

Passage

Vol. 9 No. 2, November 2021, pp.35–55

Available online at:

<https://ejournal.upi.edu/index.php/psg/article/view/40573>

A Comparative Study of Rhetorical Moves and Linguistic Features of Lecturers' Theses and Dissertations Abstracts in Soft and Hard Science

Fadlila Ghifarina Gani, Eri Kurniawan

*English Language and Literature Study Program,
Faculty of Language and Literature Education,
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia*

fadlilaghf@upi.edu, eri_kurniawan@upi.edu

ABSTRACT

Move analysis is a genre-based approach used to analyze academic writing and investigate the rhetorical pattern of the text such as academic paper, abstracts, thesis, etc. However, the analysis of rhetorical moves in the abstracts of lecturers' final papers in different disciplines remains unexplored. The aim of this study is to identify and compare the rhetorical moves, steps, and linguistic features of the abstract of lecturers from four different disciplines. The researchers focused on the abstract of master theses and dissertations from each discipline. This study analyzed eight abstracts from English lecturers for the soft science field, Mathematic and Architectural lecturers for the hard science field in Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia. The Five Move Analysis by Hyland (2004) is used as the framework of this study. The findings showed that Move 1 - *Introduction* was the most common move in hard science abstracts, while in soft science, it was Move 4 - *Product*. Moreover, the most occur step in both fields was Step 2 of Move 1 – *Making topic generalization* and Step 1 of Move 5 – *Deducing conclusion*. For linguistics features, both of the fields mostly used active voice. While for the tense, hard science tended to use present tense, but soft science inclined to use past tense. The findings show that each field has different tendencies yet similarities in writing abstracts to highlight the essential things on each abstract.

Keywords: *Abstract; Linguistic Features; Rhetorical Move*

How to cite (in APA style):

Gani, F.G., & Kurniawan, E. (2021). A comparative study of rhetorical moves and linguistic features of lecturers' theses and dissertations abstracts in soft and hard science. *Passage*, 9(2), 35-55.

INTRODUCTION

Writing a final paper is required in an academic context to complete the study. Additionally, students also should publish their research articles, as part of the prerequisites to graduate in Indonesian universities. For a successful academic career, writing and publishing are essential (Antoniou & Moriarty, 2008). An example of writing in an academic context is writing final papers such as thesis and dissertation.

It is not easy to write, especially in the academic context, also in native languages (Suwandi, 2016). Some students should write their final papers in English, primarily the abstract section. For example, those who study abroad or take the English Language as their major write their final papers in English. It is also applied to those studying in certain Indonesian universities, where English is to be used.

The use of linguistic features is also the primary concern of writing in academic writing. For the lecturers, predominantly non-English speakers,

sometimes deciding word type, voice, tense, and grammar is complex. It can happen because the vocabulary and grammar in English are different from the vocabulary and grammar in Indonesian (Suwandi, 2016). So, the ability to write coherently, cohesively, and effectively is pivotal mainly when it is aimed to be published in international and reputable journals (Kurniawan, Lubis, Suherdi, & Danuwijaya, 2019)

In line with writing in academic context, the abstract sections have become a prominent part-genre (Swales & Feak, 2009). Abstracts are known as a fundamental gateway into the research for the scientific community (Hyland, 2004; Lores, 2004; Ebadi, Salman, Nguyen, & Weisi, 2019). Abstracts are the reflection and the vital part of the research. Because of that, abstracts are necessary for graduation works such as undergraduate theses, postgraduate theses, dissertation, grant proposals, short communications, and for specific disciplinary purposes (Bondi & Sanz, 2014). Writing an abstract is not only

difficult for university students but also tricky for lecturers and novice writers (Safnil, 2014). Some linguists deepen their knowledge in writing abstract areas, such as Hyland (2004), Swales and Feak (2009), and Bhatia (1993).

Hyland (2004), in his book, distinguished a move-structure classification on abstracts. There are five moves: Move 1 - *Introduction*; Move 2 – *Purpose*; Move 3 - *Method* Move 4 - *Product*; and Move 5 – *Conclusion*. Using this structure, the researcher will be easier to write an abstract and the reader would find it easier to understand. Hyland (2004) also mentioned that people with different disciplines tend to write the abstract differently. For soft science people, they tend to situate their discourse with an Introduction. On the other side, hard science people tend to write more on a description of the Method.

