3, and Move 4. This result partially resonated with some previous studies (e.g. Kafes, 2015; Kurniawan *et al.*, 2019; Pho, 2008). In Kafes' findings, Move 2 (*presenting research*) and Move 3 (*methods*) were considered as the obligatory moves in two out of three groups of analysis. Kurniawan *et al.* (2019) stated that Move 2 – Purpose and Move 4 – Product were categorized obligatory in all journals. Moreover,

Pho claimed that *presenting the research* and *summarizing the findings* were the obligatory moves in all groups of abstracts, but *describing the methodology* categorized obligatory in two of three groups of abstracts.

*RQ2: The foremost linguistic features appeared in both groups*

*Linguistic features of abstracts moves*

The distribution of each linguistic feature across the five moves of the main data was calculated separately to disclose the linguistic features that were dominantly appeared on each move. The characteristics of linguistic features from both groups were alike with the accepted RAAs. As mentioned earlier, sentences were the main unit of analysis in this present study. Therefore, if any linguistic features were discovered in a phrase or a clause, those would not be the main focus of the data analysis, as Tseng (2011) also stated. Due to the space constraints, the whole tables were not provided here; however, the characteristic of linguistic features on each move were grouped together and discussed under the relevant subsection below.

Almost all grammatical subjects classes emerged in the main data—except Class 4. Nevertheless, this research would only focus on four of seven classes found in the whole corpus due to the frequency of occurrence. Both groups SA and DA abstracts elicited similar forms of grammatical subjects from Move 1 – Introduction to Move 4 – Product, except Move 5 – Conclusion. Some anomaly linguistic features were also found in this research, such as the absence of voice and tense, double verbs, or the choice of transition and pronoun words due to the incomplete or incorrect structure of a sentence. Therefore, some linguistic features labels (in terms of tense and voice) were manipulated based on the tense and voice pattern from the previous and following sentences in the abstracts.

*Move 1 – Introduction*

The most dominant class of grammatical subject in Move 1 of both groups was *Class 3 – Other reference subject*. The following excerpts represent the most dominant grammatical subject class in Move 1.

Example 5

Brown and Levinson's theory on politeness (3a) stated that ... (SA7, Move 1, Step 2, Sentence 2)

Example 6

Numerous researches (3b) focused on technology-assisted language learning, but few of them cover inclusive learning style with authentic elements. (SA2, Move 1, Step 4, Sentence 3)

Example 7

The output of vocational school (3c) still has lower competence in English communication for industrial networking. (SA13, Move 1, Step 2, Sentence 1)

From the examples above, there was no *Class 3d - specific research objects or outcomes mentioned in previous research* found in group SA abstracts. On the contrary, *the specific names of other researchers or citations of the author's own previous studies (Class 3a)* did not appear, but instead *Class 3d* in group DA abstracts.

Example 8

Previous studies (3b) have analysed song lyrics to identify their intended messages. (DA13, Move 1, Step 4, Sentence 2)

Example 9

Self-efficacy (3c) is a person's belief in his ability to carry out planned activities. (DA12, Move 1, Step 3, Sentence 1)

Example 10

The notion of "accommodation" (3d) has been explained by Giles and his colleagues in 1973. (DA5, Move 1, Step 2\*, Sentence 4)

From the perspective of verb tense and voice, simple present tense dominated the occurrences in both groups SA and DA (62.5% and 72% respectively), whereas the second rank of verb tense occurrences emerged differently from the groups. Simple past tense (20.83%) was the second rank in group SA, while present perfect tense (20%) appeared as the second rank in group DA. Active voice also dominantly appeared in Move 1 of groups SA and DA (87.5% and 64% respectively). Although *Class 3* was dominantly employed as the main grammatical subject of the whole corpus, it could be inferred from the tense occurrence that specifically sub-class 3c was the most frequently used grammatical subject as it was applied to inform the general topics in the field.

