

## Rhetorical Moves in Introduction Sections of Applied Linguistic Research Articles of Different SINTA's Ranking

<sup>1</sup>Nova Pandan Sari, <sup>2</sup>Azwandi and <sup>3</sup>Safnil Arsyad

<sup>1,2,3</sup> English Education Postgraduate Program  
Bengkulu University, Indonesia

Corresponding e-mail: \*[novapandansari88@gmail.com](mailto:novapandansari88@gmail.com) [azwandi22@gmail.com](mailto:azwandi22@gmail.com)  
[safnil@unib.ac.id](mailto:safnil@unib.ac.id)

Received on Sept 21<sup>st</sup>, Revised on Nov 22<sup>nd</sup>, Published on Des, 30<sup>th</sup> 2022

### ABSTRACT

Rhetorical moves of RA (research article) introductions in various disciplines have been examined in many researchers, but few have investigated and compared one discipline in different national journal ranking. Therefore, this study is concerned to find out the similarities and differences of moves and steps in applied linguistic journal articles published in SINTA 1 to 6. A corpus of 30 RAs have been analyzed following Swales (2004) CARS model. Results were obtained through coding these 30 RAs by using observation checklist and mixed analysis. The finding revealed that all 3 moves such as *establishing a territory*, *establishing a niche*, and *presenting present work* have appeared in all 30 RAs. Meanwhile the differences have found in the frequency of each step used, especially in move 2 and 3. In move 1, 100% of RAs have written step 1. Meanwhile in move 2, the frequency of step 2 was mostly used by authors in each journal of about 73%. Furthermore, there was only 1 step that not appeared in move 3 namely *outlining research structure*. Based on this finding, the writer should pay attention to various functions of each move and step in order to fulfill the aim of RA introductions.

**Keywords:** *Rhetorical Structures; Research Article Introductions; SINTA's Journal.*

### ABSTRAK

Pergerakan retorika dalam artikel penelitian di berbagai disiplin ilmu telah banyak diteliti, tetapi hanya sedikit yang menyelidiki dan membandingkan satu bidang ilmu dalam peringkat jurnal nasional yang berbeda. Oleh karena itu, penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui persamaan dan perbedaan gerak dan langkah dalam artikel jurnal linguistik terapan yang diterbitkan dalam SINTA 1 sampai 6. Sebanyak 30 artikel penelitian telah dianalisis mengikuti model Swales (2004). Hasil diperoleh melalui pengkodean 30 artikel penelitian tersebut dengan menggunakan lembar pengamatan *checklist* dan analisis campuran. Temuan mengungkapkan bahwa ketiga gerakan seperti menetapkan wilayah penelitian, membangun permasalahan yang terjadi, dan menyajikan penelitian telah muncul di semua 30 artikel. Perbedaannya terdapat pada frekuensi setiap langkah yang digunakan, terutama pada gerak 2 dan 3. Pada gerak 1, 100% artikel telah menulis langkah 1. Sedangkan pada gerak 2, frekuensi langkah 2 paling banyak digunakan oleh penulis di setiap jurnal artikel yaitu sekitar 73%. Selanjutnya hanya ada 1 langkah yang tidak muncul pada gerak 3 yaitu menguraikan struktur penelitian. Berdasarkan temuan ini, penulis harus memperhatikan berbagai fungsi dari setiap gerak dan langkah untuk memenuhi tujuan artikel penelitian pada bagian pendahuluan.

**Kata kunci:** *Gerakan retorik; Struktur Pendahuluan Artikel Penelitian; Jurnal SINTA.*

## INTRODUCTION

Writing articles is one of the requirements for finishing study in university. Writing articles is different from writing a thesis. They contain short and detailed information about our research thesis. Moreover, it should be made by using some requirements that must be existed in an article. One of the requirements is the rule of writing the introduction section. In addition, introduction has also become a challenging part in writing research articles because it has been considered to be an important section which is used to attract readers to read that article (Amnuai & Wannaruk, 2013, p. 63). Fitriyah also mentioned that introduction of research articles has become the decisive part to convince the reader and pursue them to read it (2020, p. 120).