Because this topic is interesting to be observed, many related previous studies discuss a similar issue. A study by Ebadi, Salman, Nguyen, and Weisi (2019)

investigated the rhetorical differences or similarities of Master of Arts (MA) theses abstracts and introduction section written by Iraqi and international students in Applied Linguistics. Hyland's (2000) and Chen and Kuo's (2012) framework were employed to analyze thirty abstracts from each category. The result shows that the Iraqi university students included the steps of (a) Research hypotheses and (b) Outlining thesis structures in their abstracts while these rhetorical features were absent in their international counterparts. Moreover, although both Iraqi and international MA students used the moves with similar frequencies in their introduction chapters, international students utilized various steps for the realization of Move 1 and Move 3.

Andika, Safnil, and Harahap (2018) examined the rhetorical moves and linguistic features of English research article abstracts written by three groups of authors in Applied Linguistics. Swales' (2009) framework was used to analyze sixty abstracts of master theses, national and international journals. The

results indicated there are only three moves (i.e., purpose, Method, and results) that three groups of authors commonly use. The linguistic features used commonly by three groups of authors are active voice, present tense, and simple sentence.

Furthermore, Pasavoravate and Wijitsopon (2011) analyzed the structural organization of abstracts of thesis and dissertation in linguistics written by students in Thailand and England. Swales' (1990) move analysis was used as the framework. The results show that the moves used by students in Thailand and England are quite similar while the steps used are quite different. Moreover, Thai students tend to follow the conventional sequence of moves while English students do not. Last, Thai abstracts seem to stress on Move 4 – Results and Move 3 – Methodology, whereas the English ones place more emphasis on Move 4 – Results and Move 2 – Presenting the Research.

Thus, this study sought to analyze the rhetorical moves and steps by using

Hyland's (2004) framework. Hyland's (2004) framework was used because most rhetorical moves analyses utilize this framework, such as Kaya & Yağiz (2020), Amnuai (2019), and Farzannia & Farnia (2017) (see Lubis & Kurniawan, 2019 more a more comprehensive review). As linguistic features are essential in writing an abstract, another aim of this study was to analyze the use of voice and tense used in both fields. Some research analyses have also investigated the use of voice (Liu & Zheng, 2014; Muhartoyo, 2016) and tense (Salager-Meyer, 1992; Tseng, 2011; Nurhayati, 2017) on abstracts. Because comparing and contrasting abstracts of lecturers' theses and dissertations on different disciplines is under explored, the present research would fill this gap.

METHODOLOGY

This research used a descriptive qualitative method. The Five-Move Analysis by Hyland (2004) was used as the main framework to examine the rhetorical structure of abstracts. This

study aimed to identify the rhetorical moves, steps, and the realization of linguistic features in master theses and dissertations of lecturers from the soft science field and hard science field in a state university in Bandung. Also, it was to compare and identify the tendencies of each field.

For the data collection, the study picked out eight abstracts from lecturers of different majors: the English Language Education Department, English Language, and Literature Department, Mathematics Department, and Architecture Department. The abstracts were taken from their master theses and dissertations written in English and from different educational backgrounds. The analysis was done manually. The result is displayed in the form of a table.

In Hyland's (2004) rhetorical move analysis, there are five moves: Move 1 - Introduction establishes the context of the paper and motives for the research or discussion; Move 2 – Purpose indicates the purpose and outlines the intention

behind the paper; Move 3 - Method provides information on design, procedures, assumption, approach, and data; Move 4 - Product states the main findings and the arguments, and Move 5 - Conclusion interprets or extends results beyond the scope of the paper, draws inferences, points to applications or broader implications (p. 67).

