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Abstract - Every publication has its own in-house-style of writing, and therefore, it determines its specificity, including the specific textual space of abstract writing. An abstract of any journal is considered the most important part of the whole article itself because it can lead the readers to readily understand what the article is about. This paper attempts to explore the textual space of the abstracts of journal articles. It can also reveal the specificity of abstract writing of different research journals. This study is a comparative study, qualitative in nature, and uses content analysis. The abstracts used as the sample cover two journals: one is Ventura, the journal of economics, business, and accountancy, published by STIE Perbanas Surabaya and the other is Liceo Journal of Higher Education Research, published by Liceo de Cagayan University. They are analyzed using the textual space for exploring how the moves of the abstracts of the two journals are structured. The results show that there are both similarities and differences in these two journals. It can be concluded that a guide of composing the abstract is needed so that the abstracts can be in uniform.
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INTRODUCTION

Abstracts of academic writing are considered essential in any research journal publication. Therefore, writing an abstract needs attention when dealing with the abstract of an article published in research journals. It is important because abstract is always put in the initial position of the article. Besides journals, articles are also in the form of papers published in the proceedings, especially in the event of international seminars or conferences. However, both the journal publishers and the proceeding publishers generally provide the guide by informing only the number of the words and sometimes the key words as well.

In general, not all the writers can follow the guide dealing with the points that should be written in an abstract. For example, it is stated by Swales (1990) that, when writers are requested to write an abstract, they always find difficulty in putting the points in it. He stated that it is due to the scarcity of manuals for writing an abstract of research articles (RAs). Yet, when reading an article in journals, the readers firstly have to read the title and then go on reading the abstract before reading the whole text. From the chronological steps of searching journal articles, an abstract appears essential. It is the key step to figure out the article’s main topic as well as the main discussion and significance of the research as well. Therefore, a good abstract based on a good writing guide is really important.

So far, reading a guide of writing abstracts in academic journals and academic proceedings of international seminars or conferences tends to be still blurring for the prospective writers or presenters. Due to such a condition, most of the abstracts submitted in any journal publication or published in proceedings appear different from one another, in terms of the points mentioned in the abstracts. When the difference is on the style of choosing the grammar or vocabulary, it may not be a problem. However, when the difference is on the textual space and its contents, it must be a critical problem. From this fact, it is assumed that providing a clear guide of writing an abstract is compulsory. It is common that publishers state that an abstract is written based on the number of words and some general suggestions. There are some examples of abstract writing guides, yet mostly are not really guiding the writers.
There are some different guides pertaining to writing an abstract. First of all, Tuckman (1978: 340) proposes a guide of writing an abstract as follows: 1) it should be about 150 to 200 words; 2) it is a summary of the article; 3) it should be attractive; 4) it should be provided with three to five key words. Yet, such instruction still invites the readers for asking some questions. For example, what is meant by attractive and why it should be three to five key words. Thus, it can be said that in the guide above, there is still no standard answer for such questions that can be followed by all the prospective writers or presenters. Accordingly, the writers or presenters who want to write abstract may find difficulty.

Secondly, Rathbone as in Bastomi (2006) suggests a guide of abstract writing as follows: 1) it should recount the main points of the text; 2) it serves a report in miniature; 3) it resembles a table of contents. Again, this guide is still confusing in the sense that the guide above remains unclear for the readers to follow. It is still questionable such as how to make a report in miniature. What is meant by a miniature in writing? In another occasion, Rathbone also provides a guide for the reviewers how to select a good abstract. It is suggested that the reviewers should use the criteria to select, for example, by questioning whether the abstract determines such as 1) the nature of communication and 2) the readers’ preference. Again, when considering such criteria of selection, the reviewers are still unable to judge such as what is meant by the nature of communication and how to make an abstract resembling such a nature and what is meant by determining the readers’ preference.

There is another example of a guide of writing an abstract suggested by a certain institution in an international seminar. This can be read as the following (the identities of the host of the conference are not shown):

1. All submissions should be submitted electronically to the Secretariat at xxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxxxx. The soft copy must be at least in Microsoft Office 98 (PC Version). Please make sure it is virus–free.

