Rhetorical moves in Indonesian' students research proposal introductions: A corpus-based genre analysis using the CARS model

Yogi Setia Samsi[1], Mobit[2], Hilmansyah Saefullah[3]
[1,2,3]Universitas Singaperbangsa Karawang

Corresponding author: yogi.setiasamsi@staff.unsika.ac.id

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

This study addresses a critical gap in genre analysis by examining the rhetorical moves in the introductions of research proposals written by Indonesian undergraduate students. Adopting a corpus-based genre analysis approach, this research applies Swales's (1990) Create-A-Research-Space (CARS) model as its analytical framework. The corpus consists of 30 texts. While the analysis confirms the presence of Move 1 (Establishing a Territory) and Move 3 (Occupying the Niche), the most striking finding is the near-total absence of Move 2 (Establishing a Niche) in the students' writing. This result suggests that students lack the rhetorical skills to identify a gap in existing literature. The study argues that this deficit is a significant pedagogical issue, not a mere reflection of the small corpus size. The findings underscore a need for EAP instruction to focus more on teaching students how to critically engage with literature and articulate a research gap. This research offers valuable insights for curriculum development and teaching strategies aimed at improving students' academic writing skills.

I. INTRODUCTION

Writing is a productive skill, but it poses significant challenges for second or foreign language learners, as highlighted by Richards, et al. (2002). Within a university context, academic writing (AW) is not merely a skill but a central component of a student's development. It is a crucial measure for both individual quality and institutional standards (Shannon, 2011). Academic writing is a fundamental tool for researchers, allowing them to effectively communicate their ideas, concepts, and findings to the broader academic community and to persuade their readers on a specific study's objectives (Nordquist, 2011). In this regard, university students are required to write a research proposal (RP) as a prerequisite for their thesis. As a formal and mandatory requirement, students must be meticulous in crafting their proposals, especially the introductory chapter. The quality of a

research proposal's introduction is paramount, as it is the writer's first and often only opportunity to persuade readers of the study's value and to secure their interest. Therefore, a solid understanding of the rhetorical moves within a good introduction is essential to ensure the writing is not overlooked by its intended audience.

The existing body of literature on discourse moves has explored a wide array of genres and contexts. These include the rhetorical structure of letters of leniency (Mason, 2011; Tanko, 2017), accounting texts (Amnuai, 2019), and dentistry aspects (Vathanalaoha & Tangkiengsirisin, 2018), among others. These studies have consistently affirmed the importance of rhetorical moves in different writing genres, thereby solidifying the relevance of this analytical approach. More specifically, the analysis of rhetorical moves in journal abstracts has been a common research topic (Kurniawan, et. al., 2019; Lores, 2004; Martin-Martin, 2002; Wahyu, 2016; Sidek, et.al., 2016). Furthermore, some recent studies have also broadened their scope to examine rhetorical patterns in student-written genres, such as speeches (Purwati, 2018) and summary templates (Panggalih & Bambang, 2020), offering a more nuanced understanding of how rhetorical moves operate beyond traditional academic articles. This expansion of research indicates a growing interest in the linguistic features of student writing and highlights the need for a more granular focus on specific academic genres.

While the existing literature provides valuable insights, the focus on the introductions of student research proposals remains very limited. Although some studies have analyzed student writing, they generally focus on more established genres like abstracts or full articles, not on research proposals. The lack of research on this specific genre creates a significant gap in our understanding of how students, particularly in a non-Western context, are trained to construct foundational arguments. Therefore, the current study aims to fill this gap by analyzing the discourse and structural moves of RP introductions written by university students in Indonesia. By exploring this specific and often under-researched genre, this study contributes to a more comprehensive understanding of academic writing.

This study is designed to scrutinize the quality of students' writing in their RP introductory chapters and to assess the appropriateness of their rhetorical patterns in relation to the CARS Model proposed by Swales (1990). The findings may contribute significantly to the development of students' academic writing skills, especially for future publication purposes. Thus, the research questions for this study are: (1) How are the discourse moves in the introductory chapter of a research proposal written by university students? and (2) How appropriate is the students' introductory chapter of RP with the keywords of the CARS model proposed by Swales (1990)?

Basically, academic writing is a various writing that referred to people mindset, criticism, understanding, and experience toward the exploration of a certain topic. It is mostly employed by the lecturers, linguists, researchers, students, and any kinds of academic participation among the disciplines by objective analysis. Further, the academic writing into seven categories, namely: (1) essay, which defined as argumentative text, usually contain

around 1.500 until 6.000 words, (2) research proposal, which defined as a longer essay and involved into research and references, usually contain around 3.000 until 6.000 words, (3) research article is research writing that usually aimed to publish in the journal, (4) dissertation is the longest essay that contained around 6.000 until 20.000 words and usually made by student doctorate, (5) thesis is seemed like a shorter dissertation and usually made by undergraduate or master students, (6) a report writing that usually purposed for delineating the process and progress of the research, and (7) research project is aimed at describing the topics for the investigation. However, this current study is focused on research proposal.