Table 1. Hyland's (2004) Model of Rhetorical Moves in RA

Move	Step	Label
1 Introduction (I)	1	Arguing for topic significance
	2	Making topic generalizations
	3	Defining the key term(s)
	4	Identifying gap
2 Purpose (P)		Stating the research purpose

3	Method (M)	1	Describing participants/data source
		2	Describing instrument(s)
		3	Describing procedure and context
4	Product (Pr)		Describing the main results
5	Conclu- sion (C)	1	Deducing conclusion
		2	Evaluating the significance of the research
		3	Stating limitations
		4	Presenting recommendatio n or implication

For the analysis steps, the sentences in the abstracts were analyzed by using the Five-Move Analysis framework by Hyland (2004). The first step of the analysis was the analysis of the pattern

of moves in each sentence. Next, the analysis of steps in each move was done. Then, move and steps analysis was performed by observing the frequent occurrence and the average percentage. After analyzing the abstract, the next step was analyzing the linguistic features, voice (active and passive) and tense (present and past). The linguistic features analysis was conducted by finding the common occurrence of each category and the average percentage. Finally, the conclusion and discussion from the findings were drawn.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This part presents the findings and this study based on the move and linguistic features analysis between two fields of science, soft and hard science, and the result discussed as follows. Abstracts of Hard Science were assigned as H1 (theses abstracts) and H2 (dissertations abstracts), while abstracts of soft science were assigned as S1 (theses abstracts) and S2 (dissertations abstracts).

Findings

The Occurrence of Rhetorical Move and Step

This section shows the percentage of rhetorical move usage in eight abstracts, as seen in Table 2, while the percentage of step occurrence in each move is presented in Table 3.

Table 2. The occurrence of Move

M	Move Presence Percentage					
	H1	H2	S1	S2	Hard	Soft
1	53%	16%	21%	30%	34%	26%
2	12%	12%	11%	6%	12%	8%
3	12%	36%	21%	15%	24%	18%
4	12%	24%	32%	27%	18%	29%
5	12%	12%	16%	21%	12%	19%

From the analysis, all abstracts constituted all the moves from Move 1 until Move 5. The moves were also presented in order. Here is the example.

Example 1:

[M1] (S2) In recent years, Indonesia has transformed from an authoritarian regime to a democratic country initiated by the Reform Movement in 1998 [S-1]. [M2] This study seeks to reveal the contribution of an English

online news media, the Jakarta Post, in disseminating democratic values to Indonesian intellectuals during the 1998 Reform Movement [S-2]. [M3] (S3) This study drew upon a qualitative method [S-3]. (S3) In particular, it used a Critical Discourse Analysis spawned by Van Dijk (2001) with micro-analysis and macro-analysis [S-4]. [M4] This study revealed several significant democratic values, namely freedom of speech (45%), social justice (20%), equality (15%), openness (20%) [S-5]. [M4] Apart from these essential democratic values, the Jakarta Post also conveyed biases, namely the use of violence (55 %) and lawlessness (45%) in triggering a democratic change to occur [S-6]. [M5] (S3) The findings of this study are in line with Samuelson (1995) and Patrick (2001) [S-7]. (S1)

As seen in the table above, H1 abstracts had Move 1 – *Introduction* as the most occurred move among all moves, 53%. In contrast with H1, Move

3 - *Method* with 36% appeared the most in H2 abstracts. In contrast, S1 abstracts had Move 4 – *Product* as the most frequent move with 32%. Unlike S1 abstracts, Move 1 - *Introduction* was the most used move in S2 abstract, 30%.

Overall, hard science abstracts and soft sciences abstracts had different moves that appeared frequently. In hard science abstracts, Move 1 – *Introduction* had the most significant percentage, 34%. In contrast, Move 4 - *Product* with 29% appeared most in soft science abstracts. Both fields had Move 2 - *Purpose* as the least written, 6% in hard science abstracts, and 8% in soft science abstracts.

After analyzing the move, the next step was analyzing the step in each move. Not all moves had steps in it. Only Move 1, Move 3, and Move 5 constitute steps. The step presence of each move would be presented in three different tables but it was counted in one unit. First, Table 3 describes the step presence in Move 1.

Table 3: Step Presence Percentage in Move 1

Abstract	M1			
	S1	S2	S3	S4
H1	15%	46%	0%	0%
H2	11%	11%	0%	0%
Hard Science	13%	28%	0%	0%
S1	9%	27%	0%	0%
S2	8%	27%	4%	4%
Soft Science	8%	27%	2%	2%

First, in hard science abstracts, there were no Step 3 - *Defining the key term(s)* and Step 4 – *Identifying gap* in Move 1. The result showed that Step 1 of Move 1 – *Arguing for topic significance* was 15% in H1 abstract and 11% in H2 abstract. Step 2 of Move 1 – *Making topic generalizations* was found in all abstracts. Also, it had the most significant percentage among all steps. In H1 abstract, there were 46% and 11% in H2 abstract.