The discussion of linguistic features in this study mostly referred to Pho's (2008) findings, especially for the grammatical subjects. As seen

from examples 5 to 10, each sub-classes of Class 3 had its own style of the verb tense and voice occurrence. Sub-class 3a indicated specific researchers applied simple past tense, while sub-class 3c applied simple present tense to convey the general topics in the field. This observation was in accordance with Pho's. Nevertheless, there was a slight difference with Pho's findings regarding the correlation between sub-class 3b and the verb tense choice. Although Pho stated that sub-class 3b tended to take the present perfect in the whole data, it did not appear the same in this research. Sub-classes 3b (*previous research or studies in general*) and 3d (*specific research object or outcome mentioned in previous research*) in DA abstracts applied present perfect tense. Meanwhile, simple past tense tended to be used for verbs with sub-class 3b subject in SA abstracts.

#### *Move 2 – Purpose*

The majority of grammatical subjects in Move 2 from the whole data was *the reference to the writer's own work – macro research outcome* (Class 5), as in line with the communicative function of Move 2 that intended to elucidate the purpose of the research. The following excerpts present the Class 5 subject in Move 2.

#### Example 11

This study (5) aims to determine the variation method used in online learning. (SA1, Move 2, Sentence 3)

#### Example 12

This research (5) investigated the translation process of the English-Indonesian language pair performed by a translator using Translog II. (DA10, Move 2, Sentence 1)

Most of the data utilized “this study”, “this article”, “this paper” or even “this research” as the subject of a sentence in Move 2, and were accompanied by the simple present tense. Simple present was still the foremost tense in both groups, with 85.71% occurrence in SA abstracts and 70.37% occurrence in DA abstracts. Simple past was also found in both groups, yet it did not stand out. The occurrence of active voice in SA and DA abstracts was the highest; however, the SA abstracts did not contain any passive voice. SA abstracts reached 100% occurrence, whereas DA abstracts got 85.19% occurrence for active voice.

The findings of the simple present as the verb tense that tended to be utilized in Move 2 of

rejected RAAs resonates with some related previous studies (e.g. Amnuai, 2019; Qurratu'aini, 2022). Pratiwi & Kurniawan (2021) mentioned that active voice was also highly emerged in Move 2, due to the fact that the authors intended to emphasize the doer rather than the action in order to make the RAAs more intelligible.

#### *Move 3 – Method*

The analysis for the grammatical subject of Move 3 revealed that *Class 1 - Objects of research and their attributes* obtained a great proportion in group SA and DA. The following excerpts illustrate the Class 1 subject of Move 3.

#### Example 13

One hundred fifty-three participants (1) are submitting the completed questionnaire, and the majority of the respondent in both languages is a student at the university. (SA7, Move 3, Step 1, Sentence 6)

#### Example 14

Five students who did their final project and five lecturers who were involved reviewing activities (1) were investigated in this study. (DA15, Move 3, Step 1, Sentence 3)

It was apparent from the excerpts above that Class 1 tended to be used as the subjects of participants in the data analysis, which in accordance with the function of Step 1 of Move 3 (*describing participants/data sources*). In contrast to the previous moves that had the same analysis of tenses for both groups, the primary tense employed in group SA for Move 3 contrasted to the tense that highly appeared in group DA. While simple present became the primary tense in group SA (71.88%), simple past tense was preferred in group DA (73.33%). In fact, simple past tense could not be found in any moves of SA abstracts. In terms of voice, group SA tended to use the active voice (56.25%), while the passive voice (71.11%) dominantly appeared in group DA.

From the perspective of Move 3, some previous research claimed that most of the method moves tended to use past tense with passive voice (e.g. Nurcik *et al.*, 2022; Pho, 2008) apparently found in abstracts from different affiliation authors. In contrast, this present study also discovered that simple present tense with active voice could also be the prominent linguistic features in method move, specifically in this case was retrieved from the rejected RAAs of the same affiliation authors. Amnuai (2019) also agreed with the tendency of using simple present with



active voice in Move 3 from the accepted international corpus.

#### Move 4 – Product

The observation of the grammatical subject of Move 3 showed that *Class 6 (Reference to writer's own work – micro research outcome)* stood out both in group SA and DA. Moreover, 17 of 18 abstracts in group DA contained Class 6 as the subject of a sentence. The following excerpts depict the Class 6 subject of Move 4.

