# COMMUNICATIVE MOVES IN THE DISCUSSION SECTIONS OF EFL INDONESIAN VOCATIONAL COLLEGE STUDENTS

***Titik Rahayu[1], Muhyiddin Aziz[2], and Moh. Farid Maftuh[3]**
[1,2,3]State Polytechnic of Madiun, Indonesia
*correspondence: titikrahayu@pnm.ac.id
https://doi.org/10.37147/eltr.v7i1.167
received 22 October 2022; accepted 30 January 2023

**Abstract**
Studies on the move analysis in the various sections of research articles have developed rapidly. However, the studies on the communicative moves in the discussion section particularly written by vocational college students are still limited. In fact, those students categorized as the novice writers inevitably need illustrations of how to write the proper discussion related to their findings. Therefore, this study was aimed at exploring the communicative moves and the move cycle series in the discussion sections of the final project reports written by EFL vocational college students in one of the state polytechnics in Indonesia. The method used is a discourse analysis on 15 discussion sections. The results showed that Move II, Move IV, and Move I were used frequently in all students' discussion sections. Pertaining to the move cycle series, students fulfilled the rhetorical functions of introduction (1) and evaluation (4+2 or 2+4) but the cycle for showing the conclusion was commonly not used. The results provide references and the real applications pertinent to communication moves in the discussion section by EFL students.

**Keywords:** academic writing, communicative move, discussion section

## Introduction

Studies on the move analysis in the various sections of a research article have developed rapidly. For example, research dealing with abstracts has taken a high interest during the past five years (e.g. Amnuai, 2019; Li, 2020; Rashidi & Meihami, 2018; Tanko, 2017; Tocalo, 2021). The introduction sections have been taken to some various studies (e.g. Indrian & Ardi, 2019; Lu et al., 2020; Rahayu, et al.; Saricaoglu et al., 2021). The number of studies on rhetorical moves in the abstracts and introductions have developed variously in the broader contexts. The discussion sections also drew some researchers' attention (e.g. Irawati, 2022; Suherdi et al., 2020). However, the studies on the communicative moves in the discussion section particularly written by students enrolled in the Diploma program are still limited. In fact, those students can be categorized as the novice writers that still need illustrations of how to write the proper discussion related to their findings.

Some prior studies have investigated the discussion sections in the level of an undergraduate or postgraduate writing. The studies used different move structures suggested by some authors to analyse the discussion section. Warsito et al. (2017) investigated the rhetorical analysis on the discussion sections of English master thesis by following the model of Loan and Pramoolsook (2015). Suherdi et al. (2020) analysed the findings and discussion of research articles from undergraduate theses of EFL students. Irawati (2022) investigated the discussion sections using a different method in which she interviewed the writers to find out the potentials factors that result the rhetorical patterns in the discussion sections. However, those studies have a scope for investigating the writing products written by university students. For the vocational college students, they have a real challenge dealing with the discussion sections. If referring to discussion in the research articles, there should be some moves to follow for sharing profound understanding on a particular field.

Therefore, this current research investigated the communicative moves sections and the move cycle series used in the discussion section. The results may provide significance for the development of writing quality of EFL vocational college students. Knowing the findings on the moves and the cycles may provide a typicality and issues of the discussion development in the context of vocational college. Moreover, this kind of study has an opportunity to give a variety on the move analysis related to discussion sections in general. The patterns can be insights as a teaching and learning materials in lectures or during the supervising research period.

## Literature Review
### *Exploration of meanings of a discussion section*

In research articles, discussion is presented after an abstract, an introduction, a method, and sometimes it is combined with findings. Based on some theories, a discussion itself has moves and cycles to achieve its purpose.

The discussion section has to provide the crucial part of the researcher's findings called interpretations of the studies (Loan & Pramoolsook, 2015). The interpretation may refer to the numerical data, tables, or any data display in the researcher's findings. If there is no interpretation, the data shown will be useless and meaningless that cannot be connected to any literature review.

According to Şanlı et al. (2013), the length of discussion section should be completed within six to seven paragraphs. This section should not be longer than other sections. They divided the discussion section into three namely introductory paragraph, intermediate paragraphs, and concluding paragraph. Şanlı et al. (2013) mentioned the common mistakes made in writing the discussions section is related to the literature review that is not closely related to the results. Moreover, the important mistake is related to giving too many insignificant references.