Next was the result of step analysis in soft science abstracts. Based on the result, 9% of Step 1 of Move 1 - *Arguing for topic significance* in S1 abstracts and

8% in S2 abstracts. Step 2 of Move 1 - *Making topic generalizations* was 27% in S1 abstracts and S2 abstracts. Step 3 - *Defining the key term(s)* and Step 4 - *Identifying gap* of Move 1 only appeared in S2, which shared the same percentage: 4%

The next move that had step is Move 3. Table 4 below represents the step presence in Move 3.

Table 4: Step Presence Percentage in Move 3

Abstract	M3		
	S1	S2	S3
H1	8%	0%	15%
H2	32%	16%	16%
Hard Science	20%	8%	16%
S1	9%	18%	18%
S2	8%	12%	12%
Soft Science	8%	15%	15%

In Move 3, Step 1 - *Describing participants/data source* was only used about 8% in H1 abstracts but used most frequently in H2 abstracts with 32%. Step 2 of Move 3 - *Describing instruments* was not found in H1

abstract. However, H2 abstract had 16% of Step 2 of Move 3. Step 3 Move 3 - *Describing procedure and context* was used in H1 abstract, 15% as the most occurred step in Move 3 for H1 abstract. Meanwhile, H2 abstracts had 16% Step 3 of Move 3 - *Describing procedure and context*. Here, some embedded steps were found in one move or sentence, especially in H1 abstracts.

Example 2:

[M3] (S1) Next, making use of the pilot study results, we conducted an experimental study, which involved 266 grade VII students (12-13 year-old) from eight classes of four schools, (S3) implementing ICT-based approach in algebra teaching [S-12]. (H2)

Step 1 of Move 3 - *Describing participants/data source* appeared in S1 abstracts and S2 abstracts with a thin difference percentage of 9% and 8%. Step 2 of Move 3 - *Describing instruments* was used in all abstracts; 18% in S1 abstracts and 12% in S2 abstracts. Step 3 of Move 3 - *Describing*

procedure and context was used in all abstracts; 18% in S1 abstracts and 12% in S2 abstracts.

The last move that has steps is Move 5. Table 5 below represents the step presence in Move 5.

Table 5: Step Presence Percentage in Move 5

Abstract	M5			
	S1	S2	S3	S4
H1	8%	0%	0%	8%
H2	11%	5%	0%	0%
Hard Science	9%	3%	0%	4%
S1	9%	0%	0%	9%
S2	23%	0%	0%	4%
Soft Science	16%	0%	0%	6%

Step 3 of Move 5 – *Stating limitations* was not found in all hard science abstracts. Step 1 of Move 5 – *Deducing conclusion* appeared in H1 abstract with 8% and in H2 abstract with 11%. Step 2 of Move 5 – *Evaluating the significance of the research* was only shown in H2 abstract, which was 5%. Step 4 of Move 5 – *Presenting*

recommendation or implication appeared once in H1 abstract, 8%.

Last, there was no Step 2 – *Evaluating the significance of the research* and Step 3 – *Stating limitations* of Move 5 in all soft science abstracts. Step 1 of Move 5 – *Deducing conclusion* appeared in S1 abstract, 9%, and in S2 abstract, 23%. Step 4 of Move 5 – *Presenting recommendation or implication* was written in S1 abstracts with 9% and S2 abstracts with 4%.

In conclusion, both hard science and soft science abstracts, Step 2 of Move 1 – *Making topic generalizations* had the most considerable percentage, 28% and 27% respectively. In Move 3, the most occurring steps were different in each field. In hard science, it was Step 1 – *Describing participants/data source* with 20 %. Meanwhile, Step 2 – *Describing instrument(s)* and Step 3 – *Describing procedure and context* emerged 15% in soft science abstracts. Moreover, Step 1 of Move 5 – *Deducing conclusion* showed frequently in both fields, 9% in hard science abstracts and

16% in soft science abstracts. Step 3 of Move 5 – *Stating limitation* did not appear in all abstracts.

