CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter contains discussions regarding the variable of the study, including review of literature, definitions of key terminology, and theories and findings from scholars. Following the title of this study, major headings that can be found in this chapter are: academic phrases and terms, Introduction of a research paper, *skripsi* at English Department of UNJ, and the theoretical framework of the study.

2.1. Academic Phrases and Terms

Despite having the same phraseological nature, academic phrases suggested in this study differ from the concept within the scope of common English phrases. Scholars usually refer to phrases typically used in a research paper and any kind thereof as academic phrases. There has yet to be a standard as to why they are considered as academic. However, since these kinds of phrases are mostly encountered in academic discourse, especially in writing, they are hence called so. These phrases do not contain concepts which means that the reuse of the phrases will not be counted as an academic offence. On another note, academic phrases in terms of studies and works are those phrases typically used for the purpose of disclosing moves and stating communicative functions of a text as a form of linguistic features.

Some studies reveal that certain varieties of academic phrases are applied in different kinds of texts across disciplines to find out phrases that commonly occur (Supatranont, 2012, in Hammond, 2014). This implementation consequently results in a conception as well that native or non-native English speakers may or may not know the generic and specific academic phrases which otherwise are more common to some particular disciplines. They need guidance to help them with both kinds of phrases for their writing.

Following the great importance of phraseological aspects in academic writing, the need for writers especially novice writers to develop their ability to use academic phrases has been increasing. Davis and Morley (2015) write that EFL writers can "pick up generic academic phrases in academic texts and re-use them in their own writing" as a strategic approach for writers' development on phrasal items (p. 21). A study conducted by Pecorari and Shaw in 2012 verified that university teachers whose L1 was not English agreed with the use of this kind of strategy (in Davis & Morley, 2015). Nonetheless, the activity of "taking out" phrases is applied when it is appropriate and with shorter chunks as much more preferable (Flowerdew & Li, 2007, in Flowerdew, 2016). It should also be taken into account that those are not always of fixed phrases and that it is flexible to replace reporting verbs and subjects.

Various key terms have started to emerge with the growing amount of literature on the study of phrases. Due to the inconsistent naming aside from being treated as academic, there are many terms for academic phrases introduced by some scholars. Some of which will be broken down in the following sections.

2.1.1. Terms for Academic Phrases

2.1.1.1. Sentence Stems

Academic phrases have come along with different terms. Hinkel (2004) copes with learning English sentence structure "in contextual lexicalized chunks and sentence stems" in academic discourse (p. 38). She asserts that these linguistic features enhance the proficiency of learners' especially non-native writers with academic text. Concurring with the same terminology, Otávio (2013), in his review article entitled "70 useful sentences for academic writing," listed words from his MA dissertation in the late 90s. He labels those words as sentence stems as a few words precede the following clauses that bear ideas.

An insightful collection of sentence stems, which can be translated as recurrent patterned expressions, is provided in the matter of vocabulary and grammatical repertoire (Hinkel, 2004). The list comes with examples under the headings of openings, thesis, secondary purpose (if needed), and rhetorical mode as shown below.

a. Openings:

- *The development of xxx is a typical/common problem in . . .*
- *For a long time xxx, it has been the case that yyy.*

- *Most accounts/reports/publications claim/state/maintain that xxx.*

b. Thesis:

- *The purpose of this essay/paper/analysis/overview is to xxx.*
- *This paper describes and analyzes . . .*
- *My aim in this paper is to . . .*

c. Secondary purposes:

- *Another reason/point/issue addressed/discussed in this paper is yyy.*
- *A secondary aim of this paper is to yyy.*
- *Additionally, yyy is discussed/examined.*

d. Rhetorical mode:

- *This paper (will) compare(s)/describe/illustrate xxx first by . . .*
- *This paper first analyzes/discuss xxx, followed by . . .*

2.1.1.2. Signal Phrases

Besides Hinkel's (2004) collection, another term for academic phrases is introduced by Graff and Birkenstein (2009) through their book entitled "They Say, I Say: The Moves that Matter in Academic Writing." In contrast to the previous assembled term,

they name these phrases as “signal phrases” which are indicated according to their respective functions. This term also corroborates the fact that there is indeed a need to signal some parts within a text, i.e., research papers or articles (Zeiger, 1991, in Marco, 1997).