However, it still found that most university students, especially novice writers, have found difficulties in writing the introduction section of research articles. Those problems are related to the choices of appropriate diction and style, less structured and missed some parts that must be existed in introduction. This condition can be happened because of EFL authors not only must be adapted to certain discipline but also adopted with languages in different rhetorical conventions (Rahmawati, et al., 2020, p. 46). Therefore, the problems above will be influenced their writing performance and caused unstructured language, especially for academic purposes. Hence, it is important to identify academic discourse by knowing and analyzing the move in every sequence of the text. Move is one of the genre-based approaches which used to identify the structure of RA (Amnuai & Wannaruk, 2013, p. 62). In addition, Swales also defined “move” as a discourse segment that performs a particular communicative function (2004, p. 228). Therefore, by knowing the move structure, the writers could produce a sequence and organize introduction parts, so it can be easily read.

Swales (2004) has arranged three move models and their steps that can be used for guiding the writers and readers on gathering the idea that are provided in introduction sections. Those 3 moves such as establishing the territory, establishing a niche, and presenting a present work. Meanwhile, for each move, Swales has divided into some steps. At the first move, the step is topic generalization. For the second move, there were 2 steps such as indicating the gap or adding what is known, and presenting positive justification. The last move consists of 7 steps such as announcing present research descriptively and/or purposively, presenting research questions or hypotheses, definitional clarifications, summarizing methods, announcing principal outcomes, stating the value of the present research, and outlining the structure of the paper. In this research, the researcher used the revised Swales’s theory related to CARS models (Create a Research Space), which has applied in several studies on parts of scientific journal research reports. This theory is chosen because it is most proven and well-established to follow among many accredited structures (Hlaing & Thu, 2016, p. 159). In addition, the corpus of this study consists of 30 research articles in the field of applied linguistics which published in SINTA 1 to 6. SINTA (Science and Technology Index) is an online scientific portal which has been managed by RISTEKDIKTI since December, 2017. This scientific portal is used to assess journal performance based on accreditation and citation standards that are contained in national journals. In addition, this web-based research also offers fast and easy access, and comprehensive to measure the researcher’s performance (SINTA, 2017). Therefore, SINTA’

journals were used in this study because they were categorized as indexed and accredited national journals.

Furthermore, there were several studies related to this topic. A study by Pashapour et al., (2018) analysed about structural move analysis of research article introduction sub-genre of native and Iranian writers in applied linguistics. By using Swales' (2004) CARS model, the finding was showed that there is a significance difference in frequency of move that used in native and non-native writer Moreover, native writers treated all of the moves and sub steps as obligatory, meanwhile Iranian writers treated them as optional. In addition, Rahmawati et al., (2020) also conduct a research about rhetorical moves in introduction section of literary journal articles". The result has been found that all 3 moves appeared in those 6 journal which published in 2015-2019. However, the some steps also missing in from several articles such as in move 2, and move 3. In addition, the sequence pattern also varied in each article.

Based on the previous studies, there is no existed study that analyzed only one discipline by looking at different quality or ranking. In addition, the article publication is also at range 2021-2022, which is categorized as the newest one. In addition, the researcher has proposed 4 research questions, such as: (1) What rhetorical moves are found in applied linguistic RAs of different SINTA's ranking?, (2) What steps are found in move 1 of applied linguistic research articles of different SINTA's ranking, (3) What steps are found in move 2 of applied linguistic research articles of different SINTA's ranking?, and (4) What steps are found in move 3 of applied linguistic research articles of different SINTA's ranking? Based on these RQs, then this study was aimed to find out the similarities and differences of moves and steps found in the introduction section of SINTA 1 to 6 in applied linguistic field. Hopefully, this study can facilitate students, practitioners, and academicians getting a way to produce good writing introduction section in an article and know the differences of moves and steps that are used in those SINTA rankings.

## **METHODOLOGY**

Since this study intents to describe the similarities and differences of moves and steps found in introduction sections, the researcher employed a mixed method. Mixed method is a combination of qualitative and quantitative data collection, analysis, validate, and interpret by using systematic principles (Johnson & Christensen, 2014, p. 657). In addition, the corpus data comprised of 30 RAs collected from 6 different journal in SINTA 1 to 6. Those six journals such as *IJAL*, *IJELTAL*, *Premise*, *Prasasti*, *JETALL*, and *Saga*. There were some criteria in selecting those journals. The criteria are representative, reputation, and accessibility (Jirapanakorn, 2014, p. 26). Based on those criteria, the researcher will be used reputable journals which are taken from SINTA's portal including their impact, citations, and H-index. In addition, the time period of publication also becomes the consideration for choosing the articles. Therefore, the researcher decided to take only articles which were published around 2021-2022.