A discussion section has three parts namely introductory, intermediate, and concluding paragraph. The introductory paragraph provides the main idea of the problems of the report. In the intermediate paragraph of the discussion section, the writer should mention "constrained" and "not too strongly assertive" statements. In the last paragraph, future directions or potential clinical applications may be emphasized.

The common mistake while developing the discussion section is that the writer has a favour to include or to mention all literature references. The discussion is not for reviewing literature; therefore, the literature should be related to the problems discussed in the study. Too much references and irrelevant references will decrease the quality of the article. Hence, the writers have to focus on the relevancy of the references cited in this section with the results.

Şanlı et al. (2013) concluded that the major points that the writer has to remember is that he or she should apply some principles. As the first principle, simplicity is related to the way the writer shows the references with the findings and interpret them without adding more questions related to the study. The second principle, clarity, is related to the language to realize the ideas. Lastly, the effectiveness principle is pertinent to the number of references used whether they are relevant or not. The common mistakes and the principles of developing the discussion section are significant to be learned by the writer to achieve the quality research article.

### Moves in the discussion section

Moves in the discussion section are examined by some authors that in some ways the moves are similar or completed one another. They have different terms to define the moves and also add or simplify some moves based on their thoughts of effectiveness and simplicity. Table 1 depicts some structures of the moves in the discussion section by five authors.

Table 1. The structure of the communicative moves from authors

| Author | Structure |
| --- | --- |
| Swales (1990) | M1 (Background information) – M2 (Statement of results) – M3 ((Un)expected outcome) – M4 (reference to previous research) - M5 (Explanation) – M6 (Exemplification) – M7 (Deduction and Hypothesis) – M8 (Recommendation) |
| Holmes (1997) | M1 (Background information) – M2 (Statement of results) – M3 ((Un)expected outcome) – M4 (reference to previous research) - M5 (Explanation of unsatisfactory result) – M6 (Generalization) – M7 (Recommendation) – M8 (Outlining parallel or Subsequent developments) |
| Lewin, Fine, & Young (2001) | M1 (report accomplishments) – M2 (evaluate congruence of findings to other criteria – M3 (offer interpretation) – M4 (ward off counterclaims) – M5 (state implications) |
| Peacock (2002) | M1 (Background information) – M2 (Finding) – M3 (Expected or unexpected outcome) – M4 (reference to previous research) - M5 (Explanation) – M6 (Claim) – M7 (Limitation) – M8 (Recommendation) |
| Ruiying & Allison (2003) | M1 (Background information) – M2 (Reporting results) – M3 (Summarizing results) – M4 (Commenting on results) - M5 (Summarizing the study) – M6 (Evaluating the study) – M7 (Deductions from the research) |

Swales (1990) listed eight moves that become the basic concept of the development of communicative moves in the discussion section by the other authors like Holmes (1997), Peacock (2002), and Ruiying and Allison (2003). From the move structure above, it can be seen that Lewin et al. (2001) has the major

difference in formulation the moves into 5 moves initialized by the report accomplishments. The various move structures of the discussion section above have no urgency to achieve a uniform agreement (Peacock, 2002). The available model can be used as references and considered to be applied by previously identifying the suitability with the context.

Peacock (2002) revised a model of moves in discussion made by Dudley-Evans (1994). Peacock suggested discussion sections have a three-part framework involving a series of move cycles combining two or more of these following eight moves:

1. Background information
   This move shows the background about theory/research aims/methodology.
2. Finding
   This move can be with or without a reference to a graph or table.
3. Expected or unexpected outcome
   This move provides comments on whether the result is expected or not.
4. Reference to previous research
   This move provides the relevance of the results with the previous research or theories.
5. Explanation
   This move exposes the reasons for expected or unexpected results.
6. Claim
   This move gives contribution to research (sometimes with recommendations for action)
7. Limitation
   It sets the limitation of the research to give possible recommendation for further research.
8. Recommendation
   This move provides suggestions for future research.

The eight moves listed above are the revised version of the previous one which consists of nine moves. Peacock previously put "the statement of result" in Move 2 and "findings" in Move 3. Then, he decided to combine the Move 2 into findings by adding a detailed definition to cover the area of the statement of the result The eight moves, then, are categorized into some typical move cycles to achieve rhetorical functions for the data interpretation the discussion sections. In this current study, the moves suggested by Peacock (2002) is used by seeing the simplicity of the moves to be applied in the EFL learner context that has a tendency to develop more simplified research implication.