#### Example 15

The techniques of translation which are frequently applied (6) are literal translation with 31 data and transference with 28 data. (SA10, Move 4, Sentence 5)

#### Example 16

The findings from this study (6) revealed that the participants in this study might have used English in speech situations in which they would have used recycling the mistake word. (DA16, Move 4, Sentence 6)

In terms of verb tenses and voice, group SA and DA respectively had the same tenses with the previous move–method move. Simple present was highly accommodated in SA abstracts with 75% occurrence. On the other hand, the proportion of simple present and simple past tenses were nearly commensurate in DA abstracts. Unlike the verb tenses, the realization of voice both in group SA and DA was considerably more unified. Both groups utilized active voice with 81.82% occurrence in most of the sentences appearing in product move.

The preference of active voice by the majority of authors from both groups resonates with Kurniawan et al.'s (2019) findings that analyzed accepted RAs. The previous study claimed that most authors from the data took active voice as the main voice in Move 4. As stated by Pho (2008) regarding the results of verb tenses in *summarizing the findings* move based on Santos' (1996) model, present tense was applied in order to provide the sense of “widely accepted findings” (p. 243) beyond the results of the study. Meanwhile, the use of past tense left the sense of authors' objectivity in revealing the research findings. Thus, Pho's statement was in a similar vein with the purpose of present and past tenses in the product method of this present study.

#### Move 5 – Conclusion

Unlike the previous grammatical subject realization in four moves, the subject class in Move 5 varied across the two groups. Class 1 dominated the conclusion move of SA abstracts, meanwhile Class 5 prevailed in DA abstracts. The following excerpts from both groups show the results of Class 1 and Class 5.

#### Example 17

Vocational school in Indonesia (1) should change English curriculum from general English to English for specifics purpose (ESP). (SA13, Move 5, Step 4, Sentence 17)

#### Example 18

This study (5) also reveal recommendations to tackle these issues, including: a) vocabulary enrichment through reading, b) presentation rehearsal, c) observing other students when presenting, d) learn to make effective and interesting slides, e) learn most commonly used phrases for presentation, f) practice using mind mapping and small cards to organize ideas (DA15, Move 5, Step 4, Sentence 11)

In the conclusion move, the nouns referring to people or objects of study needed to be reappeared in order to emphasize the main concern of the study which had been analyzed. It was also important for Class 5 to be restated in Move 5 as the way to confirm the readers of abstracts regarding the conclusion, suggestion, recommendation, or implication of the research.

Since most sentences in Move 5 were determined to remind the readers about the object studied and provide generalizations of the previous moves, it was not surprising that simple present became the most common tense used in group SA and DA (85.71% and 80% respectively). The use of passive and active voice in SA abstracts was nearly commensurable, while active voice prevailed in DA abstracts with 73.33% occurrence.

The results of Move 5 - Conclusion in the findings section were partly in contrast with Pho's (2008) findings in *discussing the research* (Move 5). Class 6 was not found as one of the prominent grammatical subjects in this study; but instead, Class 5 was not accommodated in Pho's findings of Move 5. However, the simple present tense which was almost exclusively employed in Move 5 of the present study agreed with Pho's (2008) research in order to make “the sentence sound more general” (p. 244).

## CONCLUSION

This research deduces that there are some similarities and differences between the rejected and accepted RAAs in general, and also between the same affiliation group of RAAs and different affiliation one in particular. It can be summed up from the results that authors' affiliation have some impact in constructing an abstract of the research article. There are two main concerns in this conclusion part that can be summarized based on the research questions.

By using Hyland's (2000) model, it can be seen that the rejected RAAs tend to emerge Move 4 – Product (SA abstracts) and Move 3 – Method (DA abstracts). Step 2 of Move 1 (*Making topic generalization*) is the most occurring step in rejected RAAs with different equality of proportion between SA abstracts and DA abstracts. It is also discovered that the obligatory move of rejected RAAs is only Move 2 – Purpose. In terms of step salience, there is no obligatory step found in rejected RAAs.

