

People's Democratic Republic of Algeria
Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research
Mouloud Mammeri University of Tizi-Ouzou
Faculty of Letters and Languages
Department of English



Field: Foreign Languages

Specialism: Language and communication

**A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Master in English**

Title

**Genre analysis of Results and Discussions of Master Dissertations Moves :
A case study in the Department of English at MMUTO**

Presented by :

-Maya BELFADEL
-Farida MANSOUR

Supervised by :

Dr.Amel BENAISSA

Board of Examiners :

Chair: Dr. Kamila AMMOUR, M.C.A, Mouloud Mammeri University of Tizi-Ouzou.

Supervisor : Dr. Amel BENAISSA, M.C.B, Mouloud Mammeri University of Tizi Ouzou .

Examiner: Ms. Karima ADEM, M.A.A, Mouloud Mammeri University of Tizi Ouzou.

Dedications

This work is dedicated to :

My mother, whose support has been my guiding light throughout my educational journey. Her belief in me has propelled me to see this incredible adventure through to its conclusion.

My dear brother, whose constant assistance and boundless patience have been my pillars of strength, I am truly thankful.

My dear sister who I miss immensely.

My dear friend Ramy, to whom I owe a debt of gratitude for his encouragement and moral support during the toughest of times.

And to my best friend, Farida.

Maya.

To my beloved parents.

My much loved grandparents.

My sister and brother.

My uncle Hamid. Specially my binominal and best friend Maya.

Farida.

Acknowledgements

We are profoundly grateful to our respected teacher and supervisor, Dr. Amel Benaissa, for her invaluable assistance, feedback, constant guidance, and patience in meticulously reviewing and correcting our work. Our co-supervisor, Ms. Ait Hamouda Hanane, for consistently taking the time to answer our questions and provide valuable support.

We would also like to express our sincere thanks to Rachida Dendaouine, our former teacher, for the time, efforts, and support she provided us with through various phases of completing this dissertation. Her support has been instrumental in the success of this work.

Our heartfelt appreciation extends to the board of examiners for graciously agreeing to sit on our panel and dedicating their valuable time to assess and evaluate our work.

Additionally, we extend special thanks to our families, friends, and all individuals who, through their support and contributions, played a vital role in our journey.

Abstract

Results and Discussion chapters in thesis writing often present challenges, especially for non-native English writers. This study explores genre analysis, a significant area in academic research, focusing on the manifestation of rhetorical moves within the Results and Discussion sections of MA dissertations authored by students specializing in language and communication within the Department of English at MMUTO. The primary objective is to analyze these moves in the MA dissertations' results and discussions. The second aim is to explore possible differences in the writing of the authors of the analyzed master dissertations. Ten Master 2 dissertations were analyzed using Chen and Kuo's (2012) framework, employing a mixed-methods approach for data collection and analysis. Qualitative content analysis was chosen as the methodology, enabling the identification of terms and sentences expressing rhetorical moves within these sections. The findings revealed inconsistencies in adherence to the organizational framework, with some moves displaced, others omitted, and two additional moves identified in certain Results and Discussion sections. This study emphasizes the need for a flexible understanding of organizing Results and Discussion chapters, acknowledging the varied approaches students may employ in crafting these sections.

Key words: genre analysis, MA dissertations, rhetorical moves, Results, Discussions

List of abbreviations

APA: American Psychological Association

EAP: English for Academic Purposes

EFL: English as a Foreign Language

ESL: English as a Second Language

ESP: English for Specific Purposes.

MA: Master of Arts

MDs: Master Dissertations

MMUTO: Mouloud Mammeri university of Tizi Ouzou

RAs : Research Articles

List of figures

<i>Figure 1: Chen and Kuo's (2012, P.50) framework for the Results chapter of MA theses in Applied Linguistic</i>	<i>21</i>
<i>Figure 2 Chen and Kuo's (2012,P.51) framework for the Discussion chapter of MA theses in Applied Linguistics.....</i>	<i>24</i>

List of tables

<i>Table 1 Yang and Allison's (2003) moves and steps in the results section of MA theses in Applied linguistics.....</i>	<i>23</i>
<i>Table 2 Yang and Allison's (2003) moves and steps in the discussion sections of MA thesis in Applied linguistics.....</i>	<i>26</i>
<i>Table 3 : Titles of dissertations and the number of pages of each section.</i>	<i>31</i>
<i>Table 4: Total of result moves and steps found in the corpus.....</i>	<i>39</i>
<i>Table 5: The total of Discussion moves and steps found in the corpus</i>	<i>44</i>
<i>Table 6: making claims: some examples of hedging (Starfield & Paltridge, 2007, p.143)</i>	<i>Erreur ! Signet non défini.</i>

Contents

Dedications.....	I
Acknowledgements.....	II
Abstract.....	III
List of Abbreviations.....	IV
List of Diagrams.....	V
List of Tables.....	VI

General introduction

Statement of the problem	1
Aims and significance of the study	3
Research questions and hypotheses	4
Research techniques and methodology	5
Structure of the dissertation	5

Chapter one : Review of the literature

Introduction.....	6
1 Genre	6
2 Dissertation writing as an academic genre	10
3 Genre analysis	13
4 Move.....	16
5 Move analysis.....	18
6 The Results and discussion section of an academic work.....	19
7 Theoretical framework.....	19
Conclusion.....	26

Chapter two: Research methodology

Introduction.....	29
1 Research method	29
2 Data collection procedures	30
2.1 The corpus of the study	30
3 Data analysis procedures.....	31
3.1 Descriptive sttastical analysis	31
3.2 Qualitative content analysis	32
3.3 Techniques of moves identification	33

Conclusion.....	36
-----------------	----

Chapter three: Presentation of the findings

Introduction.....	38
1 Results Chapters.....	38
1.1 Quantitative results :	38
1.2 Qualitative results :	40
2 The findings of the analyzed Discussions :	43
2.1 Quantitative results :	43
2.2 Qualitative results.....	45
Conclusion	48

Chapter four: Discussion of the findings

Introduction.....	50
1 Discussing the findings of the analysed Results chapters.....	50
1.1 Organisation.....	50
1.2 Schematic structure of the Results chapters.....	52
1.3 The order of move occurrence.....	53
2 Discussing the findings of the analysed Discussion chapters	62
2.1 Organisation	62
2.2 The order of moves occurrence.....	64
2.3 Moves and Steps	65
Conclusion.....	76
General conclusion	78
Reference List	83

General introduction

Statement of the problem

Genres can be understood as conventionalized forms of communication that are recognized and used by members of particular communities. Examples of genres include academic papers, newspaper articles, movie reviews, scientific reports, job applications, and many others. Swales defines a genre as "a class of communicative events, the members of which share some set of communicative purposes" (1990, p.58). Swales also emphasizes the importance of analyzing the rhetorical moves and strategies used within a genre, as well as the context in which the genre is produced and received.

Genre analysis seeks to identify the specific features and conventions of different genres and to use their communicative functions. This involves analyzing the linguistic, structural, and rhetorical features of texts, as well as their social and cultural contexts of use. In other words, it involves identifying the different genres or types of texts that are used in a particular social setting and analyzing the linguistic features that are characteristic of each genre.

By studying genres, researchers can gain insights into the ways in which language is used to achieve particular goals, to create social identities, and to negotiate power relations. This latter has applications in a wide range of fields, including linguistics, communication studies, literature, media studies, education, and business.

This approach to analyzing language has been influential in the field of Applied Linguistics, particularly in the areas of language teaching and language assessment (Paltridge, 1994, p.288). By understanding the genre system of a particular social setting, language teachers and testers can develop materials and assessments that are more closely aligned with the language needs of their students.

Writing a dissertation is an essential component of many graduate and postgraduate programs; it is a requirement for earning a degree. Successfully completing a dissertation is often a major milestone in a student's academic journey, which is why it is among the genres that they have to master. Dissertations often involve original research that can contribute new

knowledge to the field. By conducting research and presenting their findings, students can make a valuable contribution to their field of study. However, it requires students to develop critical thinking and research skills. Students must be able to analyze and interpret data, identify trends, and draw meaningful conclusions. These skills are highly valued in academic and professional settings.

As nonnative speakers, writing a dissertation for Algerian Master students is a very challenging and stressful process . It is a new experience where students may find difficulties. In addition to grappling with research and supervision challenges during dissertation writing, students may also encounter linguistic obstacles. These challenges encompass deficiencies in academic writing skills and limited knowledge, as highlighted by Bakhou and Bouhania (2022) in their research.

A dissertation comprises a number of sections : Abstract, Introduction ,Review of the literature, Research design and methodology , Results , Discussion and Conclusion. The study of the academic genre has become the focus of English for Specific Purposes (ESP) and English for Academic Purposes (EAP) researchers , it is considered an efficient means of providing foreign language students with efficient frameworks within which they can improve their writing abilities. Thus, many studies have centered on the concept of genre analysis (Bhatia , 1993, 1997 ; Dudley Evans , 1994 ; Holmes, 1997 ; Paltridge , 1994, 1995, 1996 and Swales, 1990) etc.

The present work is about analyzing one of the most significant and challenging chapters of a dissertation, that is its integrated Results and Discussion chapters. Many works have dealt with analysing dissertations and theses from different perspectives at the national and foreign levels.

First, 20 qualitative and 20 quantitative research article discussions in EFL and applied linguistics journals have been examined by Alfin Zalicha Hilmi; Toyiybah; Nur Afifi (2021).

The study has aimed at investigating the move and steps found in quantitative and qualitative research articles discussion using Yang & Allison's (2003) framework. It has been concluded that all moves in the framework have been employed in RA discussion of both qualitative and quantitative research. However, the number of occurrences of each move is different between the discussion section of these two different approaches.

Second, Amara Farida at MMUTO (2009) completed a study on the examination of the moves of Algiers University Magister theses. It is about the introductions and abstracts following Samraj's moves, as well as the acknowledgements following Hyland's moves. It has been discovered that introductions are written differently, abstract moves are respected, and acknowledgement moves are partly respected.

Third, an analysis of the abstracts, introductions and conclusions sections of MMUTO Master dissertations has been conducted by Ait Hamouda Hanane (2015). The work is based on Swales and Feak's introduction moves, Cooley and Lewkovicz's moves of abstracts , and Thompson's conclusion. The findings have suggested that the students do not have a common way of writing abstracts ,introductions, and conclusions. That is to say , on the one hand, some Master students of English have respected the moves mentioned in the literature. On the other hand, some of them have not followed them. It has been found that some students prefer to follow different moves that they propose.

In light of the researchers who have been devoted to the analysis of the writing moves, there is no previous research work at the national level that has dealt with results and discussions, not only in the specialism of language and communication but also in other master's specialisms. The two sections are important parts of master dissertations, where researchers and authors display the findings and offer interpretations of their studies.

Aims and significance of the study

The main objective of this research is to analyse the moves of the MA dissertation results and discussions. Based on the latter, the individual objectives are to, first, examine the manifestation of rhetorical moves in the findings and discussion sections written by EFL students, and second explore possible differences in the writing of the authors of published masters' dissertations. The findings of our study aim to give insights into effective instructional techniques for assisting EFL / ESL learners in writing their dissertations' results and discussion chapters. These insights can help teachers design more effective writing instructions that meet the needs of EFL/ESL learners and help them develop the necessary skills for academic writing.

The significance of this study lies in its contribution to the understanding and improvement of academic writing practices. By identifying the specific moves and steps in research papers, the study offers a valuable framework that can aid researchers and students in navigating and comprehending the structure and organization of academic writing.

Research Questions and hypotheses

This work seeks to answer this research question :

What rhetorical moves do MA students of language and communication use in the results and discussion chapters of their dissertations?

Hypotheses

1. The students use the same moves as outlined in Chen and Kuo's 2012 framework to write results and discussion chapters.
2. The results and discussion chapters of master dissertations do not strictly adhere to the moves identified in the existing literature on results chapter.
3. There might be variations in the extent to which students incorporate the recommended steps in their results and discussion chapters.

Research Techniques and methodology

To address the research questions posed in the study, we have employed a mixed-methods approach, utilizing both quantitative and qualitative methods for data collection and analysis.

The data collection tools include a corpus comprising ten dissertation results and discussions written by Master 2 language and communication students in the Department of English at Mouloud Maamri University of Tizi Ouzou.

For the analysis of data obtained from rhetorical moves, we applied the rule of three for numerical data. Additionally, we utilized Qualitative Content Analysis (QCA) to interpret the qualitative data obtained from the analyzed results and discussions following the revised framework for analyzing the results and discussion chapters proposed by Chen and Kuo (2012).

Structure of the dissertation

This dissertation follows the simple traditional model, It is divided into general introduction, review of literature, methodology, results, discussion and general conclusion. First, the introduction introduces the research topic and provides an overview of the purpose and scope of the research. It also provides a brief background on the results and discussion and states the research questions and hypotheses. The second section is dedicated to the literature review, in which a critical analysis of the existing literature on key terms, including their history and development are provided. The third section focuses on methodology, describing the research methodology, which includes the data collection methods and data analysis techniques. It also explains how the corpus of texts has been selected and analyzed. As for the last chapter, it presents the findings of the analysis and involves the interpretation and explanation of the findings. Finally, the general conclusion summarizes the main findings of the study .

Chapter 01:

Review of the literature

Introduction

This chapter extensively discusses the fundamental ideas and concepts that pertain to the current study. Firstly, the definition of the term "genre" is explored from various viewpoints, with a focus on academic writing and more particularly dissertations. Secondly, genre analysis is given significant attention. Thirdly, the concepts of "move" and "move analysis" are explained. The results and discussion section are also elaborated upon. Lastly, the analytical frameworks are thoroughly presented, with ample space dedicated to this topic.

1. Genre

Traditionally, the use of the term "genre" has been observed to have a classical association with the field of literary criticism. During the 20th century, linguists and theorists of social communication gradually adopted the term. According to the Oxford English Dictionary, the origin of the term "genre" can be traced back to the French word "genre," which means "kind" or "class" or "sort." The French word "genre" was derived from the Latin word "genus," which has the same meaning. The term was first used in the field of literary criticism in the 18th century to categorize different types of literary works based on their form, content, and style. Over time, the term "genre" has been adopted by other disciplines, such as music, art, and film, to classify different types of creative works. Today, the term "genre" is widely used in various fields to refer to different categories or types of works based on their characteristics, features and conventions.