### *Move cycles in discussion section*

The communicative moves create a move structure that can be categorized into some move cycles. Peacock (2002) categorized the pattern of the eight moves into three move cycle series. The series comprise the introduction, evaluation, and conclusion. Each of the rhetorical functions is explained as follows.

1. Introduction
   The introduction here sets the scene for the whole discussion by restating the aim and briefly describing the work carried out (Dudley-Evans, 1994). In some cases, there is a summary of the method used, restatement of the

relevant theory or previous research or, in some cases, a statement of the main results/findings of the research. It has a pattern that shows moves 1, or 2, or 6.

2. Evaluation
This cycle provides detailed comment on the key results and the writer's main claims (Dudley-Evans, 1994). The key move cycles are 2+4, 2+6, 3+4, and 3+5. Other less common cycles are 6+4 and 4+6.

3. Conclusion
The conclusion summarizes the main results and claims before making recommendations about future work (Dudley-Evans, 1994). It has a pattern that shows moves 2+6, or 8, or 8+6, or 7+6.

Knowing the cycle is important as a basic interpretation how the occurrence of Move 1 till Move 8 achieves the three main parts of the discussion section. The awareness that the scope of the discussion section is not mainly about evaluation is the attention of evaluating the cycles from the moves.

**Method**
This research was conducted by analysing the final project reports particularly the discussion section written by six-semester students of English Study Program in one of state polytechnic in Indonesia. The ideas in this section were analysed by using a discourse analysis to achieve the research objectives on rhetorical moves and move cycles.

The data in this research were the discussion sections of final project reports. The topics for their final project report fell within tourism and journalism. For finishing the process on writing final project reports, each student was guided by two advisors. The first advisor and the second advisor worked together to give assistance to the students by at least giving 8 times for consultation during approximately 5 months. The process was begun by deciding the topics first and research problems, then it was continued to work on the first chapter.

The studies on the topics tourism and journalism are limited to the level of low analysis. The characteristic of a Diploma program has the learning outcome on the application of the theory that is different from universities. Hence, students are only allowed to use a descriptive qualitative or quantitative method to complete their research. Before writing final project reports, the students get the guidelines for writing final project reports. The title of the book is "Apprenticeship and Final Project Handbook". In the guidelines, the discussion should describe the findings by comparing the finding to the existing theories. It is also suggested that opinions or theories in discussion should strengthen or contrast with the findings to achieve a credible result.

The researchers selected 15 discussion sections considered randomly. The limitation of the data taken was under a consideration to look in depth either the communicative moves and the move cycles. The move identification was be based on the revised moves of Peacock (2002) and also was analysed according to the three move cycle series. The move cycle consists of introduction, evaluation, and conclusion.

The data collection was conducted in the second semester of the academic year of 2021/2022. The period of the semester was started from January till June

2022. The researchers selected 15 reports from students' final project reports randomly. The purpose is to find the variations on the occurrence of the eight moves in the discussion section regardless the grades or the advisors. To obtain the data, the researchers communicated with the students for the file compilation. As the detailed procedure, the researchers collected the files in the form of pdf files in a full format of Final Project Report. Then, the files were saved in Google Drive to be accessed by all members of the team for a further investigation.

The instruments for analysing the data were in the forms of notes, tables, and a discussion move framework suggested by Peacock (2002). The instruments were meaningful to find out the distribution of each move in the students' discussion sections. The discussion sections were analysed manually by the researchers. A guideline is used as a tool to make the process focus on the research problems and literatures. Notes are used for writing some important points taken from the texts. This research was done by analysing the two formulated steps. First, the researchers analysed the eight communicative moves including the structures, the frequency, and the distribution of the moves in the discussion section. Second, the researchers interpreted the move cycles by focusing on the functions of introduction, evaluation, or conclusion. The two steps were done systematically to decide the communicative moves and the cycles. To obtain the reliability of the data, the analysis was conducted by all members to discuss the agreement in the identification and categorization of the moves.

**Findings and Discussion**
***The communicative moves in the students' discussion sections***
The communicative moves in the discussion sections written by vocational college students were divided into one to two points for each data. It means under the discussion sections there were two points to be discussed. The points were developed based on students' research questions in Chapter 1. The codes are Point a and Point b.