The Realization of Linguistic Features

The linguistic features that were analyzed in this research are the manifestation of voice and tense. The voice for each move are presented in Table 6 below.

Table 6. The Realization of Voice

Move	Voice			
	H1	H2	S1	S2
M1	AV (67%)	AV (50%)	AV (100%)	AV (90%)
	PV (11%)	PV (50%)		PV (10%)
M2	AV (100%)	AV (67%)	AV (100%)	AV (50%)
		PV (33%)		PV (50%)
M3	AV (50%)	AV (67%)	AV (75%)	AV (20%)
	PV (50%)	PV (33%)	PV (25%)	PV (80%)

M4	AV (100%)	AV (100%)	AV (83%)	AV (89%)
			PV (17%)	PV (11%)
M5	PV (100%)	AV (100%)	AV (100%)	AV (57%)
				PV (43%)

As we can see from the table above, the active voice became the dominant voice of all moves except in Move 3 – *Method* of S2 abstracts, which is only 20%, and in Move 5 – *Conclusion* of H1 abstracts 0%. Active voice in Move 1 – *Introduction* of H2 abstracts, Move 2 – *Purpose* of S2 abstracts, and Move 3 – *Method* of H1 abstracts shared the same percentage with the passive voice, 50% for each category.

Example 3:

[M1] One calculation form that is used most in our daily life is computational estimation. [S-1]. (H1)

Example 4:

[M1] They *found* that they had been reluctant to raise questions during the dialogs over their teachings. [S-5].
(S2)

The italic words above indicate the active voice. From the result, it is clear that active voice was used frequently in both fields.

Tense analysis was the next step after analyzing voice. Unlike the voice that had one category that dominated all moves, tense had different categories that dominated each move. Table 7 below is the result of the analysis of tense of each move.

Table 7. The Realization of Tense

Move	Tense			
	H1	H2	S1	S2
M1	Pr (100%)	Pr (75%)	Pr (100%)	Pr (30%)
		Ps (25%)		Ps (70%)

M2	Pr (50%) Ps (50%)	Pr (67%) Ps (33%)	Pr (50%) Ps (50%)	Pr (50%) Ps (50%)
M3	Ps (100%)	Pr (33%) Ps (67%)	Pr (25%) Ps (75%)	Pr (20%) Ps (80%)
M4	Pr (50%) Ps (50%)	Pr (33%) Ps (67%)	Ps (100%)	Pr (33%) Ps (67%)
M5	Pr (100%)	Pr (67%) Ps (33%)	Pr (33%) Ps (67%)	Pr (14%) Ps (86%)

For Move 1 – *Introduction*, H1 abstracts, H2 abstracts, and S1 abstracts were dominated by the present tense. However, the past tense was used frequently in S2 abstracts. Below is the example of the present tense in Move 1 – *Introduction*.

Example 5:

[M1] In Indonesia, algebra performance *is* an important issue. [S-2]. (H2)

Meanwhile, the present tense occurred dominantly in Move 2 – *Purpose* of H2 abstracts with 67%. Meanwhile, the other abstracts categories shared the same percentage between present tense and past tense, 50% and 50%.

Next, Move 3 - *Method* was dominated by the past tense. For hard science, the percentages are 100% in H1 abstracts and 67% in H2 abstracts, while for soft science, it was 75% in S1 abstracts and 80% for S2 abstracts.

The past tense also appeared frequently in Move 4 – *Result*. In hard science, it was 50% for H1 abstracts and 67% for H2 abstracts. In soft science, all sentences of Move 4 – *Product* in S1 abstracts were written in the past, while in S2 abstracts, 67%. Here is the example of the past tense in Move 4 – *Product*.

Example 6:

[M4] And the students *showed* one dominant profile of organizing and evaluating their learning based on Oxford's language learning strategies [S-10]. (S1)

Interestingly, for Move 5 – *Conclusion* between hard science and soft science abstracts, each field had its tendencies. The present tense dominated hard science with 100% in H1 abstracts and 67% in H2 science. However, the past tense dominated soft science abstracts, with 67% for S1 abstracts and 86% for S2 abstracts.

Discussion

This section aims to address the research objectives: (1) to identify the rhetorical moves, steps, and the realization of linguistic features and (2) to compare and identify the tendencies of each field.

