

## CHAPTER II

### LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter discusses the literature review on this study, concerning the genre, discussion section, and the previous studies.

#### A. Genre

In daily life, people often recognize genre as the things related to art and literature. It can be music, movie, poem, story, poetry, etc. When people are discussing about music, the genre are about *pop, rock, jazz* etc. On the other hand, when people are talking about movie, the genre can be *romance, comedy, horror, science-fiction*, etc. According to Johns, genre in this era is known as the social character of oral and written communication by diverse academics and experts from applied linguistics.<sup>26</sup> Meanwhile, that genre in this case is not merely about art or literature. It tends to discourse field.

According to Hyland, genre has a communicative practice that can influence reader by the type of the text.<sup>27</sup> Furthermore, Swales explained that a genre comprises a class of communicative events, the members of which share some set of communicative purposes. These purposes are recognized by the expert members of the parent discourse community, and thereby constitute the rationale for the genre. This rationale shapes the schematic structure of the discourse and influences and constrains choice of content and style. Communicative purpose is both a privileged criterion and one that operates to keep the scope of a genre as here conceived narrowly focused on comparable rhetorical action. In addition to purpose, exemplars of a genre exhibit various patterns of similarity in terms of structure, style, content and intended audience. If all high probability expectations are

---

<sup>26</sup> Ann M. Johns, "Genre and ESL/EFL Composition Instruction", *Exploring the Dynamics of Second Language Writing*, 195-217. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

<sup>27</sup> Ken Hyland, "Genre, Discipline, and Identity", *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 20(02), (2015), 32.

realised, the exemplar will be viewed as prototypical by the parent discourse community.<sup>28</sup> Thus, genre has many types that writers can use it based on their needs. The writers can use genres depend on what they will write or what they will report. Genre has many types that the writer should select them based on the research they take.

Hyland says that genres are description of the rhetorical movements to perceived constant conditions; also recognizing certain forms of language/meaning varieties as indicating effective ways of getting things done in familiar context. It means that the writers draw on genre in continual situation that they use rhetorical movement as way to answer and to identify the research based on societies' need. Swales noted that genre functions and forms change with time and across discourse communities. For instance, the writing of research article in Indonesia may differ from research article from another country in term of form. Thus, study concerning on writing as a genre is always needed.

Genre analysis is a branch of discourse analysis and is one of the most important approaches to text analysis. Its aim is to explore the specific uses of a language and understand the communicative uses of the language in particular communicative situations<sup>29</sup> Hyland added, there are two central assumptions to analyze genres. First, the characteristic of an alike group of texts depend on the social context of their formation and use, and the second is that those characteristics can be described in a way that communicates a text to others and to the choice limits acting on text procedures. Thus, genre academics localize member of society at the core of language use and assume that

---

<sup>28</sup> J. M. Swales, *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings* (New York: Cambridge University Press: 1990), 58.

<sup>29</sup> Ken Hyland, *Genre and second language writing (4th ed.)* ( USA: The University of Michigan Press: 2007), 27.

every successful text will present the writers' consciousness of its context and the readers which form part of that context.<sup>30</sup>

Nowadays, many experts focus on analyzing academic genres. There are some kinds of academic genre that they focus on, such as: grant proposal, introduction part of a research, research article, thesis and abstract. In line with this research, the discussion part is one of academic genre that is needed to be analyzed for enriching the discussion about academic genre. This statement supports the reason why the researcher should conduct this research. Thus, this discussion about genre is also important because discussion itself is the branch of genre, specifically academic genre.

Based on the concept of genre and its use in language teaching and learning, Hyland states that genre has two purposes. The first is to understand the connection between language and its context of use. This case explains that how people use language to get used to and figure out specific communicative conditions and the behavior practices change over time. The second is to use this knowledge in the examination of language and literacy education. This second purpose both pairs research in new literacy studies, which considers literacy as social practice.<sup>31</sup>

According to Swales and Bhatia (cited by Johansen), there are three elements included in structuring genre. Those elements are communicative purposes, moves and rhetorical strategies. Communicative purpose means text-genre that has aim to socialize the rule of the text, knowing the communicative purpose of genre helps the society to recognize the determination of the text. Furthermore, Bhahtia (cited by Johansen) defines move as the communicative purpose component the general criteria for a certain text-

---

<sup>30</sup> Ibid., 29.