Out of the eight moves, one move which is not used by the students is Move VII (showing limitation). Although the other seven moves were found in the students' discussion, the frequency indicates a variation in number. The students' discussion sections were commonly started by Move 1 to show the information regarding the first point (Point a) to be discussed. For Point b, the students started with either Move 1 or directly discussed the reference to previous research (Move IV). The complete data describing the move structures and Move I till VIII are listed in Table 2.

As seen in Table 2, the communicative move that have the highest percentage is Move II (finding) with 44,51%. The following position is Move IV (reference to previous research) with 33,52%. The third position is Move 1 (information move) with 13,29 %. To have a comprehensive understanding related to the percentage, the occurrence of the communicative moves is connected with the move structures for each discussion. The common structure is I-IV-II. The sample can be seen in Excerpt 1.

Excerpt 1
*Traveling is an activity that is carried out individually or in groups to go to a place with the aim of having fun. Nowadays, there are so many different kinds of*

*tourist attractions, it is no wonder that most of the human hobbies are traveling. According to Oka in Saldafri and Rizka (2020) argues that a tourist attraction is a place, which attracts tourist visits. The place has resources, both natural and artifical tourism, such as natural beauty, mountain, coastal flora and fauna, ancient historical buildings, monuments, temples, dances and other cultural characteristics.*

    *Based on the result, Plaza Bukit Surga is tourist attraction that has a fairly simple tourist concept, namely by presenting the natural beauty of the surrounding hills. Besides, Plaza Bukit Surga also provided the cool air, so the tourists can feel comfortable while on this tourist attraction. …*

Table 2. The communicative moves in the discussion sections

| Data | Point | Move Structures | Frequency of the Moves | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | I | II | III | IV | V | IV | VII | VIII |
| 1 | a | I-IV-II-II-II-II-II-II-II | 1 | 8 | | 1 | | | | |
| | b | I-IV- II-II-II-II-II | | 5 | | 1 | | | | |
| 2 | a | IV-I-IV-II-II-II-II-VI-II-VI | 1 | 5 | | 2 | | 2 | | |
| | b | IV-IV-II-IV-II-II-II-II-VI-II-VI-VIII | | 6 | | 3 | | 2 | | 1 |
| 3 | a | I-IV-II | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | | |
| | b | I-IV-II | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | | |
| 4 | a | I-IV-II-IV | 1 | 1 | | 2 | | | | |
| | b | I-IV-II | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | | |
| 5 | a | I-IV-II-IV-III | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| | b | IV-II-IV-II | | 2 | | 2 | | | | |
| 6 | a | I-II-IV- II-IV- II-IV-II-IV | 1 | 4 | | 4 | | | | |
| | b | IV-II | | 1 | | 1 | | | | |
| 7 | a | I-II-IV-VI-II-VI-II | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | | | |
| | b | II-IV-II | | 2 | | 1 | | | | |
| 8 | a | I-II-IV-IV-II-III-V | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | | | |
| | b | I-IV-II- | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | | |
| 9 | a | I-IV-IV-II-IV-II- IV-II- | 1 | 3 | | 4 | | | | |
| | b | I-IV-II- | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | | |
| 10 | a | I-IV-II-IV-IV-II-II-II | 1 | 4 | | 3 | | | | |
| | b | II-IV-IV-II-IV-II-IV-II-III | | 4 | 1 | 4 | | | | |
| 11 | | I-IV-I-II-II-II-II-III | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| 12 | a | I-IV-II-III | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| | b | IV-IV-II | | 1 | | 2 | | | | |
| 13 | a | I-II-IV- IV-II-IV-II-IV- IV-II-III | 1 | 4 | 1 | 5 | | | | |
| | b | IV-II-III | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| 14 | a | I-II-IV-II-IV-II | 1 | 3 | | 2 | | | | |
| | b | II-IV-II-IV-IV-II | | 3 | | 3 | | | | |
| 15 | a | I-IV-I-IV-II-III | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| | b | I-II-IV-II-V | 1 | 2 | | 1 | 1 | | | |
| | | Percentage of each move (%) | 13,29 | 44,51 | 4,62 | 33,52 | 1,15 | 2,31 | 0 | 0,58 |

    In the context built in Excerpt 1, the writer discusses her topic related to tourist attractions as the restatement for her background. She continued by referring to a particular theory pertinent to the definition of a tourist attraction from its scope.