In the term of research proposal, Onwuegbuzie, cited by Heath and Tynan (2010) define, "a research proposal (henceforth RP) is a formal written plan which communicates ideas about a proposed study in order to obtain approval to conduct the study or to seek funding" (Onwuegbuzie, cited by Heath and Tynan, 2010). It is also intended to convince the readers which the researchers have a worthwhile study. Further, RP can reach the goal by two aspects namely the good quality of concept project and academic writing which served in the RP. In the lens of university, it is one of kinds in academic writing that usually created by undergraduate students exactly in sixth semester and aims to prepare their thesis in seventh or eighth semester in the university level. Generally, the components of research proposal consist of title, abstract, introduction, literature review, methodology, and references.

Typologically, the title of the RP must be concise and descriptive while the abstract seems like a brief summary of research project that usually contained 200 until 300 words. In this current study, the focus is only concerned to the introduction of the RP. In regard with introduction, it is a part of AW which included in the RP that is mainly aimed to provide the background of information and context of research questions. On the other hand, it is covered by many information that highlights the origin of the research project, the literature review of research relevance, the research problem, the purpose of the study, and the significance of the research project. Essentially, the introduction is an initial of pitch idea so that it must create an interesting information for the reader about the topic and the overall of the research.

Regarded to introductory writing, Swales (1990) has proposed model in making introduction of academic writing in research proposal. The model named as CARS (Create A Research Space). On the other words, introductory writing has structure move that is must be followed by researchers when they write a research paper including all academic participant such as lecturer, student, and teacher.

Moreover, the framework about CARS model by Swales (1990) will be explicated such as: Move 1: Establishing a territory (in this move, the author sets the context for his or her research, providing necessary background on the topic). It consists of Step 1: Claiming centrality and/or (the author asks the discourse community to accept that the reported

research is part of a lively, significant, or well-established research area). Step 2: Making topic generalizations and/or (the author makes statements about current knowledge, practices, or phenomena in the field). Step 3: Reviewing items of previous research (the author relates what has been found on the topic and who found it).

Further, Move 2: Establishing a niche (in this move, the author argues that there is an open "niche" in the existing research, a space that needs to be filled through additional research). It also contains Step 1a: Counter-claiming or (the author refutes or challenges earlier research by making a counter-claim). Step 1b: Indicating a gap or (the author demonstrates that earlier research does not sufficiently address all existing questions or problems). Step 1c: Question-raising or (the author asks questions about previous research, suggesting that additional research needs to be done). Step 1d: Continuing a tradition (the author presents the research as a useful extension of existing research).

Furthermore, Move 3: Occupying the niche (in this move, the author turns the niche established in Move 2 into the research space that he or she will fill; that is, the author demonstrates how he or she will substantiate the counter-claim made, fill the gap identified, answer the question(s) asked, or continue the research tradition). It also provides Step 1a: Outlining purposes or (the author indicates the main purpose(s) of the current article). Step 1b: Announcing present research (the author describes the research in the current article). Step 2: Announcing principal findings (the author presents the main conclusions of his or her research). Step 3: Indicating research article structure (the author previews the organization of the article).

After highlighting the moves and steps grounded by Swales (1990), the discourse of moves has various occurrences in delivering the message linguistically either from the diction of words or structural pattern. Thus, Swales (1990) added that the moves can be indicated by words sign below which can cover as a similar meaning to be a close to the categories of move either move 1, move 2, or move 3 and their steps on introductory chapter. The model also is adopted to Futász (2006) as follows.

Table 1. The Words Signs in Each Move on Introduction

Move 1	Step 1: Claiming centrality	recently, in recent years, great importance, central issue, has been studied by, is a classic problem of, important aspect
	Step 2: Making topic generalization(s)	is well known, there is much evidence to support, not completely understood, are often criticized; there are many situations where, it is a common finding that
	Step 3: Reviewing items of previous research	integral/ non-integral citations
Move 2	Step 1A: Counter-claiming	however, nevertheless, yet, unfortunately, but
	Step 1B: Indicating a gap	suffer, is limited to, time consuming, expensive, not sufficiently accurate
	Step 1C: Question-raising	direct/indirect questions
	Step 1D: Continuing a tradition	Therefore
Move 3	Step 1A: Outlining purposes	this, the present, we, reported, here, now
	Step 1B: Announcing present research	the purpose of this investigation is/was to
	Step 2: Announcing principal findings	
	Step 3: Indicating research article structure	the paper is divided into five sections, is structured as follows, we have organized the rest of the paper in the following way

From the table above, it can be meant that those are the similar function of discourse that can be indicated as Swales' (1990) CARS model by analyzing the words or phrases based on semantics and pragmatics perspective. In other words, although the word is not same but can be indicated and included as the part of moves and steps categories, those words can be considered as part of CARS model proposed by Swales (1990). Thus, the word sign above is flexible but nevertheless, it must be relevant with the word signs semantically, pragmatically, and functionally.

II. METHOD

This study employed a qualitative approach and content analysis method, integrated with a corpus-based genre analysis to investigate the rhetorical moves in students' academic writing. We used a corpus to explore the language in a computational and data-driven manner, which provides a robust foundation for analyzing naturally occurring language samples (Fatim, et al., 2024). The integration of a corpus tool allows for the systematic

examination of discourse moves through the frequency, collocation, and concordance of specific words or phrases.

The corpus was purposively compiled from 30 research proposal introductions written by 6th-semester students at a single university in West Java, Indonesia, during the 2021-2022 period. The texts were specifically focused on English language teaching (ELT) and English language research topics. While a larger and more diverse corpus would enhance the generalizability of the findings, the current sample size of approximately 20,000 tokens is suitable for an in-depth exploratory case study focused on a specific institutional context. This approach was chosen to provide a nuanced understanding of rhetorical move patterns within this particular academic setting, rather than to achieve broad statistical representativeness. The decision to use a corpus tool for this specific genre is justified by the proven link between language analysis and computational technology (Hoed, 2011).