<sup>31</sup> Ken Hyland, *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics: Genre: Language, Context, and Literacy* (USA: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 113.

genre and provide the organization of a text into a number of constituents. Also, rhetorical strategy indicates the option of the writers in arranging their private purposes are non-discriminative strategies which means that the options do not affect or modify the nature of a genre.<sup>32</sup>

Those three structuring genre elements have relation each other. Communicative purpose is the first element that is being basic founder of genre. It is as the purpose of why the genre exists. Then, communicative purpose has move as constituent that can distinguish the different types of genre. For creating written text based on specific moves, the writers have rhetorical strategy as their strategy to fulfill the need of the content of their writing.

Another term, Rhetorical move has 2 root words, they are rhetoric and move. Rhetoric is the successful use of language, characteristically in the context of public speaking, in a continuous practice successful in return to standard ancient times. The theory of rhetoric is the concept that effective claim must be realistic and go along with a structural arrangement to create an opinion of reliability for the viewers. Besides, moves are discriminative component of generic structure of the text. In line with the theories, this study discusses about assessing the effective argument placed based on the chronological sequence in research article discussion.<sup>33</sup>

Lastly, a genre comprises a class of communicative events, the members of which share some set of communicative purposes. These purposes are recognised by the expert members of the parent discourse community and, thereby, constitute the rationale for the

---

<sup>32</sup> Winni Johansen, "Review Article: Analysing Genre: Language Use in Professional", *Journal of Linguistics*, 19, (1997), 215.

<sup>33</sup> Latifatul Fajriyah, *Representation of Rethorical Move of Thesis Abstracts in English Teacher Education Department*. A Thesis. English Teacher Education Department, Faculty of Education and Teacher Training, UIN Sunan Ampel, (2015), 17.

genre. Nowadays, genre can be found expansively in different fields, such as linguistics, discourse, social sciences and business. This study focused on the move analysis of a corpus of texts considered to be representative of a specific genre. A move in genre analysis is defined as a discursal or rhetorical unit that performs a coherent communicative function in a written or spoken discourse. Each move has its own communicative purpose, which, together with other moves, contributes to the general communicative purposes of the texts. Each rhetorical move can be realised by one or more steps, but not all moves comprise constituent steps. Both moves and steps are functional units and can be optional or obligatory in a genre. Some moves or steps occurring regularly in a genre are considered obligatory; others occurring less frequently are considered optional. The identification of moves is a crucial step in a rhetorical structure analysis.

## **B. Frameworks in RAs Discussion Section**

Researchers and scholars have investigated the research article discussion as a genre and posited different rhetorical structure models. The proposed rhetorical structure models that can be used in analyzing RA discussion section are as follow:

a. Swales (1990)<sup>34</sup>

In Swales' (1990) framework, there are eight move that possibly appear in RAs discussion sections. The moves are as follow:

Move 1

(*background information*), is statement about 'theoretical and technical information' as already addressed earlier in the RA;

---

<sup>34</sup> J. M. Swales, *Genre analysis*, 172-173.

#### Move 2

*(statement of results)*, is the claim made by the writer as the direct answer to their research question;

#### Move 3

*((un)expected outcome)*, is statement or comment on whether or not the research results or finding are as they are expected;

#### Move 4

*(reference to previous research)*, is a rhetorical attempt of writer/s to link the present research finding/s to the available relevant knowledge or information for the purpose of comparison or to support the present findings;

#### Move 5

*(explanation)*, is the writer's rhetorical attempt to logically convince readers why such unexpected or extraordinary results or findings of the present study occur;

#### Move 6

*(exemplification)*, is only an illustration or samples to strengthen or support the explanation;

#### Move 7

*(deduction and hypothesis)*, is the writer's claim on the level of interpretation of the research findings to a larger scope of topic or area; and

#### Move 8

(*recommendation*), is writer's suggestion on the application or implementation of the research findings in practical ways and/or suggestion for further studies in the same or similar topic.

b. Peacock's (2002) Model as cited in Al Shujairi, et al (2019)<sup>35</sup>

In Peacock's (2002) framework, there are also eight moves to be analyzed in discussion sections. The model of the framework is almost the same with Swales' (1990) framework. The framework is described below.