In the following paragraph, she restates the findings about an attraction that seems to refer to the data displayed in her findings.

The other finding shows the similar structure but with a different order I-II-IV. The sample for this structure is shown in Excerpt 2.

Excerpt 2

*Magetan Park is one of the adventure tourist attractions which was inaugurated in 2019. With the inauguration in 2019 it can be said that Magetan Park is a new tourist spot. New tourism that must be introduced to the wider community so that its existence is maintained even during the covid-19 pandemic. In a covid-19 situation like this, extra effort is needed by the Magetan Park management to promote this new ride during the covid-19 pandemic. This is comparable with the theory According Supriadi and Roedjinandasari in Hamida (2021:34) promotion is one of effort from seller or producer to inform their services or products to the coustumer, so the buyer or costumer interested to do the transaction of purche sold or offered.*

*Based on the data that are gained by the writer through interview, observation, and documentation the management promote Magetan Park during covid-19 namely by focusing more on using social media owned by Magetan Park. With a focus on promotion through social media, Magetan Park spreads brochures or makes videos of visitors who come and share via Instagram feeds, Instagram stories, WhatApps stories, and Facebook. ...*

As seen in Excerpt 2, the writer has a similar topic in a tourism area but has a focus on the promotion during pandemic Covid-19. She starts with a basic knowledge on that research area and continues with a statement of promotion from a reference. In the following paragraph, she refers to the data in the findings by explicitly restating the data techniques in gaining her qualitative data. She describes in specific what promotion strategies used by the management to cope with the challenges during Covid-19 pandemic.

From the findings above, the students commonly used the Move 1, Move 2, and Move 4 in their discussion sections of FPRs. The move structures have the combination of the three moves. They began their discussion by stating some basic background about their topic. The Move 1, then, is followed by either Move 2 or Move IV to provide an emphasis of a reference to previous research and the findings of the previous section in FPRs.

The communicative moves modified by Peacock (2002) were found to be used in almost the similar patterns in all students' final project reports. The students used Move 4, Move 2, and Move 1 for developing the ideas in the discussion section. It is unlike the context of a research article as shown in Le and Harrington (2015). In their research, interpreting result has a highest frequency. The term of interpreting result in this current study is related to Move 2.

This current finding is also different from that of Asari et al. (2018). In their research on 89 research articles of English language teaching learning taken from 4 nationally accredited journals of Language teaching and learning, it was found that the writers had a tendency to have a characteristic in developing their discussion section. They preceded the section with the statement of research result. Afterwards, they add explanation, reference to previous researchers, and deduction

and hypothesis. The statement of the result can be connected with the Move 2 in this study.

Similarly, Liu and Buckingham (2018) had a study on the moves on 20 empirical data-driven research articles selected from two high-impact internationally refereed journals in the field of applied linguistics. As the result, it was found that reporting results and comparing results with literature has the highest frequency. Related to this current study, the study of Liu and Buckingham (2018) showed the moves M2 – M4.

The results of the current study with those studies are different in the context of the sequence of the moves that in this context the students tend to use Move 4 + Move 2. In the studies by Asari et al. (2018) and Liu and Buckingham (2018) showed the tendency of showing Move 2 + Move 4. This current study used the communicative moves from Peacock (2002), but in their research they used various move structures from two sources suggested by Swales (1990) and Yang and Allison (2003).

### *The move cycle series in the students' discussion sections*

The move cycle series include three main points in discussion section. First, introduction describes the basic knowledge of the problem(s). Second, evaluation that provides comment on the key findings. Lastly, conclusion summarizes the main results and claims before stating recommendations to the future studies. The ideal discussion should fill those functions to explore the problem(s) in depth.

From the analysis of the communicative moves and the move structures, the researchers interpreted the functions of the distributions of those moves into three main functions consisting of the introduction, evaluation, and conclusion. There is a generalization for the structures for each cycle by avoiding the repetition of the same structure from each data.  The complete depiction of the move cycle series is shown in Table 3.