Utilizing the web-based corpus tool, Sketch Engine, was instrumental in this research. The tool was essential for uncovering the discourse moves and patterns in the compiled texts. The 30 articles were selected based on an initial verification by a linguistics expert, ensuring they were representative of the students' writing from a higher education context. Through the Sketch Engine application, the corpus was analyzed to provide a total token count, along with detailed frequency, collocation, and concordance data. This web-based corpus was fully utilized as the initial screening of analysis.

To ascertain the rhetorical moves, we applied the CARS Model proposed by Swales (1990) and developed by other researchers (Kurniawan, et. al., 2019; Lores, 2004; Martin-Martin, 2002; Wahyu, 2016; Sidek, et.al., 2016). This theoretical framework, which classifies the introduction into three moves and their various steps (Swales, 1990; Futász, 2006), served as the primary instrument for this study. To ensure the accuracy of the lexical analysis, we also cross-referenced the meanings of words and phrases using reputable online dictionaries, such as the Cambridge Dictionary and Oxford English Dictionary (available at https://dictionary.cambridge.org/ and https://www.oed.com/). This was done to confirm the semantic, pragmatic, and functional appropriateness of the words in each indicated category based on the CARS model.

Practically, the first stage of the technical analysis involved using the Sketch Engine website. Its key-word-in-context (KWIC) function allowed us to rapidly and efficiently search for target words and phrases. This process enabled the swift exploration of frequencies, collocations, and concordance lines. The second stage involved a manual investigation of the concordance lines. We classified and categorized words and phrases into the moves and steps of the CARS model. This analysis also involved a careful consideration of the different words using the model of appropriateness proposed by Futász (2006) to ensure an accurate classification of each move. The final stage was to interpret the findings and determine whether students' introductory writings conformed to the CARS Model.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents the findings on the rhetorical moves in the students' research proposal introductions, followed by a discussion that interprets these results in relation to the CARS Model (Swales, 1990) and the specific context of undergraduate writing in Indonesia.

The Discourse Move Pattern of Students' RP Introduction

Based on the analysis, a variety of move patterns were identified in the students' RP introductions. Those were categorized as *firstly,* move 1 which is focused on establishing a territory, *secondly,* move 2 which is concentrated to establishing a niche, and, *thirdly,* move 3 which is about occupying the niche. Table 2 below provides a comprehensive overview of the occurrences of each pattern.

Table 2. The Occurrence of the Moves Pattern Employed in RP Introduction

No.	Move Pattern	Data	Total	Percentage
1.	M1S1 – M1S2 – M3S1a – M3S1b – M3S2	1, 2, 5, 6, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 21, 22, 24, 26, 30	16	53%
2.	M1S1 – M1S2 – M3S1a – M3S2	3, 4, 19	3	10%
3.	M1S1 – M1S2 – M1S3 – M3S1a – M3S1b – M3S2	7, 28, 29	3	10%
4.	M1S1 – M1S2 – M1S3 – M3S1a – M3S1b	23	1	3,3%
5.	M1S1 – M1S2 – M3S1b – M2S2	20	1	3,3%
6.	M1S1 – M1S2 – M1S1 – M3S1a – M3S1b – M3S2	8, 9, 27	3	10%
7.	M1S1 – M1S2 – M1S1 – M1S2 – M3S1a – M3S1b – M3S2	15	1	3,3%
8.	M1S1 – M1S2 – M3S1a – M3S1b – M2S1a – M2S1d – M3S1b	10	1	3,3%
9.	M3S1a – M3S1b – M1S1 – M3S1a – M1S2 – M3S1b – M3S2	25	1	3,3%
	TOTAL		**30**	**100%**

M1S1= Move 1, Step 1; M1S2= Move 1, Step 2; M1S3= Move 1, Step 3; M2S1a= Move, 2 Step 1a; M2S1b= Move 2, Step 1b; M2S1c= Move 2, Step 1c; M2S1d= Move 2, Step 1d; M3S1a= Move 3, Step 1a; M3S1b= Move 3, Step 1b, M3S2= Move 3, Step 2

The table above demonstrates that the students' RP introductory writings exhibit a variety of patterns that are largely aligned with Swales's (1990) CARS Model, with a predominant focus on Moves 1 and 3. A notable finding, however, is the near-total absence of Move 2. In the other words, the students mostly missed in the category of move 2 (establishing niche), specifically about previous research. The following discussion will elaborate on the specific realizations of each move and interpret the findings in a pedagogical context.