Table checklist is used as the instrument in this research. It contains 3 moves of CARS models which were proposed by Swales (2004). The table checklist uses the Guttman scale "yes or no". This scale type is used to get a firm answer based on the issues that happen. The higher score on this scale is one for "yes" and the lowest score is zero for "no" (Sugiyono, 2011). Meanwhile, to analyze the moves and steps in RAs introduction, the researcher proposed

Johnson & Christensen theory. Those stages such as data reduction, data display, and data transformation. The first step was data reduction.

In addition, the researcher also used inter-rater reliability. Inter-rater-reliability is used to determine the consistency of the coding result and the result is determined based on the agreement from two or more raters (Budhiastuti & Bandur, 2018, p. 200). To deal with this, an inter-rater who has adequate linguistic knowledge and skills in this field would be involved in reviewing the introduction sections. There were 2 characteristics for choosing an inter-rater such as, having background knowledge in discourse analysis and having experience as a co-rater in other research.

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

### Findings

In this section, the results are presented and discussed in the light of Swales' (2004) CARS model and relevant, previously published studies. In addition, there were 4 findings based on the research questions proposed in the previous part.

**Table 1 Moves found in Sinta 1 to 6**

Journal's Name	Move 1 F (%)	Move 2 F (%)	Move 3 F (%)	Total F (%)
IJAL (SINTA 1)	5 (100)	5 (100)	5 (100)	15 (100)
IJELTAI (SINTA 2)	5 (100)	5 (100)	5 (100)	15 (100)
Premise (SINTA 3)	5 (100)	4 (80)	5 (100)	14 (93)
Prasasti (SINTA 4)	5 (100)	3 (60)	5 (100)	13 (87)
JETALL (SINTA 5)	5 (100)	5 (100)	5 (100)	15 (100)
SAGA (SINTA 6)	5 (100)	3 (60)	5 (100)	13 (87)

Table 1 showed the rhetorical moves found in SINTA 1 to 6. It can be seen that all 6 journals have used 3 moves proposed by Swales' (2004). These 3 moves such as *establishing a territory*, *establishing a niche*, and *presenting the present work*. All 30 RAs have used move 1 and move 3 in 100%. On the other hand, *establishing a niche* in move 2 only appeared completely in IJAL, IJELTAL, and JETALL journals with 100%. Meanwhile, in the Premise journal, this move appeared in 4 or 80% of articles. Moreover, in Prasasti and SAGA journals, there were only 3 or 60% of articles that used this move.

**Table 2 Steps Found in Move 1**

Move 1	Journal's Name	F (%)
S1: Topic Generalizations (obligatory)	IJAL (SINTA 1)	5 (100)
	IJELTAL (SINTA 2)	5 (100)
	Premise (SINTA 3)	5 (100)
	Prasasti (SINTA 4)	5 (100)
	JETALL (SINTA 5)	5 (100)
	SAGA (SINTA 6)	5 (100)

Table 2 revealed that 100% of RAs in SINTA 1 to 6 have presented topic generalization in writing RA introduction. In addition, mostly the authors applied this step

by writing the research background and followed by citation from previous studies in order to support present research. The example of this move can be found in IJELTAL journal as follow:

*(P2, S1-3) “In recent linguistic studies, metaphor is conceived as “a process of mapping between two different conceptual domains – the source domain and the target domain” (Simpson, 2004,p. 108). Kovecses (2010) hypothesized that understanding one domain in terms of another comprises a set of fixed correspondences, called mappings, between a source and a target domain. These mappings profoundly suggest the meaning of the metaphorical linguistic expressions that develop the meaning of a particular conceptual metaphor”. (IJELTAL-1)*

The words “*recent linguistic studies*” refers to the topic generalization that used by the author, which is mentioned metaphor as a process of mapping between two different conceptual domains in current study. In addition, previous theory has suggested developing the meaning of a particular conceptual metaphor based on those mapping. Therefore, the author tried to choose this topic because it still needed to be conducted.