Referring mostly to Pho's (2008) analysis, this present study discloses that Class 1, Class 3, Class 5, and Class 6 of grammatical subjects tend to be applied in the rejected corpus with some distinction of Move 5 – Conclusion subjects in each group of affiliation. Simple present and simple past tenses with active and passive voice have dominantly appeared in rejected RAAs with some distinction realized in each group. Thus, it can be inferred from all the results of linguistic features on each move that the grammatical subject also plays a prominent role regarding the verb tenses and voice selection based on the context.

This research also suggests that the uncommon steps realized in this present study need to be added and explored further as the new steps in rhetorical move analysis, as Lubis and Kurniawan (2020) already proposed with their synthesized model of Hyland's move. This study should be viewed with some caution: (1) Future research should involve more abstracts to capture more data; (2) Sentences as the unit of analysis may not be able to capture the results as good as phrases. Therefore, it is recommended to explore not only sentences but also clauses or phrases as the unit of analysis in rhetorical moves.

## REFERENCES

- Amnuai, W. (2019). Analyses of rhetorical moves and linguistic realizations in accounting research article abstracts published in international and Thai-based journals. *Sage Open*, 9(1).
- Andika, R. P., Arsyad, S., & Harahap, A. (2018). Rhetorical moves and linguistic features of journal article abstracts by postgraduate students, national and international authors in applied linguistics. *JOALL (Journal of Applied Linguistics and Literature)*, 3(1), 129-142.
- Arsyad, S., Arono., Ramadhan, S., & Maisarah, I. (2020). The rhetorical problems experienced by Indonesian lecturers in social sciences and humanities in writing research articles for international journals. *The Asian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 7(1), 116-129.
- Bhatti, I. A., Mustafa, S., & Azher, M. (2019). Genre analysis of research article abstract in linguistics and literature: A cross disciplinary study. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 9(4), 42-50.
- Fatma, K. A. Y. A., & Yağiz, O. (2020). Move analysis of research article abstracts in the field of ELT: A comparative study. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 16(1), 390-404.
- Fauzan, U., Lubis, A., & Kurniawan, E. (2020). Rhetorical moves and linguistic complexity of research article abstracts in international Applied Linguistics journals. *Asian ESP Journal*, 16(5), 260-292.
- Gani, F. G., Kurniawan, E., Gunawan, W., & Lubis, A. H. (2021). Rhetorical moves analysis in soft and hard science lecturers' master's thesis and dissertation abstracts. In *Thirteenth Conference on Applied Linguistics (CONAPLIN 2020)* (pp. 156-161). Atlantis Press.
- Harisbaya, A. I., Qurratu'aini, S. F., Kanafani, A., Nurcik, A. B., Kurniawan, E., & Lubis, A. H. (2021). A comparative study on rhetorical moves of IJAL's abstracts written by UPI's lecturers and by UPI-other Indonesian universities' lecturers. *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Language, Literature, Culture, and Education (ICOLLITE 2021)* (pp. 150-156). Atlantis Press.
- Huang, J. C. (2018). Marine engineering and sub-disciplinary variations: A rhetorical analysis of research article abstracts. *Text & Talk*, 38(3), 341-363.
- Hyland, K. (2000). *Disciplinary discourses: Social interactions in academic writing*. University of Michigan Press.
- Jawad, F. A. M. (2018). Genre analysis of MA thesis abstracts by native and (Iraqi) non-native speakers of English. *Journal of University of Babylon for Humanities*, 26(1), 37-50.
- Kafes, H. (2015). Cultural or discursal proclivity: Rhetorical structure of English and Turkish research article abstracts. *The Anthropologist*, 21(1-2), 240-254.
- Kanafani, A., Nurcik, A. B., Harisbaya, A. I., Fauzia, S., Qurratu'aini, E. K., & Lubis, A. H. (2021). Rhetorical move and linguistic features