Move 1: Establishing a Territory

The analysis found that the majority of students successfully employed Move 1, which involves establishing a territory for the research. The first step, Claiming Centrality (M1S1), was predominantly identified through linguistic cues that indicate the importance or relevance of the topic. This step can be identified either with a similar word or word sign as presented by Swales's (1990) CARS model. Here are examples of authentic realizations drawn from the students' work:

> ...**_broadly_**, *effectively during the class time, lesson plan, teacher,* and *are **_important_**...*
> An **_important_**, *have to master, writing skill* and *descriptive text...*
> *Feedback is generally is known as one of **_the most essential parts_** to promote successful student learning...*
> **_Curriculum_** *is broadly defined as the totally of student experiences that occur in the educational process...*
> **_Nowadays, following the fast evolution_**, *mobile,* and *make learning be more innovated and efficient...*

From the examples above, it could be meant that all of aforementioned underlines such as *broadly, an important, feedback, curriculum,* and *nowadays following the fast evolution* statements successfully indicate the author's or students' claim on centrality to establish a research area as stated by Nabilla, et.al. (2020). It is due either the words are explicitly conveyed in the text such as *an important* or the author frequently repeated the certain word/ phrase such as *curriculum* when it is seen by the context of the whole text.

Thus, unconsciously, the students established the research area because the words were constantly repetition. Nevertheless, the phrases of *nowadays, following the fast evolution,* are not included in word sign in indicating move 1 step 1 by Swales's (1990) theory but it, pragmatically or functionally, could be known the similarity meaning with word sign by Swales. It is due to *nowadays* word and *following the fast evolution* have similar meaning with *recently* or *in recent year* word while it works too for *the most essential parts* statement that included in new keywords that could indicate move 1 step 1 as same as *an important* meaning based on functional perspective. This could be possible and depended on the students' lexicogrammar or vocabulary resources. This also indicates that students are adapting their vocabulary to achieve the intended rhetorical purpose, even if they are not using standard academic lexis.

Secondly, this second step of move 1 (M1S2), which is making topic generalization, was also observed, although it was not as frequent as M1S1. It is actually an optional case. It possibly appears in the text or counterpart depended on its authors or students in this case. Regarding this result, the researchers surely did not find any kind of this step indicating as

Swales's (1990) keyword. Nevertheless, there are several words seemed as a similar meaning as Swales's one pragmatically or functionally. However, the following data below is one of examples realized as a similar meaning with Swales's (1990) keyword in the student's data:

> ...**however,** *in fact there are still **many** students in learning who are still having difficulty learning English. ...*

The highlighted word, *however,* above could be indicated as move 1 step 2 (M1S2) because the students attempt to delineate the phenomenon which is occurred in the field as social practice as stated by Nabilla, et.al. (2020). Its word semantically means when the information seems very contradictive from what imagined or realized. Pragmatically, it is also strengthened that the word of *however* gives a highly contrast on what the context and persuades the reader to understand the discourse by structure move as it aligned with Sari, E.D.P., et al. (2025) and follow what is considered about the contradiction by the student in this case. This example is also truly supported by the continuous word that employed with the word *many* as a common thing. Therefore, it is quite clear that this aforementioned example intends to highlight a general topic before starting the specific one and show the contradictive phenomena of the thing by the students. It also can be meant that the use of such a contrasting element shows the students' attempt to delineate a general topic before introducing a specific research problem.

Thirdly, reviewing item of previous research is one of an essential part as the third step of move 1. It, henceforward, is move 1 step 3 (M1S3) which already be identified. Further, the result of analysis shows none of data indicated as Swales's (1990) keyword but nevertheless, several phrases seemingly have a same meaning as stated by Swales's (1990) theory. The analysis showed that the students rarely used explicit keywords from Swales (1990), but they employed functionally similar phrases. accordingly, it can be explicated by these examples of authentic realizations as follows:

> ...**in some research that have been done,** *students in first year (JHS) still have difficulties...*
> ...**in case, based on some research** *using games in learning vocabulary is not simple as we think...*
> **In a previous study that discussed** *the ability to think critically...*
> **Much of the early research** *in speaking or feedback in speaking skill was concerned...*

From the underlined phrases above, there were some of new keywords that implied to raise previous studies as move 1 step 3 (M1S3). Even though, the phrases of *in some research that have been done* and *in case based on some studies* do not match with Swales's (1990) keyword clearly, they could be concluded that they could refer to Swales' explanation of 'what has been found?' in this step of move 1 (M1S3). Moreover, the phrases of *in a previous study that discussed,* and *much of the early research* also included as a part of move 1 step 3 with the similar interpretation.

Therefore, to categorize all of articles, it is strongly suggested to provide a whole meaning. For instance, to get the category of this step from the phrase of *in a previous study that discussed,* the analysis must require to look at the further information around of the phrase. The other is to recognize the name of person or refer to the speaker such as *according to Watson – Glaser.* Eventually, those words around it is surely be categorized as step 3 of move 1 (M1S3) which is focused on reviewing items in the previous study. The

contextual analysis confirms that these phrases serve the same function as a formal literature review, referencing the findings of earlier studies. It can be meant that the students tend to have a lack of lexicogrammar or vocabulary resources in writing this category. However, these phrases also demonstrate that students are aware of the need to cite prior literature and tend to rely on straightforward, declarative phrases to refer to existing studies, which may indicate a limited lexicogrammar repertoire for this specific move.

Move 2: Establishing a Niche

In this part, the second move 'establishing a niche' basically can be conveyed by 4 steps as Swales's (1990) CARS model. This pattern can be consisted of move 2 of step 1a (M2S1a) which focused on 'counter-claiming', step 1b (M2S1b) which focused on 'indicating a gap', step 1c (M2S1c) which focused on 'questioning-raising', or step 1d (M2S1d) which focused on 'continuing a tradition'. After deliberating the analysis, the most striking finding of this study is the near-total absence of Move 2 (Establishing a Niche) in the majority of the students' RP introductions. It can be meant that it is highly declared that all of RP introductory chapters are considered to have the possibility of disappearing from the students' RP introduction. Out of the 30 texts analyzed, only a few contained discourses that could be classified as M2, specifically in the form of counter-claiming or continuing a tradition.