Graff and Birkenstein (2009) suggest the use of templates for the development of ideas for writing and engagement into the academic and critical thinking through moves (p. 1-2). Templates, in this context, are described as a formula concocted to enlighten the sense of expressing our own ideas as well as delivering what other people say or think that can be supportive to what we say or think. It is also said that the formula encourages writers to project their opinions and develop arguments towards an idea that they think is not in their favor.

Signal phrases that can be used to take notes—summarize, paraphrase, and quote—and carry out moves are shown below under the headings: (1) capturing authorial action, (2) introducing and explaining quotations, (3) introducing statistics or “standard views,” (4) introducing contrasting arguments, and (5) expressing authorial opinions.

a. Capturing authorial action

- *X acknowledges/concedes/believes that . . .*
- *X questions whether . . .*

b. Introducing/explaining quotations

- *X complicates matters further when he writes, ". . ."*
- *In making this comment, X argues that . . .*
- *X's view confirms/reaffirms/clarifies the view that . . .*

c. Introducing standard views

- *Americans today tend to believe that . . .*
- *Conventional wisdom has it that . . .*

d. Introducing contrasting arguments

- *A number of sociologists have recently suggested that X's work has several fundamental problems . . .*
- *It has become common today to dismiss X's contribution to the field of sociology.*

e. Expressing authorial opinions

- *While it is true that . . . , it does not necessarily follow that . . .*
- *But the view that . . . does not fit all the facts.*
- *Yet a sober analysis of the matter reveals . . .*

2.1.1.3. Starter Phrases

The Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology (2012) supports the rather similar terminology by assembling the phrases

and labeling them as “starter phrases.” This assembly is based on Swales and Feak’s (1994) notion on “syntactic borrowing—a useful strategy to borrow words and phrases of others” (p. 125). The starter phrases listed are content free. Students should be able to fetch phrases that accord with their disciplines since these phrases are mostly general. (See Appendix 1 for examples.)

2.1.1.4. Academic Phrases

Unlike those mentioned above, academic phrases can also be “innominate” as most of them are extracted from either analyses on the textual organization of texts and their moves and steps, published masters dissertations, or research articles. This term is widely used in general public. Hammond (2014) specifically regards these kinds of phrases as generic academic phrases due to their formality and practicality (p. 495). The notion as to where most of the phrases are found becomes the basis for reasoning. The same name is also operated by Davis and Morley (2015) to refer to the selected phrases used in their study. There is still no definite explaining on this but it is very likely that they acknowledge how those phrases are academic based on their common usage in certain types of texts. Academic phrases are basically general that they can very well be accessible to a wider public.

A friendly resource for academic phrases that has been accepted to which most academic writers refer is a set of non-textual phrases from the *Academic Phrasebank*. It is a free, available online service that is firstly intended for student writers of L2 and yet student writers of L1 also utilize the source and find it helpful. Aside from the site version and downloadable material, the *Academic Phrasebank* is, as claimed in Morley (2014), "an approach to analyzing academic texts" established from Swales' (1981, 1990) works. Swales' definition of a move that conveys a communicative function is used as a reference to sub-categories of the phrases in the *Academic Phrasebank.* Additionally, it is said that not only are the works about moves and steps in each section of a text, they also shed some light on "the kind of language used to achieve the communicative purpose of each move" by using academic phrases. As for the source, the majority of phrases are from authentic academic sources of which the original corpora are 100 completed postgraduate dissertations from the University of Manchester and research articles from many different disciplines.

There have been an insignificant number of studies on academic phrases that incorporate the use of the *Academic Phrasebank.* To name one, a study by Davis and Morley (2015) aimed at investigating the acceptability of recycling phrases most of which were mainly taken from the *Academic Phrasebank* as in

academic writing, such activity can contribute to an act of plagiarism (p. 20). It was then unveiled that the re-use of academic phrases is conditionally acceptable seeing that phrases are useful in helping students in their thinking and academic texts reading, as well as in organizing ideas and improving writing style. It also includes as to what extent the phrases are used and whether the phrases are accepted by members of a certain academic community.

On a side note, a claim has been addressed on the existence of the source. It is argued that how such source provides students with compiled phrases will only "spoil" rather than train the students to use the phrases or form on their own (Hammond, 2014, p. 495). The possibility of faulty use without context in some cases is issued. Yet again, a suggestion that there will be necessity to substitute academic content phrases to fit in the context of respective disciplines negates the problem (Morley, 2014). The academic content phrases needed to be substituted as a case in point are otherwise stated in boldface following Morley's (2014) format, as in *X is a major* ***public health*** *problem, and the cause of* . . . and *X is the leading cause of death in* ***western-industrialised countries***. (See Appendix 2 for more examples.)