- comparative analysis of research article abstracts by authors of different organizational backgrounds. *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Language, Literature, Culture, and Education (ICOLLITE 2021)* (pp. 129-135). Atlantis Press.
- Kanoksilapatham, B. (2005). Rhetorical structure of biochemistry research articles. *English for Specific Purposes*, 24(3), 269–292.
- Kaya, F., & Yağız, O. (2020). Move analysis of research article abstracts in the field of ELT: A comparative study. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 16(1), 390-404.
- Kurniawan, E., & Sabila, N. A. A. (2021). Another look at the rhetorical moves and linguistic realizations in international and Indonesian journal articles: A case of tourism research. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 11(2), 318-329.
- Kurniawan, E., Lubis, A. H., Suherdi, D., & Danuwijaya, A. A. (2019). Rhetorical organization of applied linguistics abstracts: Does scopus journal quartile matter? *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, 19(4), 184-202.
- Lubis, A. H., & Kurniawan, E. (2020). A review of genre analysis of research abstracts: Lessons learned and recommendations for future research directions, pedagogical practices, and policies. In Anshori, D.S., Purnawarman, P., Gunawan, W., & Wirza, Y. (Eds.), *Language, education, and policy: Contemporary theory and research* (pp. 595-625). Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia Press.
- Nabilla, S., Luthfianda, S. N., Suherdi, D., Kurniawan, E., Gunawan, W., & Lubis, A. H. (2021). How do novice and experienced Indonesian authors rhetorically organize research article introduction? In *Thirteenth Conference on Applied Linguistics (CONAPLIN 2020)* (pp. 502-507). Atlantis Press.
- Noorizadeh-Honami, L., & Chalak, A. (2018). Comparative analysis of architecture research article abstracts written by native and non-native authors: a cross-linguistic, cross-cultural study. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 8(3), 325-330.
- Nurcik, A. B., Kurniawan, E., & Lubis, A. H. (2022). Rhetorical moves analysis on scopus-indexed research article abstracts by national and international authors. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, 10(2), 349-358.
- Omidian, T., Shahriari, H., & Siyanova-Chanturia, A. (2018). A cross-disciplinary investigation of multi-word expressions in the moves of research article abstracts. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 36, 1-14.
- Pho, P. D. (2008). Research article abstracts in applied linguistics and educational technology: A study of linguistic realizations of rhetorical structure and authorial stance. *Discourse Studies*, 10(2), 231-250.
- Pratiwi, S. N., & Kurniawan, E. (2021). Rhetorical move and genre knowledge development of English and Indonesian abstracts: A comparative analysis. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 8(3), 885-900.
- Qurratu'aini, S. F., Kurniawan, E., & Lubis, A. H. (2022). Rhetorical move analysis of science and engineering abstracts rejected in a scopus-indexed journal. *RETORIKA: Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa*, 8(1), 38-47.
- Rashidi, N., & Meihami, H. (2018). Informetrics of scientometrics abstracts: a rhetorical move analysis of the research abstracts published in scientometrics journal. *Scientometrics*, 116(3), 1975-1994.
- Sadeghi, K., & Alinasab, M. (2020). Academic conflict in applied linguistics research article discussions: The case of native and non-native writers. *English for Specific Purposes*, 59, 17-28.
- Santos, M. B. D. (1996). The textual organization of research paper abstracts in applied linguistics. *Text*, 16, 481-499.
- Swales, J. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge University Press.
- Tamela, E. (2020). Move structure analysis on research article abstracts in national and international SCOPUS indexed journals. *Proceedings of International Conference on English Language Teaching (ICONELT 2019)* (pp. 12-17). Atlantis Press.
- Tseng, F. P. (2011). Analyses of move structure and verb tense of research article abstracts in applied linguistics journals. *International Journal of English linguistics*, 1(2), 27-39.
- Wahyuni, I. T., Gunawan, W., Muniroh, R. D. D. A., & Kurniawan, E. (2021). Rhetorical moves and genre development in soft science research article abstracts. *Indonesian EFL Journal*, 7(2), 121-130.
- Ye, Y. (2019). Macrostructures and rhetorical moves in energy engineering research articles written by Chinese expert writers. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 38, 48-61.
- Yoon, J., & Casal, J. E. (2020). Rhetorical structure, sequence, and variation: A step-driven move analysis of applied linguistics conference abstracts. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 30(3), 462-478.

**Ayu Intan Harisbaya, Eri Kurniawan, & Arif Husein Lubis**

*Authors' affiliation influence towards rhetorical moves and linguistic features of rejected RAAs*