Over the past few decades, there has been a growing interest in the concept of genre across multiple fields of study. This is especially true for professional and academic writing in English within a particular discourse community. Bawarshi and Reiff (2010) emphasized that the concept of genre has significantly changed over the past thirty years, as researchers across a

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

range of disciplines and contexts have revolutionized the way we think about genre, connecting different types of texts to specific social actions, and leading to a new understanding of genres as dynamic ways of recognizing, responding to, and acting within recurrent situations. Swales (1990, p.58) provides the most well-known explanation for the term genre, stating that :

A genre comprises a class of communicative events, the members of which share some set of communicative purposes. These purposes are recognized by the expert members of the parent discourse community, and thereby constitute the rationale for the genre. This rationale shapes the schematic structure of discourse and influences and constrains choice of content and style. Communicative purpose is both a privileged criterion and one that operates to keep the scope of a genre as narrowly focused on comparable rhetorical action. In addition to purpose, exemplars of a genre exhibit various patterns of similarity in terms of structure, style, content, and intended audience. If all high probability expectations are realized, the exemplar will be viewed as a prototypical by the parent discourse community.

In essence, Swales argues that language use is context-dependent and that different genres require different linguistic strategies to effectively communicate their intended purposes. He emphasizes that a genre is a category of communicative events, where the members of that category share a set of communicative purposes. These purposes are acknowledged and concurred upon by expert members of the discourse community that the genre belongs to. In other words, genres have a communicative purpose that is recognized and understood by the people who are familiar with them. This communicative purpose, or set of purposes, is what defines the genre and gives it its rationale. For example, in academic writing, the research article is a genre that is recognized by scholars in various fields. It typically follows a standardized structure, with sections such as the introduction, literature review, methodology, results, and conclusion. The purpose of a research article is to communicate new knowledge and insights to other scholars in the field. As a genre, research articles are defined by their communicative purpose and shared characteristics, such as referencing previous research and using a formal writing style.

This definition challenges the notion that writing is a universal, context-free activity and highlights the importance of understanding the purpose and conventions of a particular genre in order to communicate effectively within a specific discourse community.

Bhatia (1993, p.13) , referring to swales , further adds that :

Most often it [genre] is highly structured and conventionalized with constraints on allowable contributions in terms of their intent, positioning, form and functional value. These constraints, however, are often exploited by the expert members of the discourse community to achieve private intentions within the framework of socially recognized purposes.

In this quote, Bhatia (1993) explains that genres are usually highly structured and conventionalized, which means that they have specific rules and patterns that need to be followed. These rules can limit what can be included in the genre in terms of purpose, format, and content. However, members of the discourse community who are experts in using the genre can use these constraints to achieve their own personal goals while still adhering to the overall purposes recognized by society. The phrase "their own personal needs" pertains to the individual intentions or objectives of members of the discourse community who are utilizing the genre. Although the genre serves a shared communicative purpose, individuals may have distinctive goals that they aim to fulfill through their use of the genre. These personal needs may be connected to their research interests, professional aspirations, or other motivations. The argument being presented is that even with the restrictions and conventions of the genre, proficient members of the discourse community can still employ the genre to accomplish their specific goals or needs while still adhering to the overall communicative objectives of the genre. In other words, experts have a deeper understanding of the genre's rules and how to manipulate them to fit their own needs. Bhatia (1993) emphasizes that when there is a substantial alteration in the intended communicative purpose(s), it is probable that a distinct genre of writing will emerge. Another definition of genre is provided by M. Peacock (2001) in which they have

mentioned the fact that genre is a type of communicative event used by a specific discourse community to achieve a particular purpose. By analyzing a specific genre, one can ensure that the description is valid for the specific context and participants involved. As illustrated in the following quotation :

A genre is a particular communicative event which has a particular communicative purpose recognized by its users, discourse community. By targeting specific genre as the object of analysis, one ensures that description is valid for specific situations and participants (especially where members of the discourse community are consulted as part of the analysis).

(Peacock, 2001, P.15)

Currently, there exist contemporary definitions that deal with the notion of genre . Frances Christie (2005, P.233) argues that it is “*a technical term for a particular instance of a text type*” meaning that the term "genre" is a specialized label that is used to refer to a specific example or instance of a particular text type. In other words, "genre" is a way of categorizing texts based on their shared characteristics and features, and each individual text can be seen as an instance or example of a particular genre. Furthermore , Hyland (2004) stresses the close relationship between the structure of a text and its communicative purpose. He argues that the structure of a text is closely connected to its purpose, and analyzing that structure can reveal the writer's strategies for achieving his/her communicative goals ; according to him, it is a term employed to cluster texts, demonstrating how writers typically use language to respond to recurring situations.

In summary, we have discussed the evolution and definition of "genre" beyond its origins in literary criticism. It explains how genres are used to classify different types of creative works in many fields and how the definition of "genre" has expanded to include a category of communicative events that share a set of communicative purposes recognized by a discourse community. We have also highlighted the importance of understanding the purpose and

conventions of a genre for effective communication within a specific discourse community. In the realm of academic writing, dissertation writing stands out as a distinct genre with its own conventions and expectations. The following text delves deeper into this topic.

2. Dissertation writing as an academic genre

Biber and Conrad (2009) consider academic writing as a type of written communication that is carefully crafted and edited. It is meant for a wide audience located at different times and places relative to the author. Its primary aim is to convey information on a specific subject.

The primary goal of academic writing, according to Biber and Conrad (2009), is to present information about a particular topic in a clear and organized manner. This definition emphasizes the importance of precision, clarity, and structure in academic writing, as well as the need to communicate effectively with a broad audience of readers.

Oshima and Hogue (2007) distinguish between personal/creative writing and academic writing, where the former is informal and includes stories and letters, and the latter is formal and cautious, commonly used in high school and college. They point out that the structure, lexicon, and grammar of academic writing in English may differ from those in other languages. Hartley (2008) explains that when one analyzes scientific writings, a typical style of writing can be identified. The author describes this style as being exact, detached, and unbiased.

Being formal in writing is crucial because it enables the writer to convey a specific idea in a simple manner that can be comprehended easily. Oshima and Hogue (1998, p.5) elaborate on this concept in their book stating that :

Academic writing, as the name implies, is the kind of writing that you are required to do in college or university. It differs from other kinds of writing such as personal literacy, journalistic, or business writing. Its differences can be explained in part by its special audience, tone and purposes.

To achieve accuracy in academic writing, it is essential to comprehend the intricacies of the conventions involved before beginning the writing process. As Fowler & Fowler (1906, p. 11) believe “anyone who wishes to become a good writer should endeavor, before he/she allows himself to be attempted by the more showy qualities, to be direct, simple, brief, vigorous, and lucid” (as cited in Hartly, 2008,P.3).

The primary focus of this study is the use of language in academic contexts, also known as academic discourse. which is defined by Hyland (2011, p.1) as “*the ways of thinking and using language which exist in the academy*”. Academic discourse encompasses various forms of communication, such as seminars, theses, dissertations, research articles, inaugural lectures, and lectures. Although different academic genres have received significant attention over time, research articles (RAs) seem to have dominated the focus. Certain studies have also directed their attention towards dissertations or theses.

In higher education, writing a research report, specifically, is a requirement that must be fulfilled for the attainment of a certificate or degree in academic institutions, as stated by Kennedy, Williams, and Asodike (2020). The task of composing a research report or thesis has proven to be challenging for many students. Alsied and Ibrahim (2017) note that academic writing, especially when reporting research findings, is a demanding endeavor that necessitates a strong foundation of knowledge, genuine interest, motivation, and hard work.

Numerous researchers have conducted studies in various higher education contexts worldwide to identify the challenges of thesis writing and attempt to address them. Examples of these scholars include Bitchener and Basturkmen (2006), Cooley and Lewkowicz (1995), Dong (1998), Gurel (2011), Hajar (2016), Ho (2013), Komba (2016), Lessing and Lessing

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

(2004), Sadeghi and Khajepha (2015), Strauss (2012), Todd et al. (2006), Wang and Li (2008), and Zuber-Skerritt and Knight (1986).

The results of these studies indicated that structuring the different parts of the thesis is a common difficulty among students. Specifically, the introduction and discussion chapters are found to be challenging by Shaw (1991), the literature review by Ho (2013), and the discussion of results by Bitchener and Basturkmen (2006). Singh (2015) also has found that international EFL students struggle with writing the literature review, methodology, and findings sections. These difficulties are attributed to insufficient genre-specific writing skills and unawareness of the rhetorical structure of the thesis. In addition to these generic and rhetorical challenges, several studies have also shown that some students struggle with more palpable linguistic difficulties such as grammar and punctuation problems and limited vocabulary. Chang and Strauss (2010), Dong (1998), Idri (2015), Singh (2015), and Strauss (2012) have found that EFL students face different sorts of language issues while writing their thesis. Therefore, it is crucial to consider these challenges from a holistic perspective and address them comprehensively.

The thesis and dissertation are two types of academic papers that focus on a particular field of study. They involve extensive research on a specific topic, combining theoretical concepts, practical applications, and acquired knowledge from the student's graduate program, whether it is a master's or doctoral (PhD) program. Because different countries have varying educational systems, the definitions of academic terms, including theses and dissertations, may differ. In Europe, a thesis is required to complete a doctoral or PhD program and involves extensive original research that cites existing research. On the other hand, a dissertation is a smaller research requirement that completes a master's program and does not necessarily need to contain original research. In the United States, a thesis is typically required for a master's

degree, while a dissertation is for a doctoral degree. The Algerian context follows the European distinction between a thesis and a dissertation.

In the second year of their postgraduate program, Algerian master students devote most of their time to preparing a dissertation, which is defined by (Bakhou, 2020) as an official academic document they write and submit as a partial requirement to obtain their master's degree. And this document presents the results of a research project or study that master's students carry out in their program with the assistance and direction of a supervisor.

In academic writing, particularly thesis and dissertation writing, the concept of writer identity is essential, and it can be a challenging issue for second-language writers. Academic writing is often portrayed as an impersonal and objective activity, and students are advised to distance themselves from their work. As Hyland (2002) notes, students are told to refrain from using personal pronouns such as 'I' which indicate that the ideas being presented are the student's own views or position on the topic. As Hyland points out, however, 'almost everything we write says something about us and the sort of relationship that we want to set up with our readers'. second-language writers often struggle with establishing their own writer identity in academic writing. This difficulty is compounded by the fact that students may have a different writing style and "voice" in their first language's academic writing, which can make it challenging for them to adjust to the conventions of academic writing in a new language. Hirvela and Belcher (2001) discuss this issue further and highlight the complexities involved in trying to transfer writing skills and style across languages.

3. Genre analysis

Genre analysis is a straightforward process that involves examining a text to determine its genre by analyzing its features and conventions. This analysis does not focus on the informational content of the text, but rather on the elements that make the text similar to other texts within the same genre, such as its structure, style, and language use. The goal of genre

analysis is to identify the genre of the text by comparing it with established genre conventions and characteristics .

Swales (1981) has defined genre analysis as a system of analysis that reveals the organizational patterns of a genre. In contrast, Dudley-Evans (1987) has argued that genre analysis is a means of examining language to express the challenges associated with organizing a genre. The concepts presented by Swales (1981) and Dudley-Evans (1987) provide insights into the nature of genre analysis and its focus on revealing organizational patterns and language usage in genres.

Genre analysis and discourse analysis share a relationship, as they both contribute to understanding the conventions of genre construction and interpretation. However, genre analysis diverges from discourse analysis in its emphasis on the communicative purposes of specific text genres rather than solely focusing on linguistic aspects of text construction and interpretation (Bhatia, 1993).

Genre analysis has gained increasing interest in recent years as a means of classifying genres and sub-genres and finds applications in various fields of applied linguistics, including English for specific purposes. It encompasses three essential aspects - psychology, linguistics, and sociology that are necessary for describing language in use. In linguistics Bhatia (1993) emphasizes the transition from a text analysis approach that solely focused on lexicogrammatical features to an approach that examines the rhetorical organization of texts, Bhatia (1993) further argues that analyzing varieties or registers in isolation provides limited insights into the inherent nature of genres and how social purposes are achieved through them in real-world settings. In other words, while linguistic analysis is valuable, it may overlook other essential aspects that contribute to the characterization of a genre.

The sociological aspect of genre analysis, as described by Bhatia (1993, p.19), focuses on the conventional and often standardized features of genre construction, highlighting how any genre situates the message of a text within a social frame. Bhatia also distinguishes between two aspects of psychology in genre analysis: the psycholinguistic aspect and the tactical aspect. He asserts that:

the psycholinguistic aspect of genre analysis reveals the cognitive structuring, typical of particular areas of enquiry, whereas the tactical aspect of genre description highlights the individual strategic choices made by the writer in order to execute his or her intention.

This implies that while there may be established rules governing the structure of genres, writers also employ personal strategies and tactics to achieve their communicative intentions.

Bhatia (1993) further notes that the distinction between genres and sub-genres may not always be clear-cut, as writers' personal contributions may result in the creation of new sub-genres. He states, "*It must be admitted that it seems almost impossible to draw up clearly defined criteria to make satisfactory distinction between genres and sub-genres*" (1993, p.21).

Scholars from different academic traditions have conceptualized genres differently, with varying emphasis on texts, situations, functions, and communication purposes. In 1996, Hyon identified three schools of genre studies: English for Specific Purposes, the North American New Rhetoric School, and the Australian School. Hyon aimed to highlight the diversity in genre studies across these different traditions.

Genre theory and analysis have been utilized in ESP, New Rhetoric Studies, and Australian genre theories to analyze and teach the language required of non-native speakers in academic and professional settings. In ESP, genres are defined as oral and written text types defined by their formal properties and their communicative purposes within social contexts. ESP scholars

focus on detailing the formal characteristics of genres through structural move analyses or sentence-level grammatical features. In contrast, New Rhetoric studies focus more on the situational contexts in which genres occur and the social purposes or actions that these genres fulfill within these situations. Ethnographic methods are used to analyze the contexts and actions of genres in academic and professional settings. In Australian genre theories, genres are analyzed within the larger theory of language known as systemic functional linguistics, which emphasizes the social contexts and functions of language.

Having explored the basics of genre analysis, it is now useful to introduce the concept of "move." This concept is central to the approach of move analysis and contributes to a deeper understanding of how genres are constructed and interpreted.