The Occurrence of Rhetorical Move and Step

The findings above show that almost all the analyzed abstracts used Move 1 to

Move 5 in order. There are not any specific differences in the order of the move between the two fields. Only one abstract that did not have Move 3.

However, if we pay attention to the percentage of the move presence, the differences between the two fields seem clear. In hard science abstracts, Move 1 – *Introduction* is the most frequently used move than the others, 34% for the percentage followed by Move 3 – *Method* with 24%. On the contrary, in soft science abstracts, the most frequent move is Move 4 - *Product* that has 28% on average followed by Move 1 with 24%.

When comparing this result with those of Hyland (2004), similarities and differences can be found. For example, in this study, Move 1 – *Introduction* frequently occurs in hard science, while soft science is dominated by Move 4 – *Product*. However, Hyland (2004) had mentioned in his book that soft science people tend to place their discourse with an Introduction (Move 1), while hard science people tend to write more

description in the Method (Move 3) (p. 70). This might happen because the data in this research were relatively small if we compare it with Hyland's (2004) data which was much more significant. The difference also might be due to some disciplinary variations.

However, the result is in line with Andika et al. (2018), where Move 4 – *Product* occurred the most in soft science abstracts. The significant occurrences of Move 4 - *Product* show that the authors highlight the findings to show and explain their research contribution. By pointing to the findings, the authors tend to represent the novel contribution to scientific knowledge (El-Dakhs, 2018).

Moreover, Move 1 – *Introduction* and Move 3 – *Method* are the most manifested move in hard science abstracts. This finding aligns with Omidian et al.'s (2018) and Gani et al's (2021) results that Move 3 - *Method* and Move 1 – *Introduction* are in the first and second place in hard science abstracts. The high percentage of Move 1 - *Introduction* occurrence is because the

author may want to show how important the research is, identify the gap, or explain some key terms of the research. By pointing to Move 1, - *Introduction*, the authors of hard science studies try to avoid the confusion of the terms being used in their studies by presenting the general knowledge of the research topic (Juanda & Kurniawan, 2020). At the same time, the occurrence of Move 3 – *Method* in hard science abstracts suggests that this field focuses on the steps and formula. Regarding this finding, hard science abstracts concentrate on explaining the background of the research followed by the methodology used in the study and the study's contribution (Omidian, Shahriari, & Siyanova-Chenturia, 2018). Furthermore, it may indicate that both fields have a different tendency to emphasize what point seems to be essential to be highlighted in their research.

Step 2 of Move 1 - *Making topic generalization* had the most considerable percentage, 28% in hard science and 27% in soft science. It indicates that both

fields tend to introduce some general terms and general knowledge to the reader. Thus, the readers can estimate the content of the research.

However, both fields have different most occurred steps in Move 3. In hard science, it was Step 1 – *Describing participants/data sources* with 20%. It may indicate that the hard science abstracts tend to describe the participant or data source because the research is dedicated to specific participants. Meanwhile, in soft science, Step 2 – *Describing instrument(s)* and Step 3 – *Describing procedure and context* shared the same percentage, 15%. This finding is in line with Juanda & Kurniawan's (2020) finding. It is so because soft science research tends to use many instruments or theories in research, such as interviews, questionnaires, and others. Also, they usually describe the procedure of the research in detail.

Moreover, Step 1 of Move 5 – *Deducing conclusion* was used frequently in both fields, 9% in hard science abstracts and 16% in soft science

abstracts. It appears that both fields want to help the readers get the conclusion of the research more efficiently. However, Step 3 of Move 5 – *Stating limitation* did not occur in any abstract. This step was not expected to appear in thesis or dissertation abstracts because an expert writer usually uses this step in an academic journal article, and the appearance of this step was also assumed rare even in academic journal articles (Kurniawan, Lubis, Suherdi, & Danuwijaya, 2019).

The Realization of Linguistic Features

In terms of voice, the result from both fields was uniform that the active voice occurred frequently. All moves in each category were dominated by active voice. This finding is in line with Amnuai's (2019) findings. Active voice is used because it will make the sentence more effective and precise. The sentence that uses active voice tends to be shorter than the one that uses passive voice. Besides, the international standard ISO 21421976 (E) has suggested the active

voice so that the result will be more straightforward and more concise (Liu & Zheng, 2014). However, there is only one category dominated by the passive voice. It is Move 3 – *Methodology* in S2 abstracts. Research methodology usually used passive voice to express this element of the abstract (Muhartoyo, 2016).