2.2. Introduction of a Research Paper

A research paper introduction is illustrated as a frame (in The genre of research articles: Introduction sections, 2013) of a picture—the research of a specified discipline. The Introduction usually "anchors" audience to be informed and on track on what the paper is about; problems being issued, arguments being provoked, findings to support, and future results to be foreseen. This specific section is especially salient as it holds a controlling role within all kinds of writings. Similarly, Day (1998) states that the Introduction should guide the reader through the entire framework of a paper and allow the reader to understand what the deal is about.

As Berg (2001) considers it as a map, plans and outlines are poured to the very first section or chapter of the writing; the outlines give the audience directions within the read throughout (p. 273). Other than a map, Perry et al. (2003) refer to Introduction as "an executive summary that gives the reader an enticing glimpse of what is to come" (in Kotzé, 2007). While Perry et al. (2003) believe that a good Introduction must be able to draw the attention of the reader, it is also said that "the Introduction must effectively 'sell' the study" (Day, 1998, p. 33; Summers, 2001, p. 410).

An Introduction is seen in two different lights. In accordance with its length, Swales and Feak (1994) justify that the parting of the section can be different. As a general-specific (GS) type, an Introduction can appear separately in one chapter found in most longer research papers (Swales & Feak, 1994, p. 33). At the same time, an Introduction can somehow be composed into one particular section at the beginning of the paper of much shorter pieces of writing. As cited in Kotzé (2007),

Perry et al. (2003) recommend a relative number of words for the Introduction to be about 500-1000 words for its length. In addition, even though the Introduction is necessarily placed in the first section, most experienced and knowledgeable writers and researchers write their report introductions last so that the findings and results of the study can be considerably deduced (Day, 1998; Derntl, 2014).

Conceiving different characteristics, Introductions have become the most studied area from across disciplines and in many languages. Amirian and Tavakoli (2010) analyzed and compared Introduction sections of applied linguistic research articles (RAs) in English and Persian languages. The findings of the data of 30 English RAs from various fields published in 2000-2007, 30 Persian RAs from journals of several universities published in 1997-2007, and 30 unpublished English RAs written by Persian writers showed some similarities and differences in frequency, sequence, and communicative functions of moves and steps amongst RAs from the two languages. It was also unveiled that differences between English and Persian RAs were due to EFL writers' insufficient knowledge or awareness of genre conventions of RA writing in English and influence of cultural conventions on RA writing in Persian. These differences were thought to be sort of obstruction to get EFL writers' RAs published.

Moving on to another facet, Dueñas (2010) examined the rhetorical structure of RA introductions in Business Management (English-Spanish) and compared both English and Hispanic articles. Dueñas found significant differences in the rhetorical organization from three RAs of each of the four journals published in 2003 and 2004—forming a four-move model for English

RAs with hypotheses as the most established. Consubstantial research had been carried out also across different languages, such as, Brazilian Portuguese, Chinese, Thai, Arabic, and so on (Fakhri, 2004; Hirano, 2009; Jogthong, 2001; Loi, 2010).

2.2.1. Purposes and Contents of an Introduction

Swales and Feak (1994) point out purposes—main and secondary—of the Introduction as follows:

> The main purpose of the Introduction is to provide the rationale for the paper, moving from general discussion of the topic to the particular question or hypothesis being investigated. A secondary purpose is to attract interest in the topic—and hence readers. (p. 156)

These purposes are supported by Wilkinson (1991) that the Introduction is "to establish a framework for the research, so that readers can understand how it is related to other research" (p. 96).

An Introduction evolves more often than not around three main components: (1) a brief account of the problem of the study, (2) a review of related or previous studies, and (3) the purpose of the study (Wiyati, 2012, p. 27). Creswell (2003) has a rather similar proposition including research questions and delimitations and limitations for a qualitative type of research; theoretical perspective, research question or hypotheses, definition of terms, and delimitations and limitations for a quantitative type of research (p. 57-59). However, Day (1998), as opposed to Wiyati's favor, adds at least four more essential components that should be present in the section: (1) the method of the investigation, (2) the reason of the method chosen (if

necessary), (3) the principal results of the investigation, and (4) the principal conclusion(s) suggested by the results (p. 34). Above all, Swales and Feak (1994) again have done justice to the components of Introduction that it can include all to which they refer as moves (p. 175). Creswell (2003) essentially agrees to the concept since these kinds of shortages are common to appear differently from one study to another (p. 93).