4. Move

The concept of "move" originates from the field of English for Specific Purposes (ESP), specifically in the approach of move analysis introduced by Swales, a pioneer in genre analysis. Swales defines a move as a semantic unit that serves the purpose of analyzing genres (Martin, 2000, p.7). Dos Santos (1996) further explains that a move can be considered a genre stage with a distinct communicative purpose within the genre (as cited in Prabripoo, 2009, p.19). In other words, a "move" is a semantic unit that contributes to the overall communicative purpose of a genre.

Moves can be classified into conventional and optional types, with some move types occurring more frequently than others (Kinoskilapatham, 2007, p.24). Each move may also have subfunctions that complement its main functions, referred to as "steps" by Swales (1990) and "strategies" by Bhatia (1993) (Kinoskilapatham, 2007, p.24). Additionally, moves can vary in length, but they should contain at least one proposition (Kinoskilapatham, 2007, p.24).

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

In genre analysis, a move is a structural element of a text that serves a specific communicative purpose in relation to the overall genre, while a proposition is a sentence or group of sentences that express a distinct idea or argument related to the move's communicative purpose. So, for example, in the results section of a research paper, the move "introduction to the results" might include a proposition such as "This section presents the results of the study, which aims to investigate the effectiveness of a new teaching approach in improving students' writing skills". This proposition expresses a specific idea related to the overall purpose of the move. According to Swales (2004), a text within a genre tends to follow a regular textual pattern, consisting of a number of distinct actions sequenced in a specified order, achieved by a series of processes, as per the genre analysis technique (as cited in Hilmi, A. Z, Toyyibah, & Afifi, N., 2022). In other words, genres tend to have a recognizable structure or framework, with a set of actions or moves that are typically arranged in a particular order, and these actions are accomplished through various processes or strategies that are commonly used in that genre. "Move" refers to a discourse segment that provides a specific communication function (Swales, 2004), while a "step" is defined as a lower level part of moves which fulfil the communicative function of the move to which they belong (Swales, 1990). According to Connor, Davis, and DeRycker (1995), the combination of all the moves in a genre works towards achieving the genre's overall communicative aim.

Swales (1981) proposed a move analysis within the common field of English for Specific Purposes (ESP). The main purpose was to think about the needs of advanced nonnative English speakers who learn to read and write research abstracts (RAs). Moreover, Swales (2004) added the definition of move in genre analysis. He defined move as "a discoursal or rhetorical unit that performs a coherent communicative function in a written or spoken discourse." (Swales 2004, p,228-9).

5. Move analysis

Move analysis is a well-established top-down approach utilized in genre analysis, originally devised by Swales to elucidate the organizational patterns inherent in research articles. Move analysis, as proposed by Swales (1990, 2004) and cited in Amnuai (2019b, p.162), is an analytical approach used to assess various genres like academic papers, theses, and essays. It involves a textual analysis of the writer's communicative goals and the steps taken to manifest the discourse pattern in the writing being examined. This method has garnered considerable attention in the academic and professional discourse communities, leading to extensive research on the rhetorical structures of texts (Biber et al., 2007). Swales initially developed move analysis with the goal of catering to the needs of advanced non-native English speakers who were learning to read and write research articles. The aim was also to assist non-native English-speaking professionals who were seeking to publish their articles in English.

The overarching objective of move analysis is to discern the recurrent structural and linguistic patterns that characterize different genres, achieved through a systematic analysis of a representative selection of texts belonging to a particular genre (Tardy & Swales, 2014).

A move, which encompasses both the writer's purpose and the intended message or meaning, can be realized through sentences, paragraphs, or a combination of both (Nikpei, 2016). For example, if the writer aims to describe a research method, it would involve considering constituent steps like conveying information about research subjects, instruments, and data analysis procedures. Rhetorical move analysis, based on this definition, can be seen as a textual analysis of communicative objectives and their constituent steps, with the goal of understanding how the discourse pattern is expressed in the analyzed writing (Zamani & Ebadi, 2016).

6. The Results and discussion section of an academic work

The Results and Discussion section of a scientific paper holds significant importance as it presents the primary findings of the research, which readers are eager to learn about, and forms the basis for forming opinions and planning future research. Thrower (2007) posited that the Introduction should be concise, and a significant portion of the Experimental Details section could be placed in "Supplementary Material." However, the most crucial aspect is the results and the deductions drawn by the authors from them.

In Master's dissertations, the Results and Discussion chapters are essential components where authors present their findings and provide interpretations of their studies. The Results chapter typically includes tables, graphs, and figures that display numerical outputs resulting from various statistical analyses. These numerical outputs need to be analyzed or interpreted within the same sections or chapters, or in subsequent sections, to demonstrate how they contribute to the existing disciplinary knowledge (Basturkmen, 2012). Without proper interpretation or discussion, the presented numerical data would lack meaning and fail to generate new knowledge claims.

Authors have the option to either separate the Results and Discussion sections or combine them into a single section or chapter titled "Results and Discussion" (Chen & Kuo, 2012; Dong, 1998; Paltridge, 2002; Yang & Allison, 2003). Students and novice writers may find these sections challenging to write, despite the availability of samples, due to their lack of prior experience (Basturkmen, 2009; Lim, 2010). In fact, writing these chapters requires integrating content from the literature review with the research design and results of the current study, and presenting arguments and persuasive writing styles (Swales, 1990; Swales & Feak, 2004).

7. Theoretical framework

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Several methods for analyzing the Discussion chapter/section of second language writing have been suggested by researchers in the past, including Holmes (1997), Hopkins and Dudley-Evans (1998), Kanoksilapatham (2005), Nwogu (1997), Peacock (2002), and Yang and Allison (2003). However, for this particular study, the framework proposed by Chen and Kuo (2012) is utilized.

The framework has been adjusted and combined with the moves and steps utilized in previous research to make them “not only consistent across the chapters but also appropriate for the theses in Applied Linguistics”, (Chen and Kuo, 2012, p. 27).

There are two reasons to support the application of Chen and Kuo's (2012) framework for move-step analysis over Allison and Yang's (2003) framework. First, their framework provides a more detailed breakdown of the moves and steps involved in academic writing. This level of detail allows for a more precise analysis of texts and enables researchers to identify specific patterns and trends in writing. Second, it is based on more recent research and reflects current trends in academic writing. This makes it a more relevant tool for analyzing contemporary academic writing and ensuring that the analysis is up-to-date and relevant to current research. On the other hand, Allison and Yang's framework was developed in 2003 and may not reflect current trends in academic writing.

The authors have developed a coding scheme of moves and steps for analyzing complete master's theses, as previous studies had only analyzed a single chapter or a couple of chapters. The coding scheme was based on previous studies on different chapters of theses, such as the Abstract (Lores, 2004), Introduction (Bunton, 2002), Literature Review (Kwan, 2006), Method (Lim, 2006), Results, Discussions, and Conclusions (Yang & Allison, 2003). However, the authors modified and integrated the moves and steps in these studies to make them consistent across the chapters and appropriate for the theses in applied linguistics. The coding scheme is

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

used to analyze a corpus of 20 master's dissertations in applied linguistics, selected from the ProQuest Digital Dissertation database, using keywords related to language learning, ESL, English, SLA, and academic writing. The coding scheme has allowed the authors to identify the rhetorical moves and steps in the different chapters of the master's theses, and to analyze their relationship and differentiation across the chapters. By applying genre analysis to the study of master's theses in applied linguistics, the authors have aimed to provide insights into the conventions and characteristics of this genre of academic writing, and to inform the instruction and practice of academic writing in this field.

Results	Move 1: Introducing the Results chapter (RI)	Providing background information or how results are presented Indicating methods used or statistical procedure applied	RIb RIm
	Move2: Reporting results (RR)	Locating graphics Reporting major findings	RRg RRf
	Move 3: Commenting on results (RC)	Interpreting results Comparing results with literature Evaluating results (including strengths, limitations, generalizations, etc. of results) Accounting for results (giving reasons)	RCi RCc RCv RCa
	Move 4: Summarizing results (RS)	Making conclusions of results	RSc
	Move 5: Evaluating the study (RV)	Indicating limitations of the study Indicating significance/advantage of the study	RVI RVs
	Move 6: Deductions from the (research) study (RD)	Recommending further research Drawing pedagogic implications Making suggestions	RDf RDp RDs
	Referring to other studies (RL)	Providing background information	RLt

Figure 1: Chen and Kuo's (2012, P.50) framework for the Results chapter of MA theses in Applied Linguistic

The results chapter is organized into six moves

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Move 1: Introducing the Results chapter (RI) This move introduces the Results chapter and provides some background information on how the results will be presented. This may include a brief summary of the research questions, hypotheses, or objectives, and an explanation of the study design and data analysis procedures.

Move 2: Reporting results (RR) This move involves reporting the actual results of the study. It may include locating graphics such as tables, charts, and graphs that present the data. This move also includes reporting the major findings of the study.

Move 3: Commenting on results (RC) This move involves interpreting the results and explaining their significance. It may include comparing the results with previous studies in the literature and evaluating the strengths and limitations of the findings. This move also involves accounting for the results by providing explanations or reasons for why certain results were obtained.

Move 4: Summarizing results (RS) . This move involves summarizing the key results of the study and making conclusions based on the findings.

Move 5: Evaluating the study (RV) .This move involves evaluating the study's strengths and limitations, including the methodology used. It may also include discussing the study's significance and advantages.

Move 6: Deductions from the (research) study (RD) .This move involves drawing deductions or implications from the research study, including recommendations for further research, pedagogical implications, and suggestions for future research directions.

Lastly, referring to other studies to support or justify the deductions.

Chen and Kuo's modifications to the framework included a more detailed description of the steps involved in Moves 1, 2 and 6 as well as an additional move called "Referring to other studies" with three steps.

<p>Move 1—Preparatory information</p> <p>Move 2—Reporting results</p> <p>Move 3—Commenting on results</p> <p>Step1: Interpreting results</p> <p> Step2: Comparing results with literature</p> <p> Step3: Evaluating results</p> <p> Step4: Accounting for results</p> <p>Move 4—Summarizing results</p> <p>Move 5—Evaluating the study</p> <p> Step1: Indicating limitations</p> <p> Step2: Indicating significance/advantage</p> <p>Move 6—Deductions from the research</p> <p> Step1 : Recommending further research</p>
--

Table 1 Yang and Allison's (2003) moves and steps in the results section of MA theses in Applied linguistics

After analyzing 20 MA theses using the modified framework, they have found that the first three moves in the Results chapters, namely "Introducing results chapter," "Reporting the results," and "Interpreting the results," could be regarded as the primary communicative purpose of the Results chapters in MA theses in Applied Linguistics. This suggests that these three moves are essential in conveying the main findings and interpretations of the research in the Results chapters of MA theses in Applied Linguistics.

Discussions	Move 1: Introducing the Discussions chapter (DI)	Providing background information (such as purpose, design, research questions/hypotheses, etc.) or how discussions are presented	D1b
	Move 2: Reporting results (DR)	Reporting major findings	DRf
	Move 3: Summarizing results (DS)	Making conclusions of results	DSc
	Move 4: Commenting on results (DC)	Interpreting results	DCi
		Comparing results with literature	DCc
		Accounting for results (giving reasons)	DCa
	Move 5: Summarizing the study (DO)	Evaluating results (including strengths, limitations, etc. of results)	DCv
		Summarizing the study briefly	DOs
	Move 6: Evaluating the study (DV)	Indicating limitations	DVI
		Indicating significance/advantage	DVs
		Evaluating methodology	DVm
	Move 7: Deductions from the (research) study (DD)	Making suggestions	DDs
		Recommending further research	DDf
		Drawing pedagogic implications	DDp
Reference to other studies (DL)	Providing support or justification	DLj	

Figure 2 Chen and Kuo's (2012,P.51) framework for the Discussion chapter of MA theses in Applied Linguistics

The Discussions chapter also comprises seven moves.

Move 1: Introducing the Discussions chapter. This move introduces the Discussions chapter and provides some background information, such as the purpose of the study, the research questions, hypotheses, or objectives, and how the discussion will be presented.

Move 2: Reporting results. This move involves reporting the major findings of the study. It may include restating the results reported in the Results chapter and providing additional details or analysis.

Move 3: Summarizing results. This move involves summarizing the key results of the study and making conclusions based on the findings. This move is similar to Move 4 in the Results chapter.

Move 4: Commenting on results. This move involves interpreting the results and explaining their significance. It may include comparing the results with previous studies in the literature and evaluating the strengths and limitations of the findings. This move also involves accounting for the results by providing explanations or reasons for why certain results were obtained.

Move 5: Summarizing the study. This move involves summarizing the study briefly, including the purpose, research questions or objectives, methodology, major findings, and conclusions.

Move 6: Evaluating the study. This move involves evaluating the study's strengths and limitations, including the methodology used. It may also include discussing the study's significance and advantages.

Move 7: Deductions from the (research) study. This move involves drawing deductions or implications from the research study, including recommendations for further research, pedagogical implications, and suggestions for future research directions. This move may also involve referring to other studies to support or justify the deductions.

Reference to other studies: This move involves providing support or justification for the deductions or implications drawn in the Discussions chapter by referring to other studies in the literature. This move may also include providing definitions of key terms used in the study.

The modified framework used by Chen and Kuo (2012) is largely the same as Yang and Allison's (2003), with the only difference being that Move 1 is renamed "Introducing the

Discussions chapter" instead of "Background Information". The framework consists of seven moves, with more detailed steps for Moves 1, 2, and 3.

<p>Move 1 : Background information</p> <p>Move 2 : Reporting results</p> <p>Move 3 : Summarizing results</p> <p>Move 4 : Commenting on results Interpreting results</p> <p> Step1 : Comparing results with literature</p> <p> Step2 : Accounting for</p> <p> Step3 : Evaluating results</p> <p>Move 5 : Summarizing the study</p> <p>Move 6 : Evaluating the study</p> <p> Step1 : Indicating limitations</p> <p> Step2 : Indicating significance/advantage</p> <p> Step3 : Evaluating methodology</p> <p>Move 7 : Deductions from the research</p> <p> Step1 : Making suggestions</p> <p> Step2 : Recommending further research</p> <p> Step3 : Drawing pedagogic implication</p>
--

Table 2 Yang and Allison's (2003) moves and steps in the discussion sections of MA thesis in Applied linguistics

According to Chen and Kuo's (2012) study, the Discussion chapters of the master's theses they have examined, consistently contained the move "Reporting major findings," while the other moves, which illustrate summarizing, evaluating, and deducing from the study's results, are more prevalent. This implies that these rhetorical functions are crucial and more frequently utilized in the Discussion chapters of the Applied Linguistics master's theses.