Last, for the tense use, looking at the percentage of each discipline, the contrast seems clear. Hard science abstracts tend to use the present tense, while soft science abstracts tend to use the past tense. Move 1 – *Introduction* was the most occurred move in hard science abstract. This finding aligns with Nurhayati's (2017) finding and Tseng's (2011) finding that Move 1 – *Introduction* mostly used the present tense. This is so because it indicates that the research is alive (Nurhayati, 2017).

Since Move 4 – *Product* is frequently used in soft science abstracts, the past tense will easily be found. Percentagewise, in Move 4 – *Product* in Table 7, the percentage of the past tense

in S1 abstracts is 100% and in S2 abstracts is 67%. The products are usually written in past form. This finding is also in line with Tseng's (2011) findings and Muhartoyo's (2016) findings that Move 4 – *Product* is usually written in the past tense.

CONCLUSION

To recap, both fields of hard science and soft science included all moves in their abstracts. However, each field exhibited its tendencies in using Move. Hard science tends to use Move 1 – *Introduction* and Move 3 – *Method*, while soft science tends to use Move 4 – *Product* and Move 1 – *Introduction*. The reason for that finding is because each field may have a vital point that should be highlighted.

For the step analysis, there were no significant differences between hard and soft science abstracts. Step 2 of Move 1 – *Making topic generalizations* and Step 1 of Move 5 – *Deducing conclusion* frequently occurred in both fields. However, lecturers in hard science prefer to use Step 1 of Move 3 – *Describing*

participants/data source in their abstract. Meanwhile, lecturers of soft science abstracts tend to utilize Step 2 of Move 3 – *Describing instrument(s)* and Step 3 of Move 3 – *Describing procedure and context*. All abstracts did not manifest Step 3 of Move 5 – *Stating limitation* because this step is usually found in expert writers' academic journal articles.

In linguistic features analysis, lecturers from both fields prefer to use the active voice than the passive in their abstracts. For the verb type, the action verb was more frequently used. However, the present tense was preferred by hard science lecturers, whereas the past tense was often used by soft science lecturers.

The finding of this study may serve as the reference for future studies and enrich the existing literature of academic writing. The limited amount of data in this study may be biased for some specific discussion. Exploring more disciplines in hard science and soft science is highly recommended for

further research to arrive at a more comprehensive comparison and result. Drawing from the results of the present research, implicationally, novice writers can learn and understand the manifestation of move, step, and linguistic features in abstracts of different disciplines to write their abstract more coherently and well-structured in the future.

REFERENCES

- Amnuai, W. (2019). Analyses of Rhetorical Moves and Linguistic Realizations in Accounting Research Article Abstracts Published in International and Thai-Based Journals. *SAGE Open*, 9(1), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244018822384>
- Andika, R. P., Safnil, & Harahap, A. (2018). Rhetorical Moves and Linguistic Features of Journal Article Abstracts by Postgraduate Students, National, and International Authors in Applied Linguistics. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Literatures*, 3(1), 14--27. <https://doi.org/10.33369/joall.v3i1.6539>
- Antoniou, M., & Moriarty, J. (2008). What can academic writers learn from creative writers? Developing guidance and support for lecturers in Higher Education. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 13(2), 157-167. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562510801923229>
- Bhatia, V. (1993). *Analysing genre: Language use in professional settings*. London: Longman.
- Bondi, M., & Sanz, R. (2014). Abstracts: Cross-linguistic, Disciplinary, and Intercultural Perspectives. In Busch-Lauer, *Abstracts in Academic Discourse - Variation and Change* (pp. 43-63). Bern: Peter Lang.
- Ebadi, S., Salman, A., Nguyen, T., & Weisi, H. (2019). Rhetorical Structure Variations in Abstracts and Introductions of Applied Linguistics Master's Theses by Iraqi and International Students. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 7(1), 101-117. <https://doi.org/10.30466/IJLTR.2019.120635>
- El-Dakhs, D. A. (2018). Comparative Genre Analysis of Research Article Abstracts in More and Less Prestigious Journals: Linguistics Journals in Focus. *Research in Language*, 16(1), 47-63. <https://doi.org/10.2478/rela-2018-0002>
- Farzannia, S., & Farnia, M. (2017). Genre-Based Analysis of English and Persian Research Article Abstracts in Mining Engineering Journals. *Beyond Words*, 5, 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.33508/bw.v5i1.1111>
- Gani, F. G., Kurniawan, E., Gunawan, W., & Lubis, A. H. (2021). Rhetorical Moves Analysis in Soft and