**Table 3 Steps Found in Move 2**

Move	Journal's Name					
	IJAL	IJELTAL	Premise	Prasasti	JETALL	SAGA
	SINTA	SINTA	SINTA	SINTA	SINTA	SINTA
	1	2	3	4	5	6
	F(%)	F(%)	F(%)	F(%)	F(%)	F(%)
S1-A	4 (80)	4 (80)	3 (60)	3 (60)	2 (40)	1 (20)
S1-B	1 (20)	-	-	-	-	-
S2	5 (100)	2 (40)	4 (80)	3 (60)	5 (100)	3 (60)

Table 3 has showed the steps found in move 2 among SINTA 1 to 6. It can be seen that all 2 steps have appeared in all 6 journals with different frequency. Step 1-A appeared 80% in IJAL and IJELTAL journals, 60% in Premise and Prasasti journals, 40% in JETALL journal, and 20% in SAGA journal. Meanwhile, there was only 1 RA used step 1-B, namely IJAL journal. On the other hand, step 2 used 100% in IJAL and JETALL journals, 80% in Premise journal, 60% in Prasasti and SAGA journals, and 40% in IJELTAL journal. The example of each step, as follows:

**Step 1-A: Indicating a gap**

*(P8, S1-2) From the aforementioned descriptions of MT errors and post- editing, research on post-editing is still a new field of translation (Cetiner & Isisag, 2019), as a result, research on this topic in different language pairs in the world is still under-researched (Vieira et al., 2019). In the Indonesian context, little empirical evidence has been reported regarding the undergraduate students’ real practices in postediting of machine translation activities in both English-Indonesian and Indonesian-English language pairs. (IJAL-2)*

The underlined sentence stated insufficient of related study which indicates that the investigation about undergraduate students’ real practices in post-editing of machine translation activities is still lacking. The author also showed the supporting theory that his



research topic is still a new field of translation and under-researched in different language pairs.

**Step 1-B: Adding what is known**

*(P3, S4-6) The contradictory findings reported by Sakinah (2018) and Wahyudi (2016) show the void in the research literature about the relationship between reading habit and reading comprehension. Similarly, Mu'awana (2018) and Parmawati (2018) found that there is a low correlation between the two variables. This incongruity needs further investigation; therefore, this study intends to fulfil this gap while adding another variable, namely genre awareness. (IJAL-4)*

The underlined sentence showed the new knowledge or information that needed to complete the previous studies and whether it could be made a different finding. In addition, the addition of variable can be used to make conclusive result if the number of certain research.

**Step 2 Presenting positive justification**

*(P2, S6) It is necessary to define the different types of directive speech acts in the coursebook, so that the cadets can get appropriate knowledge in the real situations (Prasasti-4)*

The underlined sentence “can get appropriate knowledge...” is indicated the need of research. Furthermore, the word “cadet” refers to the person who can get the benefit from the research.

**Table 4 Steps Found in Move 3**

Move	IJAL	IJELTAL	Premise	Prasasti	JETAL	SAGA
	SINTA	SINTA	SINTA	SINTA	L	SINTA
3	1	2	3	4	SINTA	6
					5	
	F (%)	F (%)	F (%)	F (%)	F (%)	F (%)
S1	4 (80)	5 (100)	4 (80)	3 (60)	5 (100)	4 (80)
S2	3 (60)	4 (80)	4 (80)	1 (20)	2 (40)	2 (40)
S3	3 (60)	1 (20)	3 (60)	-	2 (40)	3 (60)
S4	-	1 (20)	1 (20)	2 (40)	-	1 (20)
S5	-	-	1 (20)	-	-	-
S6	2 (40)	-	4 (80)	-	1 (20)	1 (20)
S7	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 4 shows the steps found in move 3 among 6 different journals. For step1, IJELTAL and JETALL journals have used this step in all 5 articles or 100 %. Meanwhile, IJAL, Premise, and SAGA journals have written research objectives in 4 articles or 80%. On the other hand, Prasasti journal only used this step in 3 articles or 60 %. Moreover, step 2 appeared 80% in IJELTAL and Premise journals, 60 % in IJAL journal, 40% in JETALL and SAGA journals, and 20% in IJELTAL journal. Step 3 was found 60 % in IJAL, Premise, and SAGA journals, 40% in JETALL journal, and 20% in IJELTAL journal. Meanwhile, the occurrence appeared in step 4 with 4 % in Prasasti journal, and 20% in IJELTAL, Premise, and SAGA journals. Furthermore, there was only 1 journal that used step 5, namely premise journal with 20%. Step 6 occurred 80% in Premise journal, 40% in IJAL journal, and 20% in JETALL and SAGA journals. Lastly, the researcher discovered that all authors across 6journals did not

occupy step 7.