2. Allow top margins of 1.25” (3.2 cm) first page and 0.75” (1.9 cm) the following pages, bottom margin of 1.44” (3.7 cm) left margin of 0.63” (1.6 cm) and right margin of 0.63” (1.6cm).
By taking for granted the guide above, it can be assumed that the prospective writers might find difficulty due to some reasons. First of all, the guide of abstract writing is obviously depicted in the whole instruction of full paper writing e.g., in point 4. Thus, it invites questions especially the way to write the abstract. Secondly, based on the guide above (point no 4) it appears that the abstract which should be submitted is only guided by the criterion that is only based on the number of the words (max 200 words). There is no more information or instruction of how to write the abstract that should reflect the whole or full paper.

Above all, it must be acknowledged that different journals and proceedings have their own typical ways of publication: their in-house-style of writing. For example, Swales (1990) in discipline of Sociology, found that Sociology has its typical way of writing academic articles not only for the abstracts but also introduction, discussion, and conclusion. Another proponent is Samraj (Flowerdue, 2004). Unlike in Sociology, according to Samraj, research articles in Biology also have their own typical way and they are—therefore—quite different from Sociology. However, they also have much in common in relation to the textual spaces.

Based on the description above, it is imperative to do the research on the nature of an abstract. It is specifically the nature of the abstract of research articles or papers which are practiced by a certain discourse community. This paper focuses on the discourse community of the two journals: Liceo journal and Ventura journal. These two journals are already accredited by the Higher Education Office of their respective countries. Both are the journal of research articles. It is also salient for the researcher to reveal how the moves or textual spaces of these journals, especially the moves of the abstracts are structured.
2.1 The Basic Approach of Genre Analysis

In connection with the genre analysis, Dudley (1995) states that based on the knowledge of genres, the writers (the novice writers or the language learners) can benefit from the results of the genre analysis (GA). This GA was formerly studied in all disciplines of sciences. However, in a specific class of language it is usually given to the class of English for Specific Purposes (ESP). When dealing with ESP classes, the basic philosophy of genre approach is entirely consistent with an ESP approach. This means that the more specific the discourse community is, the more specific it is when compared with other discourse communities.

By employing GA approach, the writers can focus on imparting certain genre knowledge which is part of a short-cut method of raising their proficiency in a relatively limited period of time to the level required of them. Thus, using the knowledge of a certain genre of a discourse community, any writer can benefit from it when starting to write for the intended discourse community. Therefore, it is clear that the imparting of genre knowledge involves increasing awareness of the conventions of writing. Besides that, knowing such genre means that the writers can get involved in the discourse community they wish to, by following the conventions. Finally, their writings appear a well-formed and suitably structured, following the in-house style of a certain discourse community.

It has been argued that knowledge of organization, arrangement, form, and genre can systematically lead to knowledge of subject matter (Belcher, 1995 as in Dudley, 2001). Like Belcher, Torrance et al. (1993) also in Dudley (2001), stated that a genre approach is an effective means of increasing writing proficiency. According to them, the moves in genre are considered important elements. These elements are obligatory if the text is to be acceptable as an example of the genre. Dudley mentions that Swales’ model for article introductions, as he found, consists of four basic moves in Introduction of writing such as Move 1: Establishing the Field; Move 2: Summarizing Previous Research; Move 3: Preparing for Present Research (often by identifying
a gap in previous research); Move 4: Introducing Present Research. These four moves are the examples of knowledge to be learned because they are present in the majority of the introductions that have been analyzed. That is a logical sequence of moves in which, once a choice has been made to follow a certain route, the writer is obliged to follow with a certain sequence of the moves.

Another example of the moves which may be important for the writers to know is that the abstract in academic writing (Swales, 1990), has a typical pattern of the moves as the following: Move 1: Purpose; Move 2: Method-Results; Move 3: Conclusion/Recommendations. According to Swales, the moves of abstracts of academic writing above are the result of his research on the research articles (RAs) of Sociology. Using genre approach, the moves of the abstracts of Sociology were found consisting of Purpose, Method-Results, and Conclusion/Recommendation. Unlike Swales (1990), Samraj in Flowerdew (2002: 40-56), by using the model based on Swales (1990) above as an instrument, found the moves of the abstracts of Biology as summarized in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1: Rhetorical moves of abstracts, Samraj in Flowerdew (2002: 40-56)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Move 1</th>
<th>Situating the research topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Move 2</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move 3</td>
<td>Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move 4</td>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move 5</td>
<td>Conclusion/recommendation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unlike Swales (1990) and Samraj (2002), Dudley (1995) conducted research using GA but it is related to the discussion section of RAs. The result of the research provides another example of the moves characterizing the part of the discussion section in academic writing such as the following: Move 1: Background Information; Move 2: Statement of results; Move 3: (Un)expected result; Move 4: Reference to previous research (comparison); Move 5: Explanation of Unsatisfactory Result; Move 6: Exemplification; Move 7: Deduction and Hypothesis (since modified to Claim); Move 8: Reference to Previous Research
(in support of a claim); Move 9: Recommendation; and Move 10: Justification.