Conclusion

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

In summary, this section has emphasized the significant concepts associated with the work. Various perspectives within the field of Linguistics have been explored to discuss the terms genre, genre analysis, move, and move analysis. Additionally, a thorough explanation of the theoretical frameworks of Chen and Kuo (2012) and Yang&Allison (2003) Results and Discussion moves, has been provided. As we transition to the next chapter, the focus will shift towards the research methodology employed to investigate the application of these frameworks within the master dissertations.

Chapter 02

Research methodology

Introduction

This chapter presents the methodology used in the study, starting with a description of the corpus consisting of ten Master's dissertations (MDs). Then it introduces the analysis procedures, specifically relational content analysis, which aims to identify the major characteristics of MDs results and discussion sections. The chapter discusses the mixed-method approach, combining qualitative and quantitative methods. Finally, it explains the techniques for move identification in the Results and Discussion sections.

1. Research method

This research was designed by adopting mixed-methods approach in order to assure the effectiveness of the research and reliability of the findings. It combines quantitative and qualitative research methods for both data collection and analysis.

This study employs mixed-methods research to examine the results, utilizing both quantitative and qualitative approaches. According to Creswell and Plano (2011), this method is suitable for gaining a deeper understanding of issues and research problems. Relying on only one method is deemed insufficient. Creswell and Plano Clark (2006) argue that combining datasets helps researchers better grasp the problem compared to using each dataset separately. For complex research, Daniels (2010) notes the need for multiple data resources, stating that the benefits of mixed methods design outweigh its challenges. Using both quantitative and qualitative research expands understanding through different data sources, shedding light on aspects that would remain unknown with a single research methodology. The qualitative research method relies on understanding and interpreting the problem, as explained by Deniz and Lincoln (2005). On the other hand, the quantitative research method prioritizes objective measurements and statistical mathematical analysis of

the collected data. Its main focus is on gathering numerical data and generalizing it across groups of people or explaining a specific phenomenon.

2. Data collection procedures

2.1 The corpus of the study

The corpus consists of two parts, namely the results and the discussions, which have been extracted from ten Master's dissertations authored by English students from the Language and Communication program in the English Department at UMMTO university.

The ten dissertations within the Language and Communication option have been chosen sequentially from the department's electronic catalogue, exclusively focusing on those submitted in the year 2021. This selection is made because, at the time of corpus selection, the master's students from the class of 2022 had not yet submitted their dissertations, resulting in their unavailability in the electronic catalogue. As described in table 4, the corpus includes the title and the length of each section (results and discussion). The range of pages for the Results section in the listed dissertations varies from a minimum of 8 pages to 20 pages apart from the ninth one that has 28 pages ,while the Discussion section ranges from 10 pages to 20 pages

DISSERTATION N°	Number of pages	
	Results	Dsicussion
MD 1	17	15
MD 2	16	15
MD 3	15	13
MD 4	15	15
MD 5	8	11
MD 6	20	20
MD 7	20	11
MD 8	13	10
MD 9	28	18
MD 10	13	13

Table 3 : Titles of dissertations and the number of pages of each section.

As part of their dissertation preparation, the Master 2 students who authored the dissertations have underwent a research methodology subject that familiarized them with essential aspects of academic research. The module has covered various topics, including selecting a research topic and design, composing a research proposal, utilizing the APA referencing system. The subject has also provided guidance on structuring the different chapters of their dissertations, such as the introduction, literature review, methodology, results, discussion, conclusion, and abstract, as well as honing oral presentation abilities. Through the completion of this subject, the students have gained the necessary knowledge and competencies to conduct their research effectively.

3. Data analysis procedures

3.1 Descriptive statistical analysis

The rule of three is applied in analyzing the data obtained from move analysis, a commonly employed method in the social sciences for statistical analysis. This rule helps calculate percentages, facilitating the conversion of data into statistical figures and subsequent graphical

representations. The conceptualization of the rule of three formula is as follows: ($X = \frac{Z \times 100}{Y}$), where X represents the calculated percentage, Z denotes the value of the similar answers and Y is the total number of the participants.

3.2 Qualitative content analysis

The present work aims at revealing the major characteristics of MDs results and discussion sections written by Master 2 students of UMMTO department of English. The analysis relies on content analysis, specifically Qualitative content analysis.

Content analysis is a research method that aims to identify specific terms or sentences that express a particular goal. It has a history dating back to the 1940s, when it is primarily used to determine the frequency of particular words.

Qualitative content analysis is defined as “a research method for the subjective interpretation of the content of text data through the systematic classification process of coding and identifying themes or patterns” (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005, p. 1278). This definition suggests that it is a research method used to subjectively interpret the content of textual data. In this approach, researchers engage in a systematic classification process that involves coding and identifying themes or patterns within the text.

In our study, we have employed Qualitative Content Analysis (QCA) as our chosen method to systematically interpret and examine the rhetorical moves and steps within the texts we have analyzed, predominantly sourced from the results and discussions of Master 2 Language and Communications students. Utilizing QCA, we have conducted a subjective analysis of qualitative data, aiming to identify and categorize the specific rhetorical moves present in the texts. This approach allowed us to gain a deeper understanding of how these rhetorical moves are employed in the studied texts.

Writing moves are a series of actions that writers undertake to achieve their communicative goals and produce organized and cohesive passages. Qualitative content analysis serves as a valuable tool in identifying and categorizing these moves, drawing upon the established analytical framework proposed by Chen and Kuo (2012). Their framework outlines specific steps that comprise the moves found in results and discussions, among other sections of a text.

The criteria for determining and categorizing the frequency of each move follow the guidelines set by Kanoksilapatham (2005). When a specific move appears in every research article (100% of the time), it is labeled as 'obligatory'. If the occurrence of a move falls below 60%, it is categorized as 'optional.' Moves occurring between 60% and 99% of the time are classified as 'conventional.' (Kanoksilapatham, 2005, p.272).

3.3 Techniques of moves identification

Allison and Yang (2003) are researchers who have made significant contributions to the field of move analysis in academic writing. They have focused on identifying and analyzing the moves and steps that occur in the Results, Discussion, Conclusion, and Pedagogic Implications sections of research papers. Their research provides valuable insights into the organization and structure of academic texts, helping both writers and readers better understand the communicative purposes of each section. By examining the work of Allison and Yang (2003), we can gain valuable techniques for move identification in the Results and Discussion sections.

- **Results Section:**

(R) Move 1 - Preparatory Information: Provides relevant information as a preparation for presenting the results. **Example:** The results of this experiment will be presented in both quantitative and qualitative form.

(R) Move 2 - Reporting Results: Presents the results of the study with relevant evidence such as statistics and examples. **Example:** The results indicate that if a subject has a high SR in L1, then it is likely that SR will also be high in L2.

(R) Move 3 - Commenting on Results:

Step 1 - Interpreting Results: Interprets the meaning and significance of the research results.

Example: These results suggest that significant changes take place between time one and time two, indicating differences in L2 and L1 processing.

Step 2 - Comparing Results with Literature: Compares the research findings with previous studies in the field. **Example:** These findings support the previous survey results of Ostler (1980) and the ethnographic data of Mason (1995).

Step 3 - Accounting for Results: Provides explanations or reasons for the observed results. **Example:** Such differences may be promoted by the educational systems of both cultures.

Step 4 - Evaluating Results: Evaluates the reliability or limitations of the obtained results. **Example:** Of course, the results are rather speculative and based on a small sample.

(R) Move 4 - Summarizing Results: Presents an integrated summary of the results based on specific findings. **Example:** To sum up, it becomes clear that keeping a heritage language alive across generations is not a simple matter.

- **Discussion Section**

(D) Move 1 - Background Information: Relates the discussion to the study by recapitulating main points such as research questions, aims, and purposes. **Example:** Our aim has been to

explore the accommodation of languages that parents in ethnolinguistic minority groups have to make.

(D) Move 5 - Summarizing the Study: Provides a brief account of the main points from the perspective of the overall study. **Example:** In summary, the research presented in this paper offers a contrastive text-linguistics study of rhetorical differences between texts.

(D) Move 6 - Evaluating the Study:

Step 1 - Indicating Limitations: Highlights the limitations or constraints of the study.

Example: The present study has raised a number of interesting differences, but a larger corpus is needed to establish generalizability.

Step 2 - Indicating Significance/Advantage: Indicates the significance or advantages of the study. **Example:** What is new in our study is the links we try to find with school performance and the within-family dynamics of the accommodation process.

Step 3 - Evaluating Methodology: Evaluates the methodology used in the study. **Example:** It is questionable whether her experimental data represent the strategy she would employ outside of the laboratory.

(D) Move 7 - Deductions from the Research:

Step 1 - Making Suggestions: Provides suggestions for addressing the problems identified in the research. **Example:** Where such complex methods are used, it may be better for the writer to provide a full and specific description.

Step 2 - Recommending Further Research: Proposes further research that can build upon the current study. **Example:** Further research might be profitably conducted within a single discipline to determine the degree of variability.

Step 3 - Drawing Pedagogic Implications: Discusses implications for teaching or educational practices. **Example:** The findings of this study may have implications for the teaching of EAP (English for Academic Purposes)s

The identification of the different moves and analysis of the text involves examining all the structures and forms that represent Chen and Kuo's Results and discussion moves mentioned above.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this chapter has provided a comprehensive overview of the methodology employed in the analysis of results and discussions in ten MDs. The corpus has been described, outlining the specific sections of focus. The use of Qualitative Content Analysis as analytical technique has been explained, highlighting its effectiveness in identifying and categorizing the different moves present in the analyzed texts. These moves have been identified through a careful examination of the existing literature, ensuring a solid foundation for the analysis.

Chapter 03

Presentation of the findings

Introduction

This chapter focuses on the analysis of ten master dissertations' Results and Discussion sections written by master 2 language and communication students using the method of relational content analysis. The main aim of this study is to explore the manifestation of rhetorical moves within these sections. By examining sentences, terms, and general ideas in alignment with the theoretical framework, the research identifies and investigates different moves employed by the students. Thus, the chapter is dedicated to reporting and describing the qualitative and quantitative findings derived from the analysis, as indicated by its title.

1. Results Chapters

1.1 Quantitative results

The analysis of the ten Master Dissertations Results reveals a diverse range of steps, which align with the model proposed by Chen and Kuo (2012). However, it is important to note that certain moves and steps outlined in their framework are not observed within our corpus.

PRESENTATION OF THE FINDINGS

RESULTS N°	Move 1		Move 2		Move 3				Move 4	Move 5		Move 6				Additional move
	Providing background information or how results are presented	Indicating methods used or statistical procedure applied	Locating graphics	Reporting major findings	Interpreting results	Comparing results with literature	Evaluating results (including strengths, limitations, generalizations, etc. of results)	Accounting for results (giving reasons)	making conclusions of results	Indicating limitations of the study	Indicating significance/advantage of the study	recommending further research	Drawing pedagogic implications	Making suggestions	Providing background information	<i>Introducing the next chapter</i>
1	1	1	26	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
2	1	1	25	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
3	1	1	18	18	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	1	2	21	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
5	1	1	13	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
6	1	1	25	25	4	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
7	1	1	16	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	1	1	17	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
9	1	1	34	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
10	1	1	13	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
subtotal	10	11	208	246	5	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Subtotal in %	48%	52%	46%	54%	63%	0%	0%	38%	100%							100%
Total per move	21		454		8				3	0	0	0	0	0	8	
Total per move in %	4%		92%		2%				1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	
Total (%)	494 100%															

* The italic move indicate the newly identified one in the corpus

Table 4: Total of result moves and steps found in the corpus

In the analysis of the results chapters within the corpus (table 4), several key findings have emerged. The most frequently employed move has been Move 2, involving the presentation of results, with a dominant 92% frequency, often utilizing graphics and reporting major findings. Move 1, introducing chapters with contextual information and methodology descriptions, accounted for 4% of the moves analyzed. Move 3, explicitly interpreting results, made up only 2% of the moves, and steps like "Evaluating results" and "Comparing results with literature" are absent. Moves related to summarizing results and drawing conclusions (Move 4), evaluating the study (Move 5), and deducing from the study (Move 6) are consistently lacking. Additionally, incorporating background information from other studies for contextualization is not a common practice in the analyzed dissertations.

1.2 Qualitative results :

The following section provides the various findings of the Results moves analysis relying on Chen and Kuo's 2012 framework.

Move 1: Introducing the Results chapter

Step1+ Step2 : All of the analyzed dissertations begin their Results chapters by setting the context by giving background information about the research topic or explaining how the results are presented and also describing the methods or statistical procedures that are employed to obtain the results. This move represents 4% of the analyzed moves.

Move 2: Reporting results

Step 1: Locating graphics: This step has been widely employed in all the corpus and is repeated many times in all the Results (208 times) , accounting for 46% of all moves analyzed, revealing that in dissertations, research results are often reported one by one.

The authors presented graphical representations of the results, such as charts, graphs, or tables.

Step2: Reporting major findings: The authors have presented the main or significant findings derived from the data analysis. Therefore, this step has been identified in all of the corpus, constituting approximately 54% of the total moves .

Move 3: Commenting on results

In the analyzed corpus, the move “Commenting on results” is observed. However, the steps “Interpreting results”, and “Accounting for results” are found to be relatively infrequent, with a combined total of only five occurrences. “Interpreting results” is specifically identified in two results chapters, with one chapter employing it once and the other four times, accounting for 63% of Move 3, and “Accounting for results” appears three times in a single results chapter, accounting for 38% of the move . Additionally, the steps “Evaluating results (including strengths, limitations, and generalizations of results)” and “Comparing results with literature”, typically associated with this move, are absent from the analyzed corpus. Overall, Move 3 represents 1% of all the moves analyzed.

Move 4: Making conclusions of results

The move "Summarizing results," which involves the researcher summarizing the key findings and drawing overall conclusions based on the results, is observed in the analyzed corpus. However, it appears only in three results chapters ,accounting for merely 1% of all the moves analyzed . One possible explanation is that researchers in the corpus might have chosen to present their conclusions in alternative sections, such as the Discussion or Conclusion. These sections often provide an opportunity for researchers to synthesize their findings, discuss their significance, and offer broader conclusions that go beyond the presentation of raw results.