### **Step 1 : Presenting present research purposively**

This step can be identified by looking at the research purposes of a present study. Therefore, the author mostly used the words such as “to investigate...”, “to explore...”, “to find out...”, “to examine...” and etc. which is showed the aim of research. the example as follow:

*(P5-S1-2) The purpose of this study was to explore students' views on the use of Telegram as a tool for learning English. It is worth observing insight into what is the role and effect of the telegram in language learning from the perceptions of students and teachers. (JETALL-3)*

### **Step 2 : Presenting RQ or Hypothesis**

In this step, research question or hypothesis can be identified easily. For research question, it can be found by looking at the question marks existed in introduction sections. Meanwhile, the hypothesis mostly written with H0 and H1. The example of this step as follow:

*(P4, S7) The present study attempts to find answers to the following questions. First, what are the grammatical markers for the identification of metaphors in the Holy Qur'an? And how these markers could be used for the computational identification of metaphor? (IJELTAL-1)*

### **Step 3: Definitional Clarification**

To clarify the unfamiliar terms, mostly the author used the expression such as “refer to...” or “in the other words...”. These words can be used to give a clear understanding about certain terms. The example:

*(P1-S1) “Humor is a common human characteristic that refers to acts that are deemed funny and make people laugh, as well as the processes involved in creating and perceiving these activities and the humorous mood that results (Martin & Ford, 2018)”. (IJAL-3)*

The underlined sentence is used by the author to clarify previous sentences about *humans as a common human characteristic*. Furthermore, the author also used the expert theory in his writing to help convey the meaning of “human characteristic”. This clarification is needed for the reader to understand the meaning of sentence related to the research topic.

### **Step 4: Summarizing method**

Summarizing method is one of the step that proposed by Swales in move 3. In this study, not many authors applied this step. It happen because this step is categorized as optional step. The example of this step as follow:

*(P10, S1-3) However, this study still uses the same research design as the previous qualitative descriptive research. Also, this study employed a theory of critical discourse analysis proposed by Norman Fairclough. (Prasasti-2)*

### **Step 5: Stating principal outcome**

In this step, the author has shown the principal outcome of his research by writing the research contribution in practical or theoretical. In this study, there was 1 article that stated principal outcome. The example as follow:

*(P3, S1-2) “The research outcome is projected to contribute to teachers, schools, and people worldwide, especially in the field of Teacher Training and English Education. The findings can be a theoretical and practical basis for teachers to apply the REDW (Read, Examine, Decide, and Write) strategy in teaching reading comprehension”.*

(Premise-2)

The sample above was taken from Premise Journal from SINTA 3. The undelined sentence indicates that the principal outcome will be useful for schools and teachers as well. Furthermore, the author also wrote the contribution of that research practically and theoretically. However, this step is categorized as PSIF (possible in some field) which means that this step can be found dominantly in other disciplines.

### **Step 6: Presenting present research value**

In this step, the author could be presented the research value by stating the implication or potential benefit of their research finding. The modal verbs such as *will, could, can, and may*". The example of this step as follow:

*(P3-S5-6) Investigation of this research topic is significant since it will provide useful insight into effective feedback formation. It will also offer valuable pedagogical implications for EFL writing teachers and instructors in enhancing their feedback practices in writing courses. (IJAL-1)*

The example above was taken from IJAL journal in SINTA 1. The sentence "*It will...*" indicated the implication of research finding. In this case, the author ensures that his research finding can be enhanced feedback practice in writing courses. From this sample, it can be seen that the author used present tense to indicate this step.

### **Discussion**

The first finding showed that all 30 research articles have implemented 3 moves proposed by Swales' (2004). Those moves such as *establishing a territory, establishing a niche, and presenting present work*. It means that, the accredited journals in SINTA 1 to 6 have realized the importance of those 3 moves in writing research article introductions. This finding is also in line with Swales (1990, p. 6), which said that rhetorical move needed to be written in the introduction section because it helped both readers and authors to understand the project better and to present the argument clearly.

However, the difference can be seen in the total frequency of move 2. While move 1 and 3 have appeared 100 % in all 30 articles, move 2 was not completely found in 3 journals. Those journal articles such as Premise, Prasasti, and SAGA journals. Therefore, there are some things that have been missed such as research gap and positive justification. This missing step makes it difficult for the reader to find out the problem in the research. Swales also argued that move 2 is important to be written in the introduction section because it stressed the applicability of the research reported and claimed about the novelty of what is about to be described (2004, p. 231). Furthermore, some proof of concept is also needed by presenting positive justification.