Move 1: Information move (*background about theory/research aims/methodology*)

Move 2: Finding (*with or without a reference to a graph or table*)

Move 3: Expected or unexpected outcome (*comment on whether the result is expected or not*)

Move 4: Reference to previous research

Move 5: Explanation (*reasons for expected or unexpected results*)

Move 6: Claim of the contribution to research (*sometimes with recommendations for action*)

Move 7: Limitation

Move 8: Recommendation (*suggestions for future research*).

c. Yang and Allison 2003 as cited in Hussin & Nimehchisalem (2018)<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup> Y.B.J. Al-Shujairi, H. Tan, A.N. Abdullah, V. Nimehchisalem, & L.G. Imm, "Moving in the Right Direction in the Discussion Section of Research Articles", *Journal of Language and Communication*, 6(2), (2019), 26.

In this model, proposed by Yang and Allison (2003), there are 7 moves possibly appear in RAs discussion section. There are also some steps in the move 4, 6, and 7 which allow the researchers to be more detailed in analyzing the RA discussion section.

Move 1: Background Information

Move 2: Reporting Results

Move 3: Summarizing Results

Move 4: Commenting on results

Step 1: Interpreting results

Step 2: Comparing results with literature

Step 3: Accounting for results

Step 4: Evaluating results

Move 5: Summarizing the study

Move 6: Evaluating the Study

Step 1: Indicating informations

Step 2: Indicating significance/advantage

Step 3: Evaluating methodology

Move 7: Deductions from the research

---

<sup>36</sup> N.I.S.M. Hussin & V. "Nimehchisalem, Organisation and Move Structure in the Results and Discussion Chapter in Malaysian Undergraduates' Final-Year Projects", 2368.



Step 1: Making Suggestions

Step 2: Recommending further research

Step 3: Drawing pedagogic implications

- d. Kanoksilapatham's (2007) model as cited in Sabet and Kazempouri (2015)<sup>37</sup>

The last framework is the Kanoksilapatham's (2007) framework. This framework only consists of four moves. However, in the move 3, there are some steps used to consolidate the result of the study. The framework is presented in the following.

Move 1: Contextualizing the Study

Step 1: Describing established knowledge or citing previous research

Step 2: Presenting generalizations, claims, deductions or research gaps

Move 2: Consolidating Results

Step 1: Restating methodology

Step 2: Stating selected findings

Step 3: Referring to previous literature for comparison

Step 4: Explaining differences in findings

Step 5: Making claims

Step 6: Exemplifying

---

<sup>37</sup> M.K. Sabet, & M. Kazempouri, "Generic Structure of Discussion Sections in ESP Research Articles across International and Iranian Journals", *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 6(2), (2015), 89.

Move 3: limitation of the present study

Move 4: Suggesting further studies

Generally, the main ideas in the four frameworks are the same. However, this study used the Yang and Allison's (2003) framework as it is more specific and had developed in applied linguistics studies which is also the focus of this study.

### **C. Studies on Discussion Section of Academic Papers**

Several studies have been conducted to identify the rhetorical organization of discussion section in research article. Yang and Allison (2003) examine the final sections (results, discussions, and conclusions) of RAs in applied linguistics. They further report that, although the same set of seven moves appeared across all final sections, commenting on results was the most frequent and obligatory move and could occur repeatedly in the discussion sections. The two moves of reporting results and summarizing results together occurred less often, although the former occurred in all discussion sections except one. Consequently, Yang and Allison (2003) consider the reporting results move to be quasi-obligatory. Basturkmen (2012) conducted a research on the same topic, but different subjects. He found that Yang and Allison's (2003) moves/steps framework of the discussion of results sections in applied linguistics is mostly applicable because the move/step types identified were similar to those described in applied linguistics.<sup>38</sup>

Hussin and Nimehchisalem (2018) conducted a study entitled "Organisation and Move Structure in the Results and Discussion Chapter in Malaysian

---

<sup>38</sup> Sultan H. Alharbi, "Schematic Structure of Discussion of Results Sections in the Field of Dentistry: A Comparison of International and Local English-Medium Journals", 63-64.