The analysis of the results chapters consistently indicates the absence of Move 5 (Evaluating the study) and Move 6 (Deductions from the (research) study). This finding aligns with the findings of Loan and Pramoolsook (2015), who similarly observe a complete absence of Move 5 and Move 6 in their research. The convergence of these observations strengthens the evidence that these moves are commonly overlooked or omitted in the dissertations analyzed. The absence of Move 5 signifies a missed opportunity for researchers to critically evaluate the strengths, limitations, and implications of their own studies. Likewise, the limited utilization of Move 6 suggests a tendency to neglect the process of drawing logical deductions and exploring the implications of research findings. It signifies a missed opportunity to extend the impact of the study by offering recommendations for future research, identifying pedagogic implications, or providing practical suggestions for action. Furthermore, the move, referring to other studies, specifically the step of providing background information, is not utilized in any of the analyzed dissertations. This indicates a missed opportunity to situate the current research within the existing literature and provide valuable context or support for the study. However, it is noteworthy to observe the additional step that is identified subsequent to the main move cycles in these particular chapters. All of the chapters examined have concluded with a summary of the chapter and an introduction to the content of the next chapter. This approach as adopted by the writers demonstrates their intention to establish a cohesive link between all the chapters in their dissertations. Although this method is not explicitly outlined in the guidelines, it is a commonly employed organizational strategy for structuring individual chapters in dissertations.

In summary, the analysis of the results indicates that the dissertations analyzed generally follow a pattern of introducing the Results chapter, reporting findings through graphics and reporting major findings.

2. The findings of the analyzed Discussions :

2.1 Quantitative Results :

The analysis of ten master dissertations Discussions reveals a diverse range of steps aligned with Chen and Kuo's (2012) framework. However, certain moves specified in their framework are not observed in our corpus. Conversely, we have identified the presence of a move not included in Chen and Kuo's (2012) framework, The presented table provides a preliminary overview of the findings obtained from the move analysis.

PRESENTATION OF THE FINDINGS

DISCUSSION n°	Move 1	Move 2	Move 3	Move 4				Move 5	Move 6			Move 7			Move 8	additional move
	Providing background information (such as purpose, design, research questions /hypotheses, etc.) or how discussions are presented	Reporting major findings	Making conclusions of results	Interpreting results	Comparing results with literature	Accounting for results (giving reasons)	Evaluating results (including strengths, limitations, etc. of results)	Summarizing the study briefly	Indicating limitations	Indicating significance/advantage	Evaluating methodology	Making suggestions	Recommending further research	Drawing pedagogic implications	Providing support or justification	Chapter summary
1	1	26	1	26	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	1
2	1	33	1	33	4	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	1
3	1	18	0	11	0	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	1
4	1	21	1	16	4	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	1
5	1	14	1	14	1	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	1
6	1	25	1	22	0	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	1
7	1	16	2	10	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	1
8	1	19	1	19	5	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	1
9	1	36	1	28	0	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	1
10	1	25	1	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	1
Subtotal	10	233	10	204	14	49	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	223	10
Subtotal in %	100%	100%	100%	76%	5%	18%	0%	100%	0%			0%			100%	100%
Total per move	10	233	10	267				9	0			0			233	10
Total per move in %	1%	31%	1%	35%				1%	0%			0%			29%	1%
Total (%)	762 / 100%															

* The italic move indicate the newly identified one in the corpus

Table 5: The total of Discussion moves and steps found in the corpus

Table 5 represents the quantitative analysis of the discussion chapters in ten dissertations. The analysis reveals several key findings. Move 2, reporting major findings, is the most frequently observed move, appearing in all ten texts and comprising the largest share at 31% of the moves analyzed. Move 1, which introduces the discussions chapter, is also prevalent, present in all ten dissertations and accounting for 1% of the moves analyzed. Move 3, summarizing results, is observed in nine dissertations, contributing 1% to the overall frequency. Move 4, commenting on results, encompassed various sub-steps, with interpreting results (76%) being the most commonly used, followed by accounting for results (18%), comparing results with literature (5%), and evaluating results (absent). Move 5, summarizing the study, appears in nine dissertations and constitutes 1% of the analyzed moves. Move 6 and Move 7, evaluating the study and deductions from the study, respectively, are notably absent in all instances. Move 8, referring to other studies, is present in all ten dissertations and accounted for 29% of the moves. Additionally, a newly identified move, "Chapter summary," occurred in seven dissertations, representing 1% of the moves analyzed. These findings shed light on the rhetorical organization and structure of the discussion chapters, emphasizing the prevalence of certain moves and the absence of others.

2.2 Qualitative results

To gain a better understanding of how the texts are structured and organized, a comprehensive explanation of each rhetorical unit found in the data is provided in the upcoming section.

Move 1: Introducing the Discussions chapter: The purpose of this move is to set the stage for the discussions by providing essential background information about the research, including its purpose, design, research questions, hypotheses, or how the discussions are presented. It helps orient the reader and establish the context for the subsequent analysis. Among the

analyzed texts, all ten of them included this move, indicating a 100% presence, accounting for 1 occurrence per text. Therefore, Move 1 represents 1% of all moves analyzed.

Move 2: Reporting major findings : The purpose of this move is to present the major findings of the research. By reporting the results, researchers aim to communicate the key outcomes of their study, allowing readers to grasp the main discoveries. This move is observed in all 10 dissertations with varying frequencies. The total frequency of this move across the corpus is 233, accounting for approximately 31% of all moves analyzed.

Move 3: Summarizing results : Among the ten dissertations analyzed, Move 3 (summarizing results) was observed in nine of them , albeit with a relatively low frequency of usage. Authors predominantly employed this move once within the conclusion of the discussion chapter, constituting approximately 1% of the total moves. This finding is consistent with the study conducted by Dastjerdi et al. (2017), which similarly reported a limited number of occurrences for this move. It is logical to assume that students followed this practice to maintain clarity and structure in their papers, as well as to ensure that readers can easily locate the main takeaways of the study. Summarizing the results in the conclusion chapter is a common practice in academic writing, especially when researchers want to confirm or disconfirm their hypotheses and provide a concise overview of their key findings in one place.

Move 4 : Commenting on Results : The analysis of the 10 discussion chapters in the corpus has revealed the presence of Move 4, which encompasses interpreting results , comparing results with literature ,accounting for results , and evaluating results. Interpreting results is found in all the dissertations , with a total frequency of 204 instances, constituting the most prevalent step at 76%. Comparing results with literature occurred in 4 dissertations , accounting for 14 instances (representing 5% of the move). Accounting for results is observed in 9 dissertations , with a frequency of 49 instances (representing 18% of the total).

Notably, evaluating results did not occur in any of the dissertations, indicating its absence.

Overall, Move 4 is employed 267 times in the corpus, representing 35% of the analyzed moves. It can be inferred that all the main findings are accompanied by interpretations.

Move 5: Summarizing the study : It appears that the move mentioned, which involves summarizing the study in the conclusions of the chapter, is found in 9 out of 10 dissertations analyzed and it constituted approximately 1% of the overall frequency of moves analyzed in the corpus. The “summary of the study” move encapsulates the main findings and outcomes of the research, offering a condensed overview of the study's key elements, including results, methods, and their alignment with the research objectives.

Move 6 + Move 7 = The findings from the analyzed chapters indicate that Move 6, which involves evaluating the study, and Move 7, which involves deduction from the study, are not observed in any of the instances. Therefore, the percentage of occurrence for both Move 6 and Move 7 is 0%, indicating that none of the analyzed chapters included indications of limitations or significance/advantage related to the main topic or subject being studied (dependent variables). This finding is in line with Peacock’s (2002) finding that non-native English writers made far fewer claims than their native counterparts.

Move 8 : Referring to other studies : Referring to other studies was observed in all ten analyzed chapters (Example8), unlike Moves 6 and 7. Move 8, which involves providing support or justification, occurred multiple times throughout the chapters with varying frequencies. The total number of Move 8 occurrences across all chapters is 223, representing 29% of the analyzed corpus. These findings align with Loan and Pramoolsook's (2015) study, indicating a similar presence of Move 8. Importantly, this move plays a significant role as it offers context, builds upon existing knowledge, enhances credibility, enables comparison, and

supports theoretical frameworks. Thus, the results of this study emphasize the importance of Move 8 in effectively conveying and reinforcing arguments within the research discourse.

Additional move :

Chapter summary : In the move "chapter summary", researchers provide a comprehensive overview of the chapter and the study's results, evaluating their findings within the discussion chapter and explicitly stating whether the evidence confirms or disconfirms the hypotheses, thus offering a clear understanding of the research outcomes. As indicated in Table 5, the new move (chapter summary) is identified in 7 out of the 10 analyzed chapters, with each chapter containing one occurrence of this move. Across all chapters, there are a total of 10 occurrences, representing 1% of the analyzed corpus.

In summary, the analysis of the discussion chapters indicates that EFL students consistently include moves such as introducing the chapter, reporting major findings, summarizing results, commenting on results, referring to other studies, chapter summary and summary of the study. However, there are areas for improvement, as moves related to indicating limitations and the significance/advantage of the study are not frequently observed.

Conclusion

At last, this chapter has reported the different outcomes of analyzing the results and discussion chapters of master dissertations. The results have been obtained thanks to relational content analysis. They have been presented in the form of qualitative data and quantitative data. The results are discussed in the following chapters.

Chapter 04

Discussion of the findings

Introduction

Through the application of Qualitative Content Analysis, ten results and discussions are carefully examined. The analysis involved identifying various moves by analyzing sentences, terms, and general concepts within the texts, guided by chen and kuo's (2012) theoretical framework.

The present chapter discusses the findings of the study in relation to the theoretical framework and research questions. It is made up of two main sections. The first one deals with the interpretation of the results obtained from the move analysis of the MDs results chapters, and the second is concerned with the interpretation of the MDs discussion chapters discussing to what extent they reflect the generic structure as outlined in Chen and Kuo (2012) .

1 Discussing the findings of the analysed Results chapters

1.1 Organisation

The analysis has revealed that most of the samples reflect the influence of the three-part structure of an academic essay: Opening, Body and Closing. All the samples have a Chapter Introduction, the opening (also known as preambles) paragraphs that prepare the reader before moving on to the results and discussion chapters.

No specific scholar has definitively mentioned or determined the exact length of this chapter. However, our analysis of the ten Results chapters of master dissertations has revealed that the range of pages for the results section varies. In the analyzed corpus, the results chapters ranged from a minimum of 8 pages to 20 pages, with the exception of the ninth dissertation, which had 28 pages dedicated to the results section. These variations in page length can be influenced by factors such as the complexity of the research and the amount of data presented.

Firstly, the complexity of the research being presented can impact the length of the results section. Applied linguistics studies often involve intricate methodologies and data collection techniques. For example, a study may employ various qualitative and quantitative research methods, such as surveys, interviews, linguistic analysis, or experimental design. When the research design is complex, it may require a more detailed explanation in the results section, resulting in a longer page length.

Secondly, the extent of data analysis conducted in the study can influence the length of the results chapter. Furthermore, some applied linguistics studies involve multiple experiments or case studies. Each of these experiments or case studies needs to be analyzed and reported separately (Seawright & Gerring, 2008). So, if a dissertation includes several experiments or case studies, the results chapter may be longer because each one needs its own section for analysis and reporting.

Additionally the amount of data in the study can also affect the length of the results chapter. In applied linguistics, researchers often work with large amounts of data, such as language corpora or survey responses. When there is a substantial amount of data to analyze and interpret, it may take more pages to present the findings thoroughly. A larger volume of data may require more detailed explanations, descriptions, and analyses, which can contribute to a longer results section. In our study, this factor has emerged as a consistent contributor to the extended length of the results chapters namely the nature of the data being dealt with. Several authors within our analysis have faced the challenge of handling extensive survey responses, diverse graphics, tables, and both qualitative and quantitative results. This array of data, which range from transcribed interviews and textual corpora to experimental data, necessitate a comprehensive representation. As a result, the authors employ multiple graphics and visuals to elucidate their findings. Such circumstances prompted these authors to dedicate more space to effectively communicating their findings .

1.2 Schematic structure of the Results chapters

Using the move analysis procedure drawing on Chen and Kuo's (2012) move structure model of master dissertation results, The moves adopted by the students while writing their results chapters do not totally correspond to those of Chen and Kuo (2012). That is to say, not all the students have respected all the moves, and all of them have neglected to incorporate several key elements in their results chapter. Specifically, they failed to interpret their research findings, compare them with existing literature, critically evaluate the results, account for the reasons behind the findings, and draw conclusive statements. Additionally, all the students have not indicated the limitations of the study, highlight its significance, provide recommendations for further research, draw pedagogic implications, make suggestions, or offer necessary background information. Thompson's (1993) study (as cited in Starfield & Paltridge, 2007) suggests that prescriptive study guides may not accurately convey the nature of Results sections in academic writing. Instead of recognizing that Results sections involve more than just objective reporting, these study guides present them as straightforward and purely descriptive. However, Thompson's (1993) findings indicate that Results sections inherently contain elements of argumentation and evaluation. In other words, researchers should not only present the data objectively but also interpret and evaluate the significance of the findings. This insight challenges the notion that results sections should be treated solely as objective descriptions and emphasizes the importance of considering the interpretative and evaluative aspects of presenting research results. Thompson's (1993) research highlights the need for students and writers to have a comprehensive understanding of the multifaceted nature of Results sections, which go beyond mere objective reporting and involve argumentation and evaluation of the findings. Also, (Starfield & Paltridge, 2007, p.135) state that

It is vital that the second-language student understands that successful Results sections are never mere presentation or reporting but always

involve selecting and ordering the data in a way that is designed to guide the reader to the understandings the researcher wishes the reader to come to. The writer must thus draw out the significance of the data, highlight significant trends and comparisons, and keep indicating to the reader where in the data he or she is being led .

This statement highlights the significance of understanding that successful Results sections in academic writing involve more than just presenting data. They require a careful selection and arrangement of data to guide the reader towards the researcher's intended understanding. The writer must emphasize the importance of the data, identify key patterns and comparisons, and consistently show the reader the specific conclusions or directions supported by the data. In summary, the Results section demands more than just sharing data; it requires the writer to actively guide the reader towards the desired interpretations and understanding of the research findings .

The results of our analysis reveal a notable contradiction with the ideas highlighted in the aforementioned paragraph. While our study has revealed the presence of essential moves like introducing the chapter and reporting major findings, it has also exposed a noteworthy absence of certain key elements. Specifically, the absence of moves related to "Interpreting results" and "Accounting for results" raises a crucial point of departure from the paragraph's emphasis on the interpretative and evaluative aspects of the results sections. This contrast accentuates the missed opportunity for researchers to actively guide readers towards interpretations and evaluations, as suggested in the paragraph. The observed discrepancy underscores the significance of understanding and implementing the multifaceted nature of results sections. By not incorporating the practices of interpretation and evaluation, the dissertations in question fell short of the ideal principles outlined in the paragraph. This contrast underscores the need for researchers to actively guide readers, interpret their findings, and evaluate results to craft effective results sections that go beyond mere data presentation.