The second finding was related to the steps found in move 1 (*establishing a territory*). In this move, there was only 1 step that existed, namely *topic generalization*. Among 6 journals, all 30 research articles have applied this compulsory step that suggested by Swales (2004). It means that, the SINTA's journals have proven the important role of topic generalization to provide the general situation or background information about our research. The result of this finding is also in line with Rahman, et al(2017) which found that all articles from 4 disciplines such as applied linguistic, TESOL, ELT, and ESP have written this step.

The third finding was carried out to find the steps used in move 2 among SINTA 1 to 6. The finding showed that all 2 steps have appeared in all journal articles. Those 2 steps such as



S1-A (*indicating a gap*), or SI-B (*adding what is known*) and S2 (*presenting positive justification*). It means that, the author in each journal article has realized the advantage of using gap indication and positive justification in writing research article introductions. Gap indication is used as a marker of differences between previous and present study. While positive justification is illustrated the need for present research. Afshar et al., (2018, p. 156) also stated that gap indication is important to write in the introduction section because it consisted of the area that needed to be better understood and to justify the research significance in the given area.

In addition, mostly the authors preferred indicating a gap (S1-A) rather than adding what is known (S1-B). It means that, gap indication was more popular or familiar among the authors in writing research article introductions. It might happen because the author tried to continue the study that has not been studied yet. This finding is in line with the results by Pashapour, et al (2018). Their study revealed that among 4 journals, there was only 1 of them that step 1(B). It is also in line with Swales (2004, p. 230) which mentioned that gap indication is a common option that used by many authors.

The last finding was related to the steps found in move 3 between SINTA 1 to 6. The finding was shown that every journal has different total steps used in writing research article introductions. It means that, the journal ranking did not influence the complete steps in move 3. It might happen because different authors may have different guidelines in writing this move. This argument also supported by Swales (2004, p. 232) which stated that the availability of these steps depended on some factors such as the nature of research, the status of the researcher, and the disciplinary conventional of research field or specialized standards to create text.

In addition, the difference finding of steps in this move might happen because not all 7 steps in move 3 must be included in writing research article introduction based on Swales (2004) CARS model. Among 7 steps, Swales is divided into 3 main functions. Step 1 was categorized as obligatory, step 2 until 4 were optional, while the rest 3 steps were labelled as PSIF or *possible in some fields* (2004, p. 232). Therefore, it can be said that it was enough for the authors to write step 1 or state the research purpose only based on Swales' model.

This finding has a contrast result from a study by Kinoksilapatham (2012). They found that 3 engineering sub-disciplines such as civil, software, and biomedical have outlined their research article structure. From the Kinoksilapatham study, it has been proven that step 7 can be used and found engineering sub-disciplines. It happens because those 3 sub-disciplines are needed in order to help the reader locate what they want to read for further details.

## CONCLUSION & SUGGESTION

The conclusion of this study is as follows: (1) Three moves proposed by Swales have used in all 30 research articles. It showed that accredited journals in SINTA used 3 rhetorical moves suggested by Swales' (2004) that almost all research introduction make, (2) All 30 articles from 6 journals have used step 1 of move 1, namely *topic generalization*. In this step, mostly the authors have written topic generalization by describing the condition that currently happened and proposing research problems in the real situation, (3) There were 2 steps found in move 2, namely *indicating a gap, or adding what is known, and presenting positive justification*

.However, the *presenting positive justification* is mostly use by the authors rather than *indicating a gap, or adding what is known*, and (4) All 6 journal articles have different total number of steps that are used in writing research article introductions.

Since there were many variations observed in SINTA 1 to 6, it is necessary for postgraduate or novice writer to get acquainted with rhetorical moves and their sub-steps which are typically adopted by authors in their fields. In addition, the author should pay attention to various communicative functions of each move and step in order to fulfil the aim of each research article section, especially in part of the introduction.