Undergraduates' Final-Year Projects". They found that the moves most used were "Reporting results" and "Commenting on results".<sup>39</sup> The frequencies of both moves were higher compared with the frequency of 'Preparatory/Background information' and 'Summarising results'. Another study related to the move structure in the discussion section was done by Alvi, Mehmood & Rasool (2017). They found that Not even a single obligatory move is found in selected theses which reveal that the rhetorical pattern of Pakistani PhD scholars does not match with this model of move structure. Contrary to move structure, move cycles proposed by Peacock (2002) are largely established in the research theses.<sup>40</sup>

Al-Shujairi, Tan, Abdullah, Nimehchisalem, and Imm (2019) studied the discussion sections of research articles. The findings demonstrate the manifestation of three steps in move 1 and another three in Move 5. In addition, two moves namely Implications and Summary of Results were also found in the analysis. Regarding the disciplinary differences, move 2 (*Finding*) and move 5 (*Explanation*) were found to be obligatory in AL discipline while Move 7 (*Concluding information*) was the only obligatory move in MS discipline. Furthermore, a more holistic model on moves and steps was drawn along with a list of linguistics cues pertinent in each move and step.<sup>41</sup> Dobakhti (2016) studies the discussion section of qualitative research in applied linguistics. She found that the generic structure of discussion section of qualitative RAs are both different

---

<sup>39</sup> N.I.S.M. Hussin & V. Nimehchisalem, "Organisation and Move Structure in the Result and Discussion Chapter in Malaysian Undergraduates' Final-Year Projects", 2365.

<sup>40</sup> U.F. Alvi, M.A. Mehmood, & S. Rasool, "Identification of Moves Structure in the Discussion Section of Social Sciences Doctoral Research Thesis", *Linguistics and Literature Review (LLR)*, 3(1), (2017), 42.

<sup>41</sup> Y.B.J. Al-Shujairi, H. Tan, A.N. Abdullah, V. Nimehchisalem, & L.G. Imm, "Moving in the Right Direction in the Discussion Section of Research Articles", 23.

and similar to those identified in literature investigating empirical RAs. Furthermore, she argued that these differences can be attributed to the different characteristics of qualitative research.<sup>42</sup>

Sabet and Kazempouri (2015) conducted a comparative study regarding on the discussion section in research articles across international and national journals. They found that *contextualizing the study* (Move 1) and *consolidating results* (Move 2) were the obligatory moves in Discussion section of RAs across international and national journals. *Evaluation of the findings* was a new step found in international discussion sections but absent in national ones.<sup>43</sup> Another comparative study was done by Massoum & Yazdanmehr (2019) who conducted an analysis on the discussion section of Iranian and English ELT theses. The result indicated that statistically significant differences between the genre followed in the discussion sections of Iranian and non-Iranian TEFL M.A. theses. The most significant divergence was found in summarizing the study. English-speaking TEFL thesis writers tended to summarize the study in discussion section significantly more than Iranian writers. Statistically significant differences were also found in the distribution of obligatory, conventional and optional moves. English-speaking writers indicated limitations in the discussion section significantly more than Iranian writers.<sup>44</sup> Moreover, a comparative study of research article discussion section of local and international journals was done by

---

<sup>42</sup> L. Dobakhti, "A Genre Analysis of Discussion Sections of Qualitative Research Articles in Applied Linguistics", *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 6(7), (2016), 1383.

<sup>43</sup> M.K. Sabet, & M. Kazempouri, "Generic Structure of Discussion Sections in ESP Research Articles across International and Iranian Journals", 87.

<sup>44</sup> Y.H. Massoum, & E. Yazdanmehr, "A Genre-analysis of the Discussion Section of Iranian and English ELT Theses: A Comparative Study", *Theories and Practice in Language Studies*, 9(12), (2019), 1611.

Jalilifar, Hayati, and Namdari (2012). The data comprised 80 RA discussions (40 from local and 40 from international journals) which were analyzed by incorporating Dudley-Evans' (1994) model. The findings demonstrated no major quantitative differences between the moves utilized in the two groups of RAs except for move 5 (*Reference to previous research*).<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>45</sup> A. Jalilifar, A. M. Hayati, & N. Namdari, "A Comparative Study of Research Article Discussion Sections of Local and International Applied Linguistic Journals", 1.