1.3 The order of move occurrence

The analysis of the students' Results chapters reveals that they did not employ all the moves outlined by Chen and Kuo (2012) in order to fulfill the communicative purpose of these sections. Specifically, none of the ten results chapters strictly follow the order of moves. Instead, a common pattern emerged where the majority of chapters begin with Move 1 (introduction of results chapter), followed by multiple cycles of Move 2 (locating graphics and reporting results). The deviation from the suggested moves order suggests a variation in how the students organize their results chapters to achieve their intended communicative objectives.

The analysis reveal that the Results chapters predominantly include four out of the six moves identified in Chen and Kuo's framework.

The four moves commonly found in the Results chapters are as follows:

1. Move 1: Introducing the Results chapter (4%)
2. Move 2: Reporting results (92%)
3. Move 3: Commenting on results (2%)
4. Move 4 : Summarizing results (1%)

However, Moves 3 (Commenting on results) which involves interpreting the results and explaining their significance and 4 (Summarizing results) which involves summarizing the key results of the study, are only employed in three results chapters, and Steps 1 (interpreting results) and 4 (accounting for results) within Move 3 are rarely used. On the other hand, steps 1 and 2 of move 2 (Locating graphics and reporting major findings), receive substantial support and are frequently employed, totaling 454 occurrences. This prevalence makes Move 2 the most frequently utilized move, comprising 92% of all moves analyzed. Interestingly, Moves 5 (Evaluating the study) and 6 (deductions from the study) are entirely absent. In addition to these findings, a new step has emerged across the corpus, referred to as "Introduction of the next

chapter". Remarkably, this step is consistently found in all of the dissertations. This step has served to maintain structural continuity, establish a logical progression of ideas, and engage the reader. It seems that this difference shows that enough attention is not given to 'moves' and 'move structure' in EFL writing classes (Nodoushan & Khakbaz, 2011). Another explanation for this observation may lie in the preferences of the individual universities (from which the corpus was sampled) or the thesis supervisors (Nodoushan & Khakbaz, 2011).

These findings support the previous research conducted by Chen and Kuo (2012), where they observed the presence of the first two moves in all results sections. This similarity in findings could be attributed to the fact that both studies focused on the same genre, namely master dissertations.

It is important to note that while previous studies (Brett 1994, Nwogu 1997, Posteguillo 1999, Yang & Allison 2003) have suggested that results chapters not only report on research findings but also include comments on them, this current study identifies a limited number of instances where commenting on research results (Move 3) occurred compared to the reporting of results (Move 2). Specifically, among the 246 main findings that are documented, only 5 of them underwent interpretation, highlighting a limited occurrence of the act of providing comments on research results. Therefore it seems move 3,4 ,5 and 6 are optional and the reason these specific moves and steps might not be present could be because they share similarities with the moves and steps found in the Discussions or Conclusions chapters. In other words, the functions or purposes of these moves/steps might already be fulfilled within those sections, making their separate inclusion unnecessary. For instance, if a move in the Results chapter serves a similar purpose to a move in the Discussion chapter, authors might choose to include it only in the latter, where it fits better. This overlap in functions could lead to the absence of certain moves/steps in particular sections. As suggested by Chen and Kuo (2012) “ *This could*

be due to the fact that these moves/steps are overlapping with the moves/steps in the Discussions or Conclusions chapters“ .

Additionally, it's worth considering that students prefer to reserve the interpretation of their findings and other detailed aspects for the discussion chapter, which typically tends to be longer and more expansive than the results chapter. This inclination aligns with the conventional structure of academic writing, where the discussion section provides a suitable space for a comprehensive analysis of the results and their implications (Thanajirawat and Chueanongthon, 2022). As a result, certain moves and steps might be intentionally deferred to the discussion chapter, which could contribute to their apparent absence from the results chapter. This aspect emphasizes the importance of understanding the distinct communicative functions of different sections within academic writing and how they contribute to the overall coherence and structure of the research paper.

According to Swales' (2004) rhetorical structure, the Results section consists of four parts: preparatory information, reporting results, commenting on results, and summarizing results. The writer begins by preparing the analysis data and converting it into meaningful information. Then, they report the results using tables, graphs, or other data descriptions. Subsequently, they provide descriptions or comments on the presented data in the commenting results section. Finally, the writer summarizes the overall results obtained from the study.

These excerpts show how the different moves have occurred:

Move 1: Introducing the Results chapter

Step1+ Step2 : -Providing background information or how results are presented

- Indicating methods used or statistical procedure applied

In each of the dissertations we have examined, the introduction to the results chapter is consistent. This initial part has served as a way to set the stage for what was to come, aligning with the findings observed by Chen and Kuo (2012). Similar to how a story starts with an introduction to its plot, these writers begin their results chapters by outlining what they are going to discuss. Two steps are involved in this process: "Providing background information or how results are presented" and "Indicating methods used or statistical procedure applied." Both of these steps are consistently present across all the dissertations. They can be considered obligatory steps because they appeared in every dissertation we analyzed (100%). In essence, we can categorize the move "introduction to results chapter" as an obligatory move. An illustrative example is provided below to offer a clearer understanding

Dissertation 1: "This chapter presents the results gathered after analyzing the seventy (70) questionnaires distributed on the EFL students of Master One (M1) at the department of English at Mouloud MAMMERI University. The questionnaire is divided into three sections and is specifically designed to the five (5) Master One (M1) specialties: Comparative Literature, Literature and Civilization, Literature and Interdisciplinary Approach, Language and Communication and Didactics of Foreign Languages. This chapter aims at investigating the role of YouTube channels in enhancing the Master One (M1) students' learning self confidence."

Move 2: Reporting results

Move 2, which involves reporting results, is present in every MA dissertation within the corpus (100%). This makes it an obligatory step, backed by a significant frequency of occurrences: 246 instances for reporting major findings and 208 for locating graphics. This is quite reasonable given that the core aim of the results chapter is to present the study's findings.

According to Brett (1994, p.47), the repeated presence of this rhetorical move aligns with the objective of effectively presenting the study's results. Therefore, the primary objective of move2 in this context is not only to pinpoint visuals but also offer explanations for their content and report the key findings. The examples provided below illustrate how each step is effectively realized from the extracted corpus.

Step1: Locating graphics:.

- *Dissertation 4 : “Diagram 1 shows the results obtained from the teachers’ first question about their teaching experience.”*
- *Dissertation 8: “Table (02) illustrates the participants’ attitude towards learning English idioms.”*

Step2: Reporting major findings:

- *Dissertation 9: “It is clear from the table one that the majority of the teachers have more than one year experience with a percentage of (66.67 %) representing 6 teachers, while the rest of them which means 3 teachers have less than 2 years experience (33.33%).”*
- *Dissertation8: “The results displayed in pie chart (01) show that (90%) of the participants have background knowledge on idioms, while only (10%) do not.”*

Move 3: Commenting on results


Move 3 involves the writer's interpretation of the results and the identification of their meaning and significance. Our findings diverge from those reported by the international writers, Chen and Kuo (2012), who have identified a high frequency of steps in the cycle of “Reporting major findings“ (Move 2) and “Interpreting results“ (Move 3). In our analysis, we have not

observed a similar pattern. The frequency of steps within Move 3, particularly the interpretation of results, is relatively lower compared to the reporting of major findings. This suggests that researchers in the corpus might have placed less emphasis on explicitly interpreting their results. There could be several reasons for this observation. One possible explanation is that the research papers in the corpus focus more on presenting factual information and reporting major findings rather than providing detailed interpretations. This could be influenced by the nature of the research topics or the specific methodology employed. For instance, certain quantitative studies may prioritize presenting numerical data and statistical analyses, leaving less room for extensive interpretation. However, the writers may also compare their study with previous research to support their chosen methods or procedures. Additionally, they may discuss the strengths, limitations, and generalizability of their results. This move is crucial for understanding the implications of the findings and establishing their value within the existing knowledge base. According to Paltridge and Starfield (2007), hedging allows writers to suggest explanations, interpret their data, and draw tentative conclusions. The authors argue that through the use of hedging devices, writers can moderate their claims by anticipating and/or rebutting potential challenges to their methodology and data interpretation .

The language the dissertation writer uses to comment on the significance of their results will therefore be hedged in ways that are considered appropriate by the discipline. Therefore, they have recommended the use of specific words and expressions to help writers hedge their claims. These linguistic tools enable researchers to convey precision, caution, and appropriate humility in order to effectively persuade readers of the validity and reliability of their research. By employing these words and expressions, writers can strike a balance between being confident in their findings and acknowledging the inherent uncertainties and limitations of scientific inquiry. This approach ensures that the claims made are clear, precise, and supported

by evidence while also recognizing the complexities and potential biases involved in the research process.

The following examples illustrate various degrees of hedging in language, highlighting the range from weaker expressions to stronger, more definitive statements (Starfield & Paltridge, 2007, p.143):

Weaker		Stronger
Might result in	May result in	Will result in
It is possible that	It is very likely /probable that	It is certain that
Would seem to have	Seems to have	Has
May have contributed to	Contributed to	Caused
Suggests	indicates	Shows

Step1: Interpreting results:

- *Dissertation 3: “The evidence suggests that decorative images of women such as physical attractiveness in both American and Algerian ads are likely to be linked with hedonic 40 products.”*
- *Dissertation 6: “It can be inferred that students have difficulty to spell in English.”*

Step4: Accounting for results :

- *Dissertation 6: “... The dominant intralingual source in the omission error type is incomplete application of rules among overgeneralization and ignorance of rule restrictions errors.”*

Move 4: Summarizing results

The move of making conclusions from results is surprisingly found in only three dissertations within the corpus, classifying it as an optional move (it appeared in less than 60% of the corpus). In an unexpected departure from the conventional approach, these authors have

not summarized their findings at the end of their respective works. Instead, they have opted to reiterate the statistical procedures applied and the analytical methodologies employed. As mentioned earlier in the results chapter, this could be due to the fact that they preferred to include it in the discussion chapter, which is indeed the case. The examples below show how this move is used.

- *Dissertation 3: “Overall, we may say that if the model in the ad is asked to perform as a housewife or a working woman, Goffman’s principles cannot be applied to them because none of their beauty or body parts are required for them to appear. However, if the model is used as a beauty object or if she advertises a beauty product, Goffman’s principles are always spotted in 57 this kind of ads.”*

- *Dissertation 8: “According to these results, the students from all the levels hold a positive attitude and are aware of the importance of idioms in learning the English language. In addition, it is showed that students among the four levels use frequently and favour some idiom learning strategies.”*

Introducing the next chapter is another step that has been identified through the analysis of the results. It is manifested in 80% of the results chapters analyzed, classifying it as a quasi-obligatory step due to its prevalent use. This finding is consistent with the observations made by Loan and Pramolsook (2015), who have also recognized it as a new step in their study. The use of this step plays a role in maintaining the overall coherence and logical progression of the dissertation. By introducing what is to come in the subsequent chapter, authors ensure that readers are prepared for the upcoming content, fostering a smoother transition between sections. This practice is likely influenced by a desire to guide readers through the structure of the dissertation and help them navigate its various components effectively.

Example

“...These results in fact will be discussed in the following chapter by providing explanation and interpretation“

The absence of moves 6 and 7 is not surprising, as the Conclusion chapter is normally provided for writers to discuss the limitations of the study and recommendation for further research as cited in Dastjerdi et al. (2017)

In summary, the analysis of the results chapters supports the second hypothesis proposed in the introduction. The results chapters of master dissertations do not strictly adhere to the moves identified in the existing literature on results chapters . It means that the students deviate from the moves identified in the literature, contradicting previous findings that suggest results sections include both reporting and commenting on results. This shows that the mode used by the students does not go over the style prescribed in the manual for publication writing as stipulated by the American Psychological Association (APA), style that has been a topic taught to the students through the methodology subject. This adherence to APA guidelines is particularly noticeable in their treatment of the Results sections. According to the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (1996), the results must be entirely dedicated to the presentation and promotion of study outcomes, while subjective evaluations and interpretations will be more adequate and fitting in the discussion sections.

2 Discussing the findings of the analysed Discussion chapters

2.1 Organisation

The analysis indicates that the majority of the samples has demonstrated the impact of the conventional three-part structure observed in academic essays, comprising an introduction,

body, and conclusion, similar to the results section. The length of the discussion chapter varies across different countries and universities, and in our corpus, it ranged from 10 to 20 pages. According to Swales, the discussion chapter adopts a "reverse" structure compared to the introduction. While the introduction primarily focuses on prior research related to the topic, the discussion chapter shifts its emphasis to the student's own research, with previous research playing a secondary role. In this context, previous research is utilized to support, compare, or differentiate the findings of the student's study. This structure allows for a comprehensive examination and interpretation of the research findings within a broader scholarly context.

That is to say, the structure of the Discussion chapter in academic writing differs from the Introduction section. In the Introduction, the emphasis is on the existing research related to the topic, whereas in the Discussion chapter, the focus shifts to the student's own research and previous research is used to support the student's findings rather than being the main focus of the section.

The analysis conducted using Chen and Kuo's (2012) move structure model of master dissertation discussions has revealed that the moves employed by the students in their discussion chapters did not align entirely with those proposed by Chen and Kuo (2012). It is observed that not all students followed all the recommended moves, notably, elements such as summarizing, evaluating and deducing from the study were elements found to be missing.

According to Swales (1990) (as cited in Syafryadin et al., 2022, p.29), there are 3 parts that are mandatory in the discussion: namely comments on research results that answer the research questions, then references to previous research, where researchers connect their research results with results from previous research or relevant theories. Next is the explanation section, where the researcher tries to convince the reader of the results of his research that have been found to introduce fresh insights and present new knowledge to readers and fellow researchers.

This demonstrates that the communicative purposes of Discussions are not merely to report results; they also involve summarizing results, commenting on them, and comparing them with other studies in the field (Chen and Kuo, 2012).