## REFERENCES

- Afshar, H. S., Doosti, M., Movassagh, H., & Sina, B. A. (2018). A Genre Analysis of the Introduction Section of Applied Linguistics and Chemistry Research Articles. *Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics (IJAL)*, 21(1), 149-195. <https://ijal.khu.ac.ir/article-1-2856-en.html>
- Annuai, W., & Wannaruk, A. (2013). An Analysis Of Moves In Introductions in International and Thai Journal Research Articles. *PASAA Journal*, 45, 61-90. <https://www.culi.chula.ac.th/publicationsonline/files/article/b8EJbj5s1Mon35921.pdf>
- Budiastuti, D., & Badur, A. (2018). *Validitas dan reliabilitas penelitian*. Mitra Wacana Media. <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/187726085.pdf>
- Davies, A. (2007). *An Introduction to Applied Linguistics: From Practice to Theory (2nd ed.)*. Edinburgh University Press. <https://pasca.uns.ac.id/s3linguistik/wp-content/uploads/sites/44/2016/10/an-introduction-to-applied-linguistics.pdf>
- Fitriyah, U. (2020). Rhetorical moves in thesis introduction written by english major students. *PARADIGM: Journal of Language and Literary Studies*, 3(2), 119-132. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18860/prdg.v3i2.10229>
- Hlaing, N. N., & Thu, S. M. (2016). Move Structure of Introduction Sections In Research Articles from the Journal of the Myanmar Academy of Arts and Science. *ACADEMIC Journal*. 157-174.
- Jirapanakorn, N., Trakulkasemsuk, W., & Keyuravong, S. (2014). Move Analysis of English Research Article Introductions In Thai And International Medical Journals. *Reflections*, 17, 23-40. <https://so05.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/reflections/article/view/114201/88598>
- Johnson, R. B., & Christensen, L. (2014). *Educational research: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed approaches (5th ed.)*. SAGE Publications. [https://ismailsunny.files.wordpress.com/2017/07/educational-research\\_-quantitat-r-robert-burke-johnson.pdf](https://ismailsunny.files.wordpress.com/2017/07/educational-research_-quantitat-r-robert-burke-johnson.pdf)
- Kanoksilapatham, B. (2012). Structure of Research Article Introductions in Three Engineering Subdisciplines. *IEEE Transactions On Professional Communication*, 55(4), 294-309. [http://barronfam.com/blog/wpcontent/plugins/zotpress/lib/request/request.dl.php?api\\_user\\_id=380060&dlkey=77HVND6U&content\\_type=application/pdf](http://barronfam.com/blog/wpcontent/plugins/zotpress/lib/request/request.dl.php?api_user_id=380060&dlkey=77HVND6U&content_type=application/pdf)
- Pashapour, A., Ghaemi, F., & Hashamdar, M. (2018). A Structural Move Analysis of Reserach Article Introduction Sub-genre: A Comparative Study of Native and Iranian Writers in Applied Linguistics. *International Journal of English Studies*, 12(1), 79-106.
- Qamariah, H., & Wahyuni, S. (2017). How a Research Article Intruduction Structured? The

- Analysis of Swales Model (cars) on English Research Article Introductions. *Getsempena English Education Journal (GEEJ)*, 4(2), 136-146. <https://doi.org/10.46244/geej.v4i2.744>
- Rahman, M., Darus, S., & Amir, Z. (2017). Rhetorical Structure of Introduction in Applied Linguistics Research Articles. *International Journal for Educational Studies*, 9(2), 69-84. <https://journals.mindamas.com/index.php/educare/article/view/800/763>
- Rahmawati, S. M., Setiawan, S., & Retnaningdyah, P. (2020). Rhetorical Moves In Introduction Section of Literary Journal Articles. *International Journal of Education and Social Science Research*, 3(1), 45-61. <https://ijessr.com/link2.php?id=264>
- Safnil. (2013). A genre-based analysis on the introductions of Research Articles Written by Indonesian Academics. *TEFLIN Journal*, 24(2), 180-200. <http://dx.doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v24i2/180-200>
- Saputra, A. (2020). Pemanfaatan *Science and Technology Index* (SINTA) untuk Publikasi Karya Ilmiah dan Pencarian Jurnal Nasional Terakreditasi. *Media Pustakawan*, 27(1), 56-68. <https://doi.org/10.37014/medpus.v27i1.674>
- SINTA. (2017). *Science and Technolody Index*. <https://sinta.kemdikbud.go.id/about>
- Sugiyono. (2011). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D*. ALFABETA. <https://www.pdfdrive.com/prof-dr-sugiyono-metode-penelitian-kuantitatif-kualitatif-dan-rd-intro-d56379944.html>
- Swales, J. M. (2004). *Research Genres: Explorations and Applications*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524827>