In the table, the move cycle series in three functions of the discussion sections. The move cycle series fall into two functions which are the introduction and evaluation. The introduction has the same move cycle that consists of Move 1. In Point a, all the paragraphs were initialized by Move I. However, in Point b, some students have a tendency to skip the point b. Then, for evaluation students use two common moves occurred in a high frequency. The cycle series include 4+2 and 2+4 by showing a rare variation of Move 3 or 5.  For the last rhetorical function which is conclusion, only one student states it for their discussion. The missing statement of conclusion is the characteristic of the majority of the students' discussion sections.

Furthermore, the evaluation function was also reflected with Move III, with combination of 4+3, 3+4, or 2+3. The cycle means the occurrence of the theories not only followed with findings, but also an expected or unexpected outcome. This variation seems to appear eight times. This cycle showed profound understanding on the use of the term "evaluation" by giving judgment on the application of a certain issue compared to a particular theory.

The move cycle series categorized by Peacock (2002) include three main parts of rhetorical functions in the discussion section. Those parts are introduction, evaluation, and conclusion that has their own characteristics on the sequence of the moves. The results of this current study showed that that the discussion section is

developed with the introduction and evaluation. The occurrence of conclusion was not found in their discussion.

Table 3. Move cycle series in the discussion sections

| Data | Points | Move cycle series | | |
|------|--------|-------------------|------------|------------|
| | | Introduction | Evaluation | Conclusion |
| 1 | a | 1 | 4+2 | x |
| | b | 1 | 4+2 | x |
| 2 | a | 4+1 | 4+2 | 6 |
| | b | x | 4+2 | 6+8 |
| 3 | a | 1 | 4+2 | x |
| | b | 1 | 4+2 | x |
| 4 | a | 1 | 4+2 | x |
| | b | 1 | 4+2 | x |
| 5 | a | 1 | 4+2, 4+3 | x |
| | b | x | 4+2 | x |
| 6 | a | 1 | 2+4 | x |
| | b | x | 4+2 | x |
| 7 | a | 1 | 2+4 | x |
| | b | x | 2+4 | x |
| 8 | a | 1 | 2+4, 3+4 | x |
| | b | 1 | 4+2 | x |
| 9 | a | 1 | 4+2 | x |
| | b | 1 | 4+2 | x |
| 10 | a | 1 | 4+2 | x |
| | b | x | 2+4+3 | x |
| 11 | | 1 | 4+1+2+3 | x |
| 12 | a | 1 | 4+2+3 | x |
| | b | x | 4+2 | x |
| 13 | a | 1 | 2+4+2+3 | x |
| | b | x | 4+2+3 | x |
| 14 | a | 1 | 2+4 | x |
| | b | x | 2+4 | x |
| 15 | a | 1 | 4+1+4+2+3 | x |
| | b | 1 | 2+4+2+5 | x |

This current finding is different from the result of Asari et al. (2018). In their study, the communicative moves used by the researchers in the article tend to achieve the three main rhetorical functions called introduction (statement of the research result), evaluation (statement of the research result, explanation, reference to previous research), and conclusion (deduction & hypothesis). The study of Suherdi et al. (2020) on undergraduate theses written by EFL students showed a similar result that the writers develop the introduction by providing background knowledge. The evaluation was done by reporting results and summarizing results. Lastly, for conclusion, they provided comments on their result for instance by giving recommendations using verbs like *suggest, need*, and *recommend.*

The current results reinforce the EFL students to develop conclusion in their discussion sections. The steps that can be followed by fulfilling the moves of claim, limitation, and recommendation. The EFL students may overlap of recommendation with the suggestion in the following chapter (the last chapter called conclusions and suggestions). However, there is a clear difference that recommendation in this part is related to the limitation of the research or the unexpected result that gives a gap for a recommendation.

**Conclusion**

Related to the communicative moves used, it was found that Move II, Move IV, and Move I commonly occurred in all the student's discussion section. The moves were used in different structures began by the Move I for providing the background information of the students' studies. Afterwards, the Move IV were occurred to show related references or theories regarding their issues. The references may refer to those that they have mentioned in the previous section called literature review. Then, the students used Move II to restate in brief the findings related to the issue being discussed. The students stating the findings in the forms of reporting the qualitative data from interview, observation, and/or documentation. Regarding the move cycle series from the communicative moves in the students' discussion, there is a tendency for students to fulfill the rhetorical function of introduction and evaluation. The cycle for showing the recommendation was commonly not found in their students' introduction section. Moreover, the cycle used for introduction is 1. The cycles for evaluation are either 4+2 or 2+4. Some suggestions are given related to communicative moves and move cycle series in the discussion of final project report. First, developing a relevant interpretation between findings and theories is challenging. The initial efforts that can be enforced to the students are building the students' awareness towards the rhetorical functions. Since there are many references of communicative moves especially for developing a discussion section, students would be widely exposed to the available theories. Second, the issue of the rhetorical function to achieve the recommendation should be raised in an EFL classroom to give an enlightenment that a recommendation in the discussion is necessary to be included. For future research, it is significant to conduct studies by discussing in-depth the citation efforts in the discussion section.