This finding, while a significant limitation, provides valuable insight into the writing habits of these students. The lack of Move 2 is not due to a lack of data, but rather reflects a potential gap in their pedagogical training and academic writing competence. Thus, it seems quite hard to discover this move, but nevertheless the researchers found some of discourses which strongly indicated as both of counter-claiming or disagreement with a previous study at step 1a (M2S1a) and continuing a tradition at step 1d (M2S1d) in some cases. Those cases are exemplified based on the attached quotations below as the indications of move 2 of step 1a and step 1d, as follows:

> **_of the several articles I read_** *developing in a learning plan in the 2013 curriculum...*
> *...***most of them talked*** *about the implementation of the learning process. In addition, it also discusses...*
> **_Therefore, in this study_** *I will focus on how the teacher explores in a learning plan in this new curriculum...*

Although, Swales's (1990) framework has mentioned the clues in indicating move 2 step 1a (M2S1a), the study reported that only one article that occurs in the RP introduction focusing on counter-claim statement of previous research. The underlined phrases of "*of the several articles I read* and *most of them talked*" are explicitly meant a high contradictive. This is probably happened when the students have a good literature in the field and try to compare to the other studies. In this case, the students mostly refuse and attempt to fill a new gap that has not researched yet. On the other hands, the students can establish the niche of the field which is in line with Nabilla, et.al. (2020).

Moreover, the use of *therefore* refers to the counter-claim statement mentioned before. It noticeably signals that the writer or the student carries out to the new research. However, the word of *therefore* is pragmatically meant likes emphasizing about the current study or

help the reader understanding the specific information of the study as it is in similar with Sari, E.D.P., et al. (2025) which highlights the challenges students face in constructing complex rhetorical arguments. The few instances of Move 2 found, such as the use of "therefore" in a counter-claiming statement, likely reflect the individual competence and extensive reading of a small number of students, rather than a common practice. It also can show the students' competence in writing RP introduction focused on their field.

This absence of this move is likely due to several pedagogical reasons. First, undergraduate students may not have been explicitly taught the importance of identifying and stating a research gap in their introductory chapter. Instead, they might be instructed to simply present a general problem and then outline their research topic. Second, writing a compelling Move 2 requires a high level of critical engagement with existing literature, which can be challenging for undergraduate students. It necessitates not just summarizing, but also critiquing or extending previous research, a skill that may not be sufficiently emphasized in their academic curriculum. The lack of this critical skill prevents them from building a strong, persuasive argument for the novelty of their research.

Move 3: Occupying the Niche

It is truly last move in this section that establishing the niche delineates several steps such as step 1a (M3S1a) focused on 'outlining purpose' step 1b (M3S1b) focused on 'announcing present research', step 2 (M3S2) 'announcing principal findings', and step 3 (M3S3) focused on 'indicating research article structure'. This section varies some of steps that can be optionally chosen such as step 1a (M3S1a) or step 1b (M3S1b) while the others such as step 2 (M3S2) and step 3 (M3S3) should be involved in the Rp introduction.

Based on the corpora, the result found that one of examples of authentic realizations, indicated as the category of 'outlining purposes' (M3S1a), and seemingly detected as 'announcing present research' (M3S1b) drawn from students' RP introduction as similar as Swales's (1990) CARS model. The following examples can be seen below:

> **_Based on the explanation above, the researcher interested_** in conducting the research of the title...
> ...**_this study will answer_** the teachers' choices of feedback that is given to student in speaking classroom...
> **_The objective of the research:_** to analyze the students respond in writing...

Many of these frequent patterns in this case are definitely included to move 3 step 1 (M3S1). It is due most of writers delineate their purposes through the research article. Having the analysis, it surely reports that only one article is so hard to find its purpose of the study. Otherwise, the underlined phrases or sentences above are the instances of indicating a purpose. Commonly, it could be recognized that *based on the explanation above, the researcher interested in conducting research of the title* sentence strongly indicates move 3 step 1a (M3S1a) due the author intended to present the main purpose of their research explicitly without giving a wide explanation. In addition, these phrases are direct, clear, and effectively convey the research's intent, indicating that this is likely a major component of their writing instruction.

Moreover, regarded to move 3 step 1a and 1b, they have a relation with each other because outlining a purpose is collocated with announcing present research. However, there are a lot of ways to employ the recent studies such as the attached examples above, *this will answer, the objective of the research, thus, the researcher takes the title is, the researcher would conduct a study entitled, the authors are more directed at,* and so on.

The next step is about step 2 of move 3 (M3S2) which defined as announcing principal findings. It can be detected either with a similar word or word sign as presented by Swales's (1990) theory. For instance, in the following attachment below is one of the examples of step 2 of move 3 (M3S2):

> **<u>This study can produce significance result for</u>** the writer...
> **<u>this research is expected to</u>** provide new knowledge and experience regarding the efficiency teaching English vocabulary...