2.2.2. Phrases in Realization of Moves in an Introduction

An Introduction as a sub-part of a bigger constitution conceives a string of textual functions that are conveyed through moves. A move denotes a part of text representing linguistic units with specific purposes (Connor et al., 2007; Swales, 2004, in Amnuai & Wannaruk, 2012). The moves serve to achieve communicative purposes of the introductory portions and are correlated with linguistic items as a means of conveyance (Swales, 1990). These items can be realized by the use of signaling phrases.

In light of presenting the move structure, model frameworks for moves have been established. Swales (1990) principally offers a model by which he believes all article introductions are constructed. The first construction of a four-move structural model was generated in 1981 from his findings on similarities of research article introductions from many diverse fields of study. The former model went through some modification which resulted in the creation of a three-move model called “Creating a Research Space” (CARS) in 1990. The model was then revised again in

2004 with omissions and additions of some moves, and reconstructions of the other.

Table 2.1 shows an example of the CARS model which consists of three moves: (1) establishing a territory, (2) establishing a niche, and (3) occupying the niche; each move comprises several steps.

MOVE 1: Establishing a territory	**MOVE 2: Establishing a niche**	**MOVE 3: Occupying the niche**
• Step 1: Claiming centrality • Step 2: Making topic generalization(s) • Step 3: Reviewing items of previous research	• Step 1A: Counter-claiming • Step 1B: Indicating a gap • Step 1C: Question raising • Step 1D: Continuing a tradition	• Step 1A: Outlining purposes • Step 1B: Announcing present research • Step 2: Announcing principal findings • Step 3: Indicating RA structure

Table 2.1 CARS model by Swales (1990)

Since moves share such a symbiotic relationship with linguistic items, i.e., word and phrase level, below are illustrations given to demonstrate the correlation between the two facets. This illustration is conducted in order to show how generic standard phrases serve to accomplish the communicative functions carried by these moves (Morley, 2014). Swales' (1990) model above is put to use for the sake of giving instances and only the academic phrases are given. To enlighten more, traits indicating each move are stated in bold. (Phrases are taken from http://www.cs.tut.fi/)

a) Move 1: Establishing a territory

- Step 1: Claiming centrality
  - *Recently, there has been **wide interest** in . . .*
  - *The effect of . . . **has been studied extensively** in recent years.*
  - *Knowledge of . . . has **great importance** for . . .*
- Step 2: Making topic generalization(s)
  - *It is **generally accepted** that . . .*
  - *A **standard procedure** for assessing . . . has been . . .*
  - *There is now **much evidence** to support the hypothesis that . . .*
- Step 3: Reviewing items of previous research
  - *Data have been presented **in the literature** . . . which suggest that . . .*
  - *Observations by **Smith (1989)** suggest that . . .*

b) Move 2: Establishing a niche

- Step 1A: Counter-claiming
  - ***However**, this view **is challenged** by recent data showing . . .*

- *. . . these approaches become **increasingly unreliable** when . . .*

- Step 1B: Indicating a gap
  - *A considerable amount of research has been . . . **but little research** . . .*
  - ***However**, **less attention** has been paid to . . .*
  - ***Despite** the importance of . . . , **few** researchers have studied . . .*
- Step 1C: Raising a question
  - ***However**, **it is not clear whether** the use of . . .*
  - ***In spite of** these early observations, the mechanism . . . has **remained unclear**.*
- Step 1D: Continuing a tradition
  - *These differences **need to** be analyzed . . .*
  - ***Hence**, additional studies of . . . **are needed**.*
  - *It is **desirable** to carry out surveys of . . .*

c) Move 3: Occupying the niche

- Step 1A: Outlining purposes
  - *The **objective** of this **research was** to quantify . . .*
  - ***Our purpose was** to describe . . .*

- *The **aim** of this **paper is** to . . .*

- Step 1B: Announcing present research
  - *In this paper, **we attempt** to develop . . .*
  - ***This paper evaluates** the effect on . . .*

- Step 2: Announcing principal findings
  - *This **approach provides** effective . . .*
  - *Our **results indicate** that this method is effective in . . .*

- Step 3: Indicating structure of the paper
  - *We have **organized** the rest of this paper in the following way . . .*
  - *This paper is **structured** as follows . . .*

2.3. *Skripsi* in English Department of UNJ

As generally described, *skripsi* is a type of scientific writing undergraduate students are required to do as the partial fulfilment in order to finish their study of *S1* program (Wirartha, 2006). Tatan (2012) proceeds to claim that *skripsi* is proof of the students' academic capability in research they are doing with a corresponding topic to their field of study. Djarwanto (2006), confirming the first definition, also describes *skripsi* as a scientific study by students based on the research with analyses of primer and secondary data (in Isnaini, 2011).