**References**

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

Asari, S., Kurnia, F.D., & Suharsono S. (2018). Ideas pattern manifested in rhetorical moves of English Language teaching and learning research articles discussion written by Indonesian English academics. *ELite Journal: International Journal of Education, Language, and Literature*, *1*(1), 83-92.

Dudley-Evans, T. (1994). Genre analysis: An approach to text analysis for ESP. In M. Coulthard (Ed.), *Advances in written text analysis* (pp. 219–228). London: Routledge.

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.

Indrian, R. D., & Ardi, P. (2019). Rhetorical structures of English-major undergraduate thesis introduction chapters. *Indonesian Journal of EFL and Linguistics, 4*(2), 195-214.

Irawati, L. (2022). Potential factors influencing the rhetorical patterns of research article discussion sections. *Studies in English Language and Education, 9*(1), 115-131.

Jurusan Administrasi Bisnis. (2020). *Panduan praktik kerja lapangan dan tugas akhir*. Madiun: Politeknik Negeri Madiun.

Le, T.N.P., & Harrington, M. (2015). Phraseology used to comment on results in the Discussion section of applied linguistics quantitative research articles. *English for Specific Purposes,* 39, 45-61. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2015.03.003

Lewin, B.A., Fine, J., & Young, L. (2001). *Expository discourse: A genre-based approach to social science research texts*. New York: Continuum

Li, X. (2020). Mediating cross-cultural differences in research article rhetorical moves in academic translation: A pilot corpus-based study of abstracts. *Lingua, 238,* 1-11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2020.102795

Liu, Y., & Buckingham, L. (2018). The schematic structure of discussion sections in applied linguistics and the distribution of metadiscourse markers. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 34, 97-109. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2018.04.002

Loan, N.T.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

Lu, X., Casal, J. E., & Liu, Y. (2020). The rhetorical functions of syntactically complex sentences in social science research article introductions. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *44,* 1-16. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2019.100832

Peacock, M. (2002). Communicative moves in the discussion section of research articles. *System, 30,* 479-497.

Rahayu, T., Permatasari, I., Mudofir, I., Sutantohadi, A., & Maftuh, M.F. (2022) Rhetorical moves in the background sections of EFL Indonesian vocational college students. *LLT Journal*, *25*(20), 660-670. https://doi.org/10.24071/llt.v25i2.4273

Rashidi, N., & Meihami, H. (2018). Informetrics of Scientometrics abstracts: A rhetorical move analysis of the research abstracts published in Scientometrics journal. *Scientometrics, 116*, 1975–1994. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-018-2795-6

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

Şanlı, Ö., Erdem, S., & Tefik, T. (2013). How to write a discussion section?. *Turkish Journal of Urology, 39,* 20-24.

Saricaoglu, A., Bilki, Z., & Plakans, L. (2021). Syntactic complexity in learner-generated research paper introductions: Rhetorical functions and level of move/step realization. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 53, 1-11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2021.101037

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

Suherdi, D., Kurniawan, E., & Lubis, A. H. (2020). A genre analysis of research article 'findings and discussion' sections written by Indonesian undergraduate EFL students. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *10*(1), 59-72. https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v10i1.24989

Tanko, G. (2017). Literary research article abstracts: An analysis of rhetorical moves and their linguistic realizations. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 27,* 42-55.

Tocalo, A.W.I. (2021). Move structures and their rhetorical verbs of research article abstracts across Englishes. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 11*(1), 1-10. https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v11i1.34593

Warsito, W., Syah, S. A., & Harahap, A. (2017). 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*(2), 188-207. http://dx.doi.org/10.15408/ijee.v4i2.6746

Yang, R., & Allison, D. (2003). Research articles in applied linguistics: Moving from results to conclusions. *English for Specific Purposes, 22,* 365-385.