From the data above, it alternatively recognizes that the clues of move 3 step 2 (M3S2) is 'is there (any) statement(s) refers to advantages/ benefits of present research? or no'. If there is/ are statement(s) refers to advantages/ benefits of present research and counterpart. On the other hands, the underlined phrase above representatively reflects a part of announcing principal finding by signing the word *can*, and contextually means about significance of its study.

Moreover, indicating research article structure is the other step of move 3. Henceforward, it is represented as move 3 step 3 (M3S3) which provided 'an indicating research article structure'. Although, all of articles have been being read carefully, but none of discourses in those articles can be categorized as step 3 in this move (M3S3). It is due the writers possibly have a lack of systematically academic insight. This finding also is not surprising, as research proposals typically do not contain a formal outline of the paper's structure in the same way that a completed journal article would. This absence aligns with the conventions of the specific genre being analyzed.

The appropriateness Word and Move with CARS Model of Swales (1990)

Reading carefully is an essential point in this part to determine the appropriateness of word and structure move through CARS model keywords. In this case, the researchers require to reveal whether the words, phrases, or sentences contain a similar meaning or not from the semantics, pragmatic, and functional perspectives. Having the analysis from the data, it variously reported that there are numerous structures or moves on the RP introduction written by the students. Half of them were almost appropriate with Swales's (1990) CARS model and the others were counterparts. It is seemingly in line with Salom, Monreal, & Olivares (2008) that the researcher found many keywords in each step. Those keywords are similar which mentioned by Swales (1990) and further investigation shows the keywords that had synonymy or same meaning with Swales's (1990) keywords.

More detail, here are the findings of Swales' (1990) keywords in each step of move on students' RP introduction as follows: *recently, in recent years, great importance, central issue, has been problem of, important aspect*. While, most of student's work do the same word as Swales (1990) indication such as *are <u>important</u>, an <u>important</u>, <u>important</u> skill, the most <u>important</u> part,* so on.

For the other instance, here is the whole example contextually: *the learning of vocabulary is very <u>important</u> part of learning a language.* From the aforementioned statement, it could be assumed that the writer has conducted M1S1 which is claiming centrality or establish research area. It is due the author used *important* word which is included in Swales' (1990) keywords.

In addition, the other finding also reveals the keywords which have same meaning or synonymy with Swales' keywords such as: *nowadays* and *following the fast evolution* can be meant *recently/in recent years)*, while *is very needed* and *must be mustered* referred to *important*. For further instance, the underlined phrase in sentence of *in the vocabulary learning process <u>is very needed</u> for young learners,* can be meant pragmatically that the main message of the underlined phrases, *is very needed,* is *important* meaning. Thus, its word could be categorized as move 1 step 1 (M1S1).

Moreover, the keyword in move 1 step 2 (M1S2) has been being highlighted by Swales's (1990) keywords such as *is well known, there is much evidence to support, not completely understood, are often, criticized, are often criticized; there are many situations where, it is a common finding that*. After analyzing, none of the students establish as Swales's (1990) keywords, but nevertheless, it is only found a same synonymy meaning orientated to Swales's (1990) keywords in indicating move 1 step 2 (M1S2), for instance: the phrase of *in many cases* can be meant as *there is much evidence to support*. The phrase of *these problems come from several factors, found out some problems, there are some factors* also can be relevant with *there are many situations*, and so on.

Last part is about move 1 step 3 (M1S3). This step does not have any keyword to determine move 1 step 3 (M1S3) based on Swales's (1990) theory. It is due a limited exploration that he only separated integral citation and non-integral citation.

Epistemologically, integral citation can be realized by the citation of founder's/expert's name in the sentence and non-integral citation can be detected by founder's/ expert's name citation in parentheses, for instance based on the data: <u>*In addition, based on Jacobs' written*</u> *"The instructional use of small groups so that students work together to maximize their own and each other's learning <u>(Johnson & Johnson, 1993, p. 9)"</u>.* From the sentences above, it could be categorized that the aforementioned sentence is contained by integral and non-integral citation. Integral citation was signed with *in addition based on Jacobs' written* words due to the name of citation in the sentence and non-integral citation was signed with *(Johnson & Johnson, 1993, p. 9)* due to the name of citation in parentheses, and so on.

Furthermore, to identify move 2 step 1a (M2S1a), it is required to refute the previous research. As Swales's (1990) keywords, it can be recognized as follows: *however, nevertheless, yet, unfortunately,* and *but*. In move 2 step 1b (M2S1b), he has mentioned some keywords to indicate this step namely *suffer, is limited to, time consuming, expensive, not sufficiently accurate*.

The others is move 2 step 1c (M2S1c) which asks about the previous research or earlier research which indicated by *direct* or *indirect question* as keywords. From the explanation above, the researchers found that most of the students did not conduct move 2 except step 1d that included Swales's (1990) keywords as follow: <u>*therefore, in this study*</u> *I will focus on how the teacher explores in a learning plan in this new curriculum.* The underlined phrase of

therefore, in this study is strongly indicated as move 2 step 1d (M2S1d). It is due the word *therefore* is similar with Swales's keyword which means that the author or writer presented the research as a useful extension of earlier research and so on.

Additionally, the words of *this, the present, we, reported, here, now* are included in Swales's (1990) keywords in indicating move 3 step 1a (M3S1a) which focused on RP introduction. The study shows the keywords which are appropriate with Swales's (1990) theory are *in this study/ research, here the researcher presents the research about..., the limitation of this study, based on description of the problem above this paper focus on..., for the purpose to discover the fact.*

Here is the example in a whole context based on the data: *depend on the problem stated above, the present research is conducted to recognize and analyze the feedback that often be used in the speaking classroom.* From the sentences above, move 3 step 1a (M3S1a) is signed with *present* word. It is caused Swales's (1990) framework has mentioned the keywords that could indicate move 3 step 1a (M3S1a).