2.2 The order of moves occurrence

The analysis of the students' discussion chapters reveals a deviation from the prescribed order of moves as outlined by Chen and Kuo (2012) for the communicative purpose of these sections. None of the ten chapters strictly adhered to the suggested order, meaning there is no straightforward linear structure (M1-M2-M3-M4-M5-M6-M7) appearing in the data; instead, a common pattern has emerged, where the majority of chapters commenced with Move 1, which involves introducing the Discussion chapter. This is followed by multiple cycles of Move 2, focusing on reporting results, and Move 4, encompassing the interpretation of results. Additionally, all the chapters include references to other studies to provide support or justification. The discussion chapters concluded with Move 3, which involves drawing conclusions about the results, Move 5 summarizing the study briefly; and the new identified move which entailed summarizing the chapter in which they have confirmed/ disconfirmed the hypotheses previously suggested in the introduction chapters. The large variation in move structure that is found in our corpus as explained by Amnuai & Wannaruk (2013):

“ May be due to the fact that the Discussion section is where the author presents his/her point based on the research findings. The author has greater freedom in generating the ideas which are relevant to the research conducted. This may lead to the presence of the various deviations of move structures in the Discussion sections of the corpus.”

It means the reason for the big differences in how moves are organized, which we noticed in our collection of texts (corpus), could be linked to how the discussion section is used. In this section, authors express their thoughts about their research results. They have more flexibility to come up with ideas that match their study. This flexibility might result in different ways of

arranging the moves in the discussion sections, leading to the varied structures we have observed in our corpus.

2.3 Moves and Steps

It appears that the students did not adhere to all of the moves proposed by Chen and kuo (2012) when writing their discussion sections. The analysis has revealed that the discussion chapters included six out of eight moves .

The five moves commonly found in the discussions chapters were as follow :

1. Move 1 : Introducing the discussion section (1%)
2. Move 2 : Reporting results (31%)
3. Move 3 : Summarising results (1%)
4. Move 4 : Commenting on results (35%)
5. Move5 : Summarizing the study (1%)
6. Reference to other studies (29%)

and the newly identified move chapter summary (1% of all analyzed moves) is also observed in the discussion chapters.

Table 5 (see Results chapter) provides an overview of the frequency of the occurrence of moves in the Discussion sections. It becomes evident that Moves 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 8, encompassing the introduction of discussion chapters, reporting and summarizing results, commenting on results, summarizing the study, and referencing other studies, are consistently present in all the discussion chapters. Notably, there is a particular focus on Move 4, commenting on results, with an emphasis on interpreting results. These findings align with previous research conducted by Chen and Kuo (2012), who have also observed that the first four moves occur more frequently in theses than the other moves representing summarizing, evaluating, and deducing from the study , “*it can be observed that (summarizing, evaluating,*

DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

and deducing from the study) are characteristic of the communicative purposes of Conclusions in theses“ (Chen & Kuo, 2012, p. 40). The steps involving "reporting major findings" and "interpreting findings" are noticeably more frequent, with 233 and 204 instances, respectively, compared to other steps that occur less than 50 times. This highlights the prominence of these two functions in discussions. Across the dissertations, the step "reporting major findings" is consistently present, suggesting its essential role. Similarly, "interpreting results" and "providing support or justification " are found in all ten dissertations (100%), while "accounting for results" appear in eight dissertations (80%) and "comparing results with literature" appear in four dissertations (40%). The prevalence of primary moves (60%) emphasizes their writing significance, while secondary moves have a lower occurrence (below 60%), indicating their more optional nature within the methodology (Kanoksilapatham, 2005). However, some dissertations do not include all the necessary steps and moves. Regarding Moves 6 and 7, addressing the indication of limitations, advantages, methodology evaluation, suggestions, further research, and pedagogical implications are notably absent from the discussions.

Move 6, step1 (indicating limitations of the study) is noticeably missing from our analysis. According to Kanoksilapatham (2005, P. 285)(as cited in Dastjerdi et al., 2017, P.78) , a higher frequency of this step implies that researchers are careful and honest about acknowledging the limitations of their study's various aspects. Based on our findings and Kanoksilapatham's (2005) remarks, the absence of this step suggests that student writers might have intentionally avoided critiquing their studies to safeguard their research's validity. Additionally, the limited use of this step could also be attributed to Thompson's (2005) guide to thesis writing, which suggests that study limitations could be discussed in the Conclusion section (as cited in Dastjerdi et al., 2017). This explanation seems fitting to our study, as a notable portion of dissertations include limitations within their conclusion chapters. Another possible perspective is that this step might not have been included due to the absence of limitations in their respective studies. Yang and

Allison (2003) note in their study that the appearance of the final three moves in the Discussion section is influenced by the presence of a subsequent conclusion or pedagogic implication section, indicating their suitability for the conclusion chapter of the final-year projects. This aligns with the nature of conclusion chapters, which typically serve as a platform to summarize the study, discuss its limitations, propose implications, and suggest areas for future research. Consequently, the tendency to include these aspects in the conclusion chapter could explain their relative absence in the earlier sections of the dissertations, like the Discussion section.

These examples show how the different moves have occurred :

Move 1 : Introducing the discussion chapter

Step1 : Providing background information

Introducing the discussion chapter has emerged as a common practice within all the dissertations selected for this study. Notably, this move consistently serve as the opening move in every text analyzed. It is well-established that the primary purpose of an opening paragraph is to introduce the section and elucidate the procedure to be followed. Consequently, this move is observed as an obligatory move , present in all instances (100%), with a frequency of 10 occurrences. This frequency is entirely reasonable, considering that this introductory move serves its purpose once at the outset of each discussion chapter. An illustration of how this step is typically presented can be found in the following examples:

Examples:

- *Dissertation 10: “This chapter is devoted to the presentation of the findings obtained from the move analysis of master dissertation introductions using CARS framework as modified by Samraj (2008) adopted to DI Introductions and the results reached from the students’ questionnaire [...]”*

- *Dissertation 8: “This chapter aims to discuss and interpret the results obtained from L1 , L2 , M1 and M2 participants’ questionnaire. The results are interpreted in relation to the literature presented in the first chapter .They aim at answering the research questions and confirm or refute the suggested hypotheses stated in the general introduction .It is divided into two sections [...]“*

Move 2 : Reporting major findings

Move 2, which involves reporting results, is consistently present across all MA dissertations within the corpus. This move plays a vital role in both the results and discussion chapters, often following move 1. Its primary function in this context is to present the study's findings. Notably, move 2 isn't exclusively limited to following move 1; it is also observed following various other moves within the corpus. Specifically, the step of reporting major findings, constituting an essential component of move 2, is universally observed in 100% of the corpus with 233 instances , marking its significance as an obligatory step .

Examples :

- *Dissertation 7: “question four dealing with learners’ psychology during Covid 19 quarantine, the findings show that twenty eight students representing (65,19%) have not been prepared for the emergence of covid 19 quarantine. “*
- *Dissertation 9: “ According to the findings, the shortest teaching experience is ten months, and the longest is sixteen years. (See table 1)“*

Move 3 : Summarising results

Step1: making conclusions of results

Move 3 is also consistently present as a conventional move within the corpus, manifesting in 90% of the Master's discussion sections. This is achieved through the step "making conclusions of results". While some students employed the move of drawing conclusions of results in the traditional manner by summarizing their findings in the conclusion of the chapter, others chose to draw conclusions after specific segments or sets of results. As shown in the examples below.

Examples :

- *Dissertation 2: "To sum up the findings , the majority of the students prefer distance learning and they express their satisfaction since it is a motivating tool [...]."*
- *Dissertation 7: "On the basis of the data obtained in this part of the questionnaire , we conclude that the Covid 19 lockdown has impacted students' emotional health , as well as their studying experience ."*

Move 4 : Commenting on result

Within the corpus , Move 3 is consistently recognized as an obligatory move . It frequently followed Move 2, and within this context, authors expressed their own assessments of the findings. This move is carried out through four distinct steps: interpreting results, comparing results with existing literature, evaluating results, and accounting for results. Table5 (see results chapter), illustrates that both interpreting results and accounting for results are obligatory in their functionality. They are observed in 100% and 90% of the corpus, comprising 204 and 49 instances, respectively. Additionally, the step involving comparing results with literature is found to be an optional move, appearing in 40% of the corpus with a frequency of 14 instances.

Step 1 : Interpreting result :

This step “includes hypothesis, in which the writer makes a more general claim arising from his experimental results“ (Yang & Allison , 2003 ,P.378). It means, it is where the writer puts forward a broader statement based on their experimental findings. An example of step1 is given below

Example:

- Dissertation 1: “ by interpreting the results we understand that managing positively the stress level it is not very important for the participants , but still important for the majority of them. “

Step 2 : Comparing result with literature :

After presenting the findings of their study, authors should also discuss the findings of other studies and whether those findings align with or differ from their own. This comparison is employed by only four student writers to assess their study's results, which is quite unexpected. As a result, this particular step is utilized in 40 percent of the dissertations, making it an optional move. These findings contradict the conclusions drawn by Chen and Kuo (2012), Allison and Yang (2003), and Loan and Pramoolsook (2015). This variation might be attributed to several factors, such as sample variability and research goals. To elaborate further, it's important to note that the samples of writing we have examined might not fully represent the broader patterns seen in all students' work or dissertations on a larger scale. The trends and practices we have identified within our specific collection of materials could be shaped by distinct characteristics or specific situations unique to the students or dissertations we have focused on. However, these characteristics may not be universally applicable. For instance, our corpus comprises ten dissertations exclusively from the English department at MMUTO in the year 2021. Consequently, the insights we have gained from this limited sample might not be uniformly applicable to dissertations originating from different departments, institutions, or

years. One significant reason why students often skip this step is the uncertainty that arises when their research results deviate from existing literature. This uncertainty often stems from concerns that their results contradict established theories or previous research. Additionally, in cases where there is limited existing literature on their specific research topic, students may find it challenging to make meaningful comparisons, making it difficult to connect their findings to prior work. These situations can lead to differences in the extent to which literature comparison is emphasized. Examples of the step can be seen below.

Examples :

- *Dissertation 8: "The results reached in our study are in line with those obtained by Ababneh's (2016) investigation about Jordanian EFL students' attitude towards learning English idioms as well as Shourouk and Soltan's study (2018) which investigates the attitude of female EFL college..etc"*

- *Dissertation 3: "The housewife is primarily used to advertise household products in a variety of previous research studies. Plakoyiannaki & Zotos, (2009); Razzouk et al., (2003); Rudansky, (1991)."*

Step 3 : Accounting for results :

According to Chen and Kuo(2012) and Loan and Pramoolsook (2015). The recognized rhetorical function of this step entails offering explanations for particular findings. This obligatory step appears in 90% of the corpus. The logical justifications employed to achieve this specific communicative objective are underscored through the utilization of terms like "because," "possible explanation," "an explanation of this result suggests," "it is possible," and "can be explained by." As demonstrated in the instances below.

Examples

- *Dissertation 4: “ An explanation of this results suggests that teachers differentiate their teaching styles to allow students acquire the content of the subject of investigation “*
- *Dissertation 3: “that is explained by the fact that the models in the ads are adverting a product that doesn’t necessarily require for them to include themselves or their bodies. “*

Move5: Summarizing the study

This move appears in 90% of the Master’s discussions analyzed . This move is realized in one step : summarizing the study briefly . The results do not align with the findings of Chen and Kuo (2012) and those of Loan and Pramolsook (2015) who have found that the move of summarizing the study is considered optional. In the conclusion of the chapter, the authors provide a dual summary. They first summarize the contents of the chapter, and in doing so, they briefly summarize the entire study, including key findings. Additionally, they revisit and briefly reiterate the research methodology applied, offering a concise overview of the analytical methods and procedures used. The examples below show how this move is used in the three dissertations.

In the conclusion of the discussion chapter, summarizing the study serves the purpose of reinforcing the study's main findings and their alignment with or deviation from the research hypotheses. If the hypotheses are confirmed, the conclusion reaffirms this. In cases where the hypotheses are refuted, the conclusion addresses this discrepancy. Summarizing the study in the conclusion chapter is a valuable practice for clarifying the study's outcomes and their relevance to the research objectives and hypotheses.

Examples

- *Dissertation 2: “Therefore, the results in this study show that students have responded positively towards the use and the integration of Zoom Lecturing Application in the educational system.”*
- *Dissertation 7: “To conclude, this chapter has dealt with the discussion of the answers that originated from the study's research questions. It is composed of three parts which interpret the findings gathered from the third year EFL students’ and teachers’ questionnaires, as well as, from the structured interview which was conducted with some of the teachers. Furthermore, the results collected and analyzed indicate that the Covid-19 lockdown had in fact a negative influence on the majority of third year students and teachers in the Department of English at theMMUTO.”*

Move8 : Reference to other studies

Step1: Providing support or justification

The move reference to other studies, which involves the act of citing other studies in order to provide support or justification is found in all ten chapters (100%), making it an obligatory move . The frequent use of this move , with 233 instances ,supports Peacock's (2002) findings that referring to previous research is important in Language and Linguistics. This could be because MA dissertations often repeat details and information (Basturkmen 2009, as cited in Loan and Pramoolsook, 2015, p.9) . An example below illustrates how this move is employed to provide reasons for specific findings.

Example :

- Dissertation 8: *“Gardner (1980 : 267) stated that ‘ attitude is the sum total of man's instinc, feeling , prejudice or bias , preconceived notions , fear , threats , and convictions about any specific topic. “*
- Dissertation 3: *“ Lazar (2006) suggests that such female portrayals appear to empower women to seek for learning opportunities in order to become informed consumers. “*

Additional moves

Chapter summary : The move chapter summary is detected in every Discussion chapter (100%). Since this step is present in over 50% of the corpus, it is identified as a new step (Nwogu, 1997).

“However, this new step should be regarded as a new move according to move definitions by Swales (1981) and Holmes (1997). In fact, this text at the end of the chapter not only performs a specific communicative function of its own but also contributes to the overall communicative purpose of the genre . In relation to Move 1, which aims to open the Discussion chapter, this newly identified move, Chapter summary, was employed to close the chapter“.

(Loan and Pramoolsook, 2015, p.10).

Additionally, this move often involves summarizing the entire chapter's content and either confirming or refuting the hypotheses presented earlier in the introduction section.