There are many variations of *skripsi* in terms of pattern, structure, and style. Despite having divergences, all similarities a *skripsi* has consolidate into the main structural organization (Insaini, 2011; Putri, 2014). Isnaini (2011) and Putri (2014), in their respective studies, identify the main structure of *skripsi*, including (1) abstract, (2) acknowledgement, (3) introduction, (4) literature review, (5) methodology and data description, (6) findings and discussion, (7) conclusion, (8) suggestion and recommendation, and (9) references.

Practically, most *skripsi* in English Department of UNJ are written, adhering to the main structure for its format. ED students all massively write their *skripsi* in chapters for some of the abovementioned sections. The description of how the chapters work within *skripsi* is shown in Table 2.2 below (Isnaini, 2011; Putri, 2014).

Chapters	Rhetorical Function
Introduction	Revealing background of study, problem statement, purpose or aim of the study, limitation of the study, and significance of the study
Literature review	Consisting of the key terminology and definition, literature of the past relevant research, and data supporting the study
Methodology	Describing the research design or method used to carry out the study, including time, place, and correspondence of the study; data collection; and data analysis

Findings and discussion	Exhibiting what is found within the study and elaborating the findings, description, and discussion of the study
Conclusion and recommendation	Drawing conclusion and suggesting recommendation taken out from the study for future purposes

Table 2.2 Main structure of *skripsi* in ED

Skripsi has likewise been one of the subject matters worth a discussion that many students take account of, especially ED students of UNJ. Inshaf (2015) analyzed the process structure in the quotation in a total number of ten research articles and *skripsi* using SFL as the basis of the analysis. The results of the data showed that 62 and 99 quotations were found in research articles and *skripsi* respectively. He argued over the clear evidence that *skripsi* writers opted to make the most of quotations as idea support especially in literature review. As for the findings, verbal process held the highest rate of occurrence (55 occurrences) in *skripsi* quotations as a means of reporting ideas; while material process was the most frequently used process found in research article quotations though with a decreasing rate of 26 occurrences. These revelations somehow led to an indication that quotations in both corpora might be exposed to a liability of an act of plagiarism (Inshaf, 2015, p. 37).

The closest study found to the current one was conducted by Rahmawaty (2015). She took an interest in examining the rhetorical structure of Introduction sections in ELESP students' theses. The revised CARS model by Swales (2004) was used to analyze the data. Of the fifteen thesis introductions gathered from

year 2011 to 2015, most of the Introductions followed the patterns of CARS schema, although their sequences were disordered. All three of the moves with their steps and sub-steps were present roughly in all samples, yet again the patterns did not comply with the structure of the revised CARS model.

2.4. Theoretical Framework

The focus of this study is to find out the use of academic phrases in students' final research paper, i.e., *skripsi*. As suggested by their name, these phrases are essentially used in most academic texts. On account of varying titles, the term academic phrases is generally assigned, thus predominantly used throughout the study. Academic phrases as target items realize communicative functions achieved through moves and are thereby used to signal those functions within a text (Allen, 2016; Morley, 2014).

For investigatory purposes, this paper adheres to a framework established by Morley (2014) along with his collection of generic phrases for academic writing called the *Academic Phrasebank.* The employment of Morley's (2014) compendium is on the basis of covering more moves that other frameworks or models do not seem to cover. The resource will be used much as a reference for the objective as well as the analytical process of this study.

Following his naming on the headings of each section, a move in this perspective is addressed as a communicative function. There are approximately 17 headings in the Introduction section that are reduced and translated into 12 functions under which the phrases are categorized. These functions encompass (1)

establishing the importance of the topic, (2) synopsis of literature, (3) highlighting problems, (4) stating inadequacies of previous studies, (5) stating the focus, aim and purpose, (6) research questions, (7) synopsis of research method and source of data, (8) indicating significance, (9) indicating limitation, (10) giving reasons for personal interest, (11) outlining structure of the paper, and (12) explaining terminology.