Swales (1990) also describes the keyword to identify move 3 step 1b (M3S1b) for instance *the purpose of this investigation is/was to*. The finding reports that only few students' RP introduction who used keywords of Swales's (1990) theory in move 3 step 1b (M3S1b) such as in the context below: *The purpose of this study is to do whether the speaking activity can improve the vocabulary and pronunciation of students in junior high school.* From the statements above, it could be known that move 3 step 1b (M3S1b) was signed by *purpose* word. It is caused *purpose* word is included in Swales' keywords in indicating move 3 step 1b (M3S1b).

Accordingly, Swales (1990) also did not give the keywords that can indicate move 3 step 2 (M3S2). Thus, it seldom appears in the RP introductory writing. But nevertheless, he delineated some of new keywords in indicating move 3 step 3 (M3S3), for instance: *the paper is divided into five sections, is structured as follows, we have organized the rest of the paper in the following way.* Those instances words are included in Swales's (1990) keywords. As the result, it did not find its step that established move 3 step 3 (M3S3).

On the other hands, it caused the students did not know how to make good introduction in research paper in this case research proposal (Rp). From the explanation above, it could be interpreted that the researcher found some of the words, phrases, and sentences provide a similar indication with Swales's (1990) keywords on the introductory research proposal (RP) of the students.

Regarding the previous studies, the results are seemingly similar and aligns to the previous studies that conducted by Salom, Monreal, & Olivares (2008) which both of studies have a half of similar model with Swales (1990) and another half is not. Furthermore, this study may support Swales (1990) which argued about moves and steps on introductory chapter as Futász (2006) supports to this study in the term of appropriate word of introductory chapter.

From the aforementioned results and findings, it essentially emphasizes on the importance of an academic writing due to have a bigger potential publication in the reputable journal more specifically in the RP introductory chapter so that all of participants such as researcher, lecturer, especially students, must pay attention more to this study due the good introduction writing can be an initial step to the publication.

Thus, it also can be used for one of references especially for EFL students to evaluate and repair their moves of RP Introduction writing regarding the context of structures, lexicogrammar, textual organization, and different culture views. It is highly supported by Azizah & Asep (2017) with the challenges of AW and its publication. Furthermore, the exploration of publication can be analyzed by culture discourse through functional context such as transitivity view as stated by Saloyo (2020), and possibly investigated by interpersonal and textual views.

IV. CONCLUSION

This study successfully revealed the complex rhetorical structure in students' research proposal introductions, which generally aligns with Swales's (1990) CARS model. The findings show that students have strong competence in establishing a territory (Move 1) and occupying a niche (Move 3). However, there is a significant contrast: the majority of students failed to establish a niche (Move 2), a crucial move for justifying the need for new research. This failure indicates a gap in their rhetorical skills that needs to be addressed. Ultimately, this research has important pedagogical implications, not just for evaluating student writing but for improving their academic writing quality as a whole, particularly for publication.

Academic writing curricula, especially within EAP programs, must place a greater emphasis on teaching Move 2. Instructors need to provide explicit instruction and structured practice on how to identify gaps in the literature, rather than simply summarizing it. They should also offer targeted feedback to guide students in developing a strong and compelling argument for their research. While this study is limited by its small sample size, its recommendations can serve as a clear roadmap for instructors and students to enhance writing quality and pave the way for future research with a larger and more diverse sample.

REFERENCES

Amnuai, W. (2019). Analyses of rhetorical moves and linguistic realizations in accounting research article abstract published in international and Thai-based journals. *Sage open*. *9*(1), 1-9. https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244018822384

Azhar, S. (2015). *Analysis of generic structure of recount texts: (The study of fourth semester students of STAIN Salatiga in the academic year of 2012/2013).* Thesis, State Institute for Islamic Studies. Unpublished.

Azizah, U. A., & Asep B. (2017). Challenges in writing academic papers for international publication among Indonesian graduates students. *JEELS: Journal of English Education and Linguistics Studies*. Vol. 4. No. 2. 175-197. https://doi.org/10.30762/jeels.v4i2.405

Biber, D., Connor, U. & Upton, T. A. (Eds.) (2007). *Discourse on the move: Using Corpus Analysis to Describe Discourse Structure*. *Studies in Corpus Linguistics* (pp. 1-19). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamin Publishing Company.

Fatim, A. L. N., Hamid, M. A., & Mubasyiroh (2024). A corpus-based cognitive analysis of metaphors of gender issues in national media. *Notion: Journal of Linguistics, Literature, and Culture,* 6(2), 152-170. https://doi.org/10.12928/notion.v6i2.10489

Futász, R. (2006). Analysis of theoretical research article introductions written by undergraduate students: A genre-based approach. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica, 53*(2), 97-116. https://doi.org/10.1556/ALing.53.2006.2-3.1

Heath, M. T. P., & Tynan, C. (2010). Crafting a research proposal. *The Marketing Review, 10*(2), 147-168. https://doi.org/10.1362/146934710X505753

Hoed, B. H. (2011). *Semiotik dan dinamika sosial budaya* (Edisi kedua). Komunitas Bambu.