- Hard Science Lecturers' Master Thesis and Dissertation Abstracts. *The Thirteenth Conference on Applied Linguistics (CONAPLIN 2020)*. 546, pp. 157-161. Bandung: Atlantis Press.
<https://doi.org/10.2991/a-ssehr.k.210427.024>
- Hyland, K. (2004). *Disciplinary Discourse: Social Interactions in Academic Writing*. Michigan: The University of Michigan Press.
- Juanda, M. R., & Kurniawan, E. (2020). A Comparison of Rhetorical Moves in Students' Undergraduate Thesis Abstract. *4th International Conference on Language, Literature, Culture, and Education (ICOLLITE 2020)* (pp. 443-448). Bandung: Atlantic Press.
<https://doi.org/10.2991/a-ssehr.k.201215.070>
- Kaya, F., & Yağiz, O. (2020). Move analysis of research article abstracts in the field of ELT: A comparative study. *a*, 16(1), 390-404.
<https://doi.org/10.17263/jlls.712854F>
- Kurniawan, E., Lubis, A., Suherdi, D., & Danuwijaya, A. (2019). Rhetorical organization of applied linguistics abstracts: Does Scopus journal quartile matter? *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, 19(4), 184-202.
<http://doi.org/10.17576/gema-2019-1904-10>
- Liu, J., & Zheng, R. (2014). A Comparative Study on Voice Distribution in English Abstracts between Chinese and English Power PAPers. *2nd International Conference on Education, Management, and Social Science (ICEMSS)* (pp. 38-41). Beijing: Atlantis Press.
<https://doi.org/10.2991/icemss-14.2014.11>
- Lores, R. (2004). On RA abstracts: From rhetorical structure to thematic organisation. *English for Specific Purposes*, 23(3), 280-302.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2003.06.001>
- Muhartoyo. (2016). A Study on Completeness, Finite, Verb Tense, and Voice of Coconut Research Abstracts. *Lingua Cultura*, 1, 49-55.
<https://doi.org/10.21512/lc.v10i1.879>
- Nurhayati, N. (2017). Verb Tense Analysis of Research Article abstract in Asian EFL Journal. *Progressive Journal*, 12(2), 121-128.
<https://ejournal.nusaman.diri.ac.id/index.php/progressive/article/view/572>

- Omidian, T., Shahriari, H., & Siyanova-Chenturia, A. (2018). A cross-disciplinary investigation of multi-word expressions in the moves of research article abstracts. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 36*, 1-14.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2018.08.002>
- Pasavoravate, Y., & Wijitsopon, R. (2011). Genre analysis of thesis and dissertation abstracts in linguistics written by students in Thailand and students in England. *Thoughts, 1*, 23-47.
<https://so06.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/thoughts/article/view/59338>
- Safnil. (2014). The Discourse Structure and Linguistic Features of Research Article Abstracts in English by Indonesian Academic. *Asian ESP Journal, 10(2)*, 191-224.
<http://repository.unib.ac.id/id/eprint/11456>
- Salager-Meyer, F. (1992). A text-type and move analysis study of verb tense and modality distribution in medical English abstracts. *English for Specific Purposes, 11(2)*, 93-113.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906\(05\)80002-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(05)80002-X)
- Suwandi. (2016). Coherence and Cohesion: An Analysis of Final Project Abstracts of the Undergraduate Students of PGRI Semarang. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 5(2)*, 253-261.
<https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v5i2.1349>
- Swales, J., & Feak, C. (2009). *Abstracts and the Writing of Abstracts*. Michigan: University of Michigan.
- Tseng, F.-p. (2011). Analyses of Move Structure and Verb Tense of Research Article Abstracts in Applied Linguistics Journals. *International Journal of English Linguistics, 1(2)*, 27-39.
<https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v1n2p27>