Examples

- Dissertation 3: *“This chapter assembles all the results we have discussed dealing with the representation of women in television advertisements....The findings of our study, confirm our hypotheses about the depiction of Algerian women in traditional roles, And the American women in decorative ones..etc “*
- Dissertation 10: *“This chapter has discussed the main results obtained from the analysis of*

master dissertation introductions and the questionnaire submitted to Didactics master 2 students of Discussion of the Findings 53 the department of English at MMUTO in order to answer the research questions stated in the general introduction... it is analysed and discussed in light of the analytical framework identified in the literature review.“

Examples of the hypotheses confirmed in the chapter summary

- *Dissertation1: “the study finally confirms the three hypotheses in the General Introduction.”*

- *Dissertation8: “The results of the second section revealed that the majority of the students from different levels hold a positive attitude towards learning English idioms and are aware of their importance, confirming then the first, the second and the third hypotheses.”*

In summary, the section has focused on the analysis of the discussion chapters in master dissertations. The study has utilized a move analysis procedure based on Chen and Kuo's 2012 framework to identify the presence and frequency of specific moves within the chapters. The findings have revealed that while the majority of the chapters include the essential moves of introducing the discussion, reporting results, summarizing results, and commenting on results, there are variations in the order and completeness of these moves. Some moves, such as comparing results with literature and indicating limitations and suggestions, are frequently absent. The students' deviation from the suggested framework may be attributed to the preference of discussing certain aspects in the concluding chapter. Nevertheless, despite these deviations, the students are able to convey the communicative purpose of the discussion chapters by presenting their research findings, analyzing the results, and providing supporting references. The chapter concludes that while there is room for improvement in adhering to the suggested moves, the students have demonstrated their understanding of the research and its

implications through their discussion chapters. Regarding the confirmed hypotheses, it is found that the results and discussion chapters of master dissertations do not strictly adhere to the moves identified in the existing literature (Hypothesis 2). The findings reveal variations in the presence and order of steps within the results and discussion chapters analyzed, indicating a deviation from the prescribed framework proposed by Chen and Kuo (2012). Furthermore, the analysis supports the hypothesis that there might be variations in the extent to which students incorporate the recommended steps in their results and discussion chapters (Hypothesis 3). Certain moves are commonly observed, while others are frequently absent or not fully implemented, suggesting differences in the extent of adherence to the recommended moves among the students.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the analysis of the results and discussion chapters in master dissertations has revealed that while students generally follow the three-part structure of an academic essay, they deviate from the recommended moves and steps proposed in the literature. The order of move occurrence also differs from the suggested framework. However, despite these deviations, students effectively convey their research findings and analyze the results. Yang and Alison (2003) argue that the major communicative purpose of the 'results' subgenre is to 'report the results' whereas that of the 'discussion' subgenre is to 'comment on results'. The findings emphasize the need for improved guidance and instruction on the structure and content of these sections. Further research and pedagogical interventions are necessary to enhance students' writing skills in results and discussion chapters. In the upcoming chapter, we provide a comprehensive general conclusion based on the findings and analysis presented in the previous chapters.

General conclusion

This research delves into the realm of genre analysis, a subject that holds significant intrigue. Its focus is centered on scrutinizing the results and discussions within Master dissertations. As such, the primary aim is to analyse the moves of the master dissertations results and discussions and examine the manifestation of rhetorical moves in the findings and discussion sections written by EFL students. The second aim is to explore possible differences in the writing of the authors of published master's dissertations. To achieve this, the following research question was asked:

What rhetorical moves do MA students of language and communication use in the results and discussion chapters of their dissertations?

In an attempt to address the question posed by the research, three hypotheses have been put forward.

Qualitative Content Analysis is employed as the analytical method. It involves extracting specific terms, sentences, and brief passages from the corpus. The aim is twofold: to mirror and depict the moves outlined by the theoretical frameworks, as well as to pinpoint any supplementary moves that might be present.

In the course of our investigation, we have noted several significant observations. To begin with, a clear pattern emerged, indicating that all the samples followed the established format of an academic essay, encompassing an introduction, main body, and conclusion. Notably, each sample begins with an introduction, serving as both a preamble to set the context and a means to establish a connection with the reader. This introductory phase paves the way for a seamless transition to the subsequent presentation of research results or findings. Additionally, it is observed that each results chapter is rounded off with a chapter summary, effectively summarizing the findings. Regarding the length of the results chapters, an array has emerged, varying from a minimum of 8 pages to a maximum of 20 pages. Notably, the ninth dissertation

deviates from this trend with an extensive 28-page results section. When observing the sequencing of moves, a significant divergence is noticed between the patterns highlighted in the existing literature. It is observed that not all the seven moves proposed by Chen and Kuo (2012) are consistently followed. Our analysis underscores a recurrent trend: introducing the Results chapter, Report results graphically and draw conclusions. Moreover, an additional move used by students was revealed: introduction of the next chapter .

Secondly, as for the discussion chapters, it is observed that their length ranged from 10 to 20 pages. The analysis reveals that the moves employed by the students in their discussion chapters do not align entirely with those proposed by Chen and Kuo (2012). Notably, not all students follow all the recommended moves. Elements such as, evaluating, and deducing from the study are found to be missing. Finally, an additional move is revealed, namely the inclusion of a chapter summary. The findings reveal that while the majority of the chapters include the essential moves of introducing the discussion, reporting results, summarizing results, and commenting on results, which are the main elements of the discussion chapters by Master 2 Language and Communication students at MMUTO, there are variations in the order and completeness of these moves. Some steps, such as comparing results with the literature and indicating limitations and suggestions, are frequently absent. Nevertheless, despite these deviations, the students are able to convey the communicative purpose of the discussion chapters by presenting their research findings, analyzing the results, and providing supporting references. Remarkably, the structure of an academic essay is also evident in the discussion chapters, echoing the pattern seen in the results chapters, which comprises introduction, body, and conclusion. This adherence to structure is a common thread binding both sections.

In conclusion, the study has illuminated several key insights into the structure and content of master dissertation results and discussion chapters. Deviations are observed in the presence,

order, and completeness of specific moves. It is found that the results and discussion chapters of master dissertations do not strictly adhere to the moves identified in the existing literature (hypothesis 2). The findings reveal variations in the presence and in the order of steps within the results and discussion chapters analyzed, indicating a deviation from the prescribed framework proposed by Chen and Kuo (2012).

Furthermore, the analysis supports the hypothesis that there might be variations in the extent to which students incorporate the recommended steps in their results and discussion chapters (hypothesis 3). Certain steps are commonly observed, while others are frequently absent or not fully implemented, suggesting differences in the extent of adherence to the recommended steps among the students. In contrast, the results disconfirm the first hypothesis, which posited that the students of language and communication use the same moves as outlined in Chen and Kuo's 2012 framework to write results and discussion chapters.

Additionally, the study highlights the need for a more flexible understanding of results and discussion chapter organization, acknowledging the diversity of approaches that students might take in crafting these sections.

Given the limited corpus of ten dissertations, our findings cannot be generalized to novice Language and Communication M.A. students at MMUTO. This limitation stems from the fact that our research is conducted as a case study.

Recognizing the significance of genre awareness in assisting EAP students in comprehending and excelling within their respective academic genres has gained considerable attention. Our study has practical implications for teachers working with EAP students. Using our findings, educators can create workshops and materials that match the identified moves and

GENERAL CONCLUSION

genre features. This will help EAP students write effective dissertation chapters, contributing to their academic success and enhancing proficiency in English academic writing.

Further research could delve deeper into the factors influencing students' choices in structuring their chapters, and the potential impact of these variations on the overall quality and coherence of their academic writing , and investigate effective pedagogical strategies for teaching students how to use rhetorical moves effectively in their writing.

Reference list

Reference list

- Al-Khasawneh, F. M. (2017). *A Genre Analysis of Research Article Abstracts Written by Native and Non-Native Speakers of English*.
- Alsied, S. M., & Ibrahim, N. W. (2018). Exploring Challenges Encountered by EFL Libyan Learners in Research Teaching and Writing. *IAFOR Journal of Language Learning*, 3(2). <https://doi.org/10.22492/ijll.3.2.06>
- Amirian, Z., Kassaian, Z., & Tavakoli, M. (2008). Genre Analysis: An Investigation of the Discussion Sections of Applied Linguistics Research Articles. *The Asian ESP Journal*, 4(1), 39–63.
- Amnuai, W., & Wannaruk, A. (2012). Investigating Move Structure of English Applied Linguistics Research Article Discussions Published in International and Thai Journals. *English Language Teaching*, 6(2), p1. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v6n2p1>
- Arsyad, S., Warsito, W., & Harahap, A. (2018). Stating and Defending New Knowledge Claim: A Rhetorical Analysis on the Discussion Section of English Master Thesis by Indonesian EFL Learners. *IJEE (Indonesian Journal of English Education)*, 4. doi:10.15408/ijee.v4i2.6746
- Basturkmen, H. (2009). Commenting on results in published research articles and masters dissertations in Language Teaching. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 8(4), 241-251. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2009.07.001>
- Bawarshi, A. S., & Reiff, M. J. (2010). *Genre : An introduction to history, theory, research, and pedagogy*. Parlor Press ; WAC Clearinghouse.
- Bhatia, V. K. (2017). Methodological Issues in Genre Analysis. *HERMES - Journal of Language and Communication in Business*, 9(16), 39. <https://doi.org/10.7146/hjlc.v9i16.25383>
- Chen, T.-Y., & Kuo, C.-H. (2012). A genre-based analysis of the information structure of master's theses in applied linguistics. *The Asian ESP Journal*, 8(1), 24-52
- Cotos, E., Link, S., & Huffman, S. (2016). Studying disciplinary corpora to teach the craft of Discussion. *Writing & Pedagogy*, 8(1), 33-64. <https://doi.org/10.1558/wap.v8i1.27661>
- Dastjerdi, Z. S., Tan, H., & Abdullah, A. N. (2017). Rhetorical Structures of Integrated Results and Discussion Chapter in Master's Dissertations Across Disciplines. *Discourse and Interaction*, 10(2), 61-83. <https://doi.org/10.5817/DI2017-2-61>

Discussion Sections of Local and International Applied Linguistic Journals. *Journal of Asia TEFL*, 9(1), 1-29.

- Evans, D., Gruba, P., & Zobel, J. (2014). *How to Write a Better Thesis*. Springer International Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-04286-2>
- Flowerdew, L. (2023). Corpus-based discourse analysis. In J. P. Gee & M. Handford, *The Routledge Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (2^e éd., p. 126-138). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003035244-11>
- Generic Structure of Discussion Sections in ESP Research Articles across International and Iranian Journals. (2015). *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 6(2). <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.all.v.6n.2p.87>
- Hamouda, H. A., & Nabi, S. (2015). *Genre Analysis of Abstracts, Introductions, and Conclusions of Master Dissertations Moves : A Case Study : Department of English, UMMTO*.
- Hartley, J. (2012). *New ways of making academic articles easier to read*. 12.
- Hilmi, A. Z., Toyibah, & Afifi, N. (2022). A Genre Analysis on The Discussion Section Of Quantitative And Qualitative Research Articles In ELT And Linguistics. *JEELS (Journal of English Education and Linguistics Studies)*, 8(2), 341-369. <https://doi.org/10.30762/jeels.v8i2.3264>
- Holmes, R. (1997). Genre analysis, and the social sciences : An investigation of the structure of research article discussion sections in three disciplines. *English for Specific Purposes*, 16(4), 321-337. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906\(96\)00038-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(96)00038-5)
- Hopkins, A., & Dudley-Evans, T. (1988). A genre-based investigation of the discussion sections in articles and dissertations. *English for Specific Purposes*, 7(2), 113-121. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0889-4906\(88\)90029-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0889-4906(88)90029-4)
- Hyon, S. (1996). Genre in Three Traditions : Implications for ESL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30(4), 693. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587930>
- Jalilifar, A., & Dabbi, R. (2012). *Citation in Applied Linguistics : Analysis of Introduction Sections of Iranian Master's Theses*. <https://doi.org/10.13092/lo.57.252>
- Jalilifar, A., Hayati, A. M., & Namdari, N. (2012). A Comparative Study of Research Article
- Kanoksilapatham, B. (2005). Rhetorical structure of biochemistry research articles. *English for Specific Purposes*, 24(3), 269-292. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2004.08.003>
- Khorramdel, M. (2017). *COMPARATIVE GENERIC ANALYSIS OF DISCUSSION SECTIONS OF ENGLISH AND PERSIAN DENTISTRY RESEARCH ARTICLES*.

- Paltridge, B. (1994). Genre Analysis and the Identification of Textual Boundaries. *Applied Linguistics*, 15(3), 288-299. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/15.3.288>
- Paltridge, B. (2002). Thesis and dissertation writing : An examination of published advice and actual practice. *English for Specific Purposes*, 21(2), 125-143. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906\(00\)00025-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(00)00025-9)
- Paltridge, B., & Woodrow, L. (2012). *Thesis and dissertation writing : Moving beyond the text* (p. 88-104).
- Peacock, M. (2002). Communicative moves in the discussion section of research articles. *System*, 30(4), 479-497. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X\(02\)00050-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(02)00050-7)
- Robertson, D. P. (2012). *The Asian ESP Journal. Spring Edition 2012*.
- Ruiying, Y., & Allison, D. (2003). Research articles in applied linguistics : Moving from results to conclusions. *English for Specific Purposes*, 22(4), 365-385. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906\(02\)00026-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(02)00026-1)
- Shirian Dastjerdi, Z., Tan, H., & Ebrahimi, S. F. (2021). Voice in rhetorical units of results and discussion chapter of master's theses : Across science study. *Brno Studies in English*, 1, 73-92. <https://doi.org/10.5817/BSE2021-1-5>
- Sithlaothavorn, J., & Trakulkasemsuk, W. (2016). *A Move Analysis of Research Discussion Section in English Articles Published in Thai and International Journals*. 21.
- Swales, J. M. (2004). *Research Genres : Explorations and Applications* (1^{re} éd.). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524827>
- Swales, J.M. (1990). *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Syafryadin, S., Harahap, A., & Astrid, A. (2022). Students' Rhetorical Structure Mastery Of The Finding And Discussion Section In English Thesis. *JEES (Journal of English Educators Society)*, 7(1). <https://doi.org/10.21070/jees.v7i1.1643>
- Thanajirawat, Z., Chuea-nongthon, C. (2022). Move and Text Analysis of the Discussion section in Humanities and Social Sciences Research Articles. *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 8(1), 217-231. Doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.32601/ejal.911531>
- Thuy Loan, N. T., & Pramoolsook, I. (2015). Move Analysis of Results-Discussion Chapters in TESOL Master's Theses Written by Vietnamese Students. *3L: The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*, 21(2), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.17576/3L-2015-2102-01>

•