Hyland, K. (2000). *Disciplinary discourses: Social interactions in academic writing.* London, UK: Longman.

Kurniawan, E.,Arif, H. L., Didi, S., & Ari, A. D. (2019). Rhetorical organization of applied linguistics abstracts: Does scopus journal quartile matter?. *Gema Online*. *19*(4), 184-202. https://doi.org/10.17576/gema-2019-1904-10

Lores, R. (2004). On RA abstracts: From rhetorical structure to thematic organization. *English for Specific Purposes*. *23*, 280-302. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2003.06.001

Nordquist, R. (2011). *Academic writing*. Retrieved from http://grammar.about.com/od/ab/g/academicwritingterm.htm

Martin-Martin, P. (2002). A genre analysis of English and Spanish research paper abstracts in experimental social sciences. *English for Specific Purposes*. *22*(1), 25-43. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(01)00033-3

Mason, M. (2011). Examining the rhetorical structure and discursive features of letters of leniency as a genre. *International Pragmatics Association, 21*(1), 111-125. https://doi.org/10.1075/prag.21.1.06mas

Nabilla, S., Luthfianda, S. N., Suherdi, D., Kurniawan, E., Gunawan, W., & Lubis, A. H. (2020). How do novice and experienced Indonesia authors rhetorically organize research article introduction?. Presented at the Thirteenth Conference on Applied Linguistics (CONAPLIN). *Atlantis Press. Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research, Vol. 546. http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/.*

Panggalih, W. B., & Bambang, Y. C. (2020). EFL students' perception on the use of "rhetorical precis" as a summarizing template. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. Vol. 5. No. 1. 109-120. http://dx.doi.org/10.21093/ijeltal.v5i1.610

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), 31-50. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445607087010

Pratama, M. A. & Munandar, A. (2024). Decoding IELTS writing performance: Grammatical clauses mastery by University Ahmad Dahlan Students. *Notion: Journal of Linguistics, Literature, and Culture,* 6(1), 112-127. https://doi.org/10.12928/notion.v6i1.9519

Purwaningrum, P. W. & Harmoko, D. D. (2023). Critical discourse analysis of proportional closed election system news (on the online media CNNindonesia.com and News.detik.com). *Notion: Journal of Linguistics, Literature, and Culture,* Vol 5(2), p. 190-207. https://doi.org/10.12928/notion.v5i2.7960

Purwati, O. (2018). Cultural pattern of rhetorical move in Indonesian students' speeches. *Journal of Literature and Art Studies, 8*(4), 659-679. https://doi.org/10.17265/2159-5836/2018.04.014

Salom, Luz Gil, et.al. (2008). The move-step structure of the introductory sections of Spanish PHD theses. *Revista Espanola de Linguistica Aplicada*. 21, 85-106. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/28264928_The_move-step_structure_of_the_introductory_sections_of_Spanish_PHD_theses

Saloyo, J. D. (2020). Woman's right, a call for life: A critical discourse analysis of Pres. Donald Trump's speech for the 2020 March for life. *JEELS: Journal of English Education and Linguistics Studies*. Vol. 7. No. 1. 115-135. https://doi.org/10.30762/jeels.v7i1.1906

Samraj, B. (2005). An exploration of a genre set: Research article abstracts and introduction in two disciplines. *English for Specific Purposes*. *24*(1), 41-56. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2002.10.001

Shannon, S. L. (2011). *A guide to academic and scholarly writing.* USA: Baldwin Book Publishing.

Sari, E. D. P., Agustina, M. F., Adiarti, D., & Hamzah, R. H. (2025). Genre analysis of textual strategies in the Mandalika tourism website. *Notion: Journal of Linguistics, Literature, and Culture, 7(1), 104-121. https://doi.org/10.12928/notion.v7i1.12905*

Sidek, H. M., Saad, N. S. M., Baharun, H., & Idris, M. M. (2016). An analysis of rhetorical moves in abstracts for conference proceedings. *IJASOS-International E-Journal of Advances in Social Sciences, 2*(4), 24-31. https://doi.org/10.18769/ijasos.80136

Suntara, W. & Usaha, S. (2013). Research article abstracts in two related disciplines: Rhetorical variation between linguistics and applied linguistics. *English Language Teaching*. *6*(2), 24-31. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v6n2p84

Swales. J. M. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Tanko, G. (2017). Literary research article abstract: An analysis of rhetorical moves and their linguistic realizations. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*. *27*, 42-55. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2017.04.003

Udayana, I. B. W. & Munandar, A. (2025). Naminalizations in humanities research articles in SINTA-and scopus-indexed journal by Indonesian authors: An insight of its frequency and indexing matters. *Notion: Journal of Linguistics, Literature, and Culture, 7(1), 1-20. https://doi.org/10.12928/notion.v7i1.10499*

Vathanalaoha, K. & Tangkiengsirisin, S. (2018). Genre analysis of experiment-based dental research article abstract: Thai and International journal. *3L: The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*. *24* (3), 1-14. https://doi.org/10.17576/3L-2018-2403-01

Wahyu, L. C. (2016). The rhetorical moves and verb tense in research article abstracts. *Jurnal Pendidikan Humaniora, 4*(4), 187-192. https://journal.um.ac.id/index.php/jph/article/view/8202/3787