The moves above occur in cycles in which the writer chooses an appropriate sequence of moves. The examples above, according to Dudley, are found in most academic writings. However, he also suggests that writers may modify the above moves. In some cases, one or two of the moves above may not be present in another discipline of science. This is the so called in-house-style of writing.

Besides the repertoires above, the writers also need more detailed work on the moves of different sections with the language exponents expressed in the moves. At one level, they need to develop greater sensitivity to ways in which they can use the conventions to develop their individual expression and to make their own impact on the disciplines of their science. In addition, at a lower level, the writers need to develop a wide repertoire of linguistic exponents of the various moves that they wish to make.

Brookes and Grundy, as in Dudley (1995), have argued that the acquisition of genre knowledge is usually in three stages. The first is being at the reading stage that precedes the writing stage. An awareness of the generic structure of the texts the prospective writers read will have a positive effect on their future writing. The second is the immediate planning stage where the findings of GA help writers grasp what is expected in the genre they are proposing to write. The third stage is the draft stage in which an awareness of genre conventions helps the writer to reorder the text. Thus, the process of writing is not finished by the time the writers are in the first and the second stages.

The novice writers, especially with relatively little experience of writing, have been found that the move models above have been very effective for them for writing purposes. By recognizing such explicitly linguistic orientation and having greater concern with the exponents of the moves of any texts, the writers can smoothly start writing the text for the intended discourse community. However, it is also possible for the writers not to be over-prescriptively based on the strict approach as presented above, especially as they themselves may be looking for their writing difficulties. It is suggested that the writers strike the right balance by acquiring the model for the genre as a means of structuring ideas and as the basis for the introduction of relevant linguistic forms. By doing so, they can follow the discourse community’s style of
writing. It is—therefore—such knowledge is important for especially the novice writers with a considerable experience of academic writing, either in their first language or English as a second language. They can use the genre approach as a means of putting ideas into an appropriately ordered and expressed text. In general, any deviation from the specific genre of a certain discourse community is due to being lack of understanding the GA.

In connection with the knowledge of the genre repertoires in academic writing, it can be summarized that there are at least four distinct areas of competence for the prospective writers to develop their genre knowledge in order to get over their lack of confidence in handling specialist discourse, e.g., journal publication or conference proceeding publication. Although the writers might have reasonably adequate competence in the use of the language for general every day functions, they will still need to develop such functions by (firstly) understanding the specialist code. In this stage, the writer should be familiar with the dynamics of specialist genres. Every journal publication has its in-house-style of writing, and this is called specific genre of the discourse community. This genre includes (secondly) the rhetorical forms. This can be stated as the textual spaces that are adopted naturally by a certain discourse community. Thirdly, it is the content, specific contexts they respond to and the conventions they tend to use in their responses. In this level, the writers should know the discipline of science that is being uniformly used by the discourse community. Finally, it is a proficiency in the manipulation of specialist genres to respond to the exigencies of unfamiliar and novel situations. In this stage, the writers not only adopt the specificity but also modify their writing to show their creativity. It is the individual creativity to make the writers clearly identified. Yet, the common genre or the code of the intended discourse community is still reflected in their text writing.

The new “comers” (the prospective writers or presenters) have to develop the understanding of code, the acquisition of genre knowledge associated with the specialist culture, sensitivity to cognitive structuring of specialist genres. From this, they are expected to exploit generic knowledge of a repertoire of specialist genres by becoming informed users of the discourse of their chosen field e.g., journal publication of a certain discipline of science.
By considering the concept of basic approach of GA described above, it is clear that the effort of GA will result in the effort of uncovering the moves, the language style, in-house-style of writing, and other aspects of language as procedural and social knowledge (Bhatia, 2001; 2002). These repertoires, in a specific discourse community, are considered a convention which, therefore, would be beneficial for writing purposes.

**OBJECTIVES**

Based on the background as described in the previous section, this study focuses on analyzing the genre related to the abstracts of the two journals: Liceo and Ventura. This comparative analysis is intended to reveal the moves or textual spaces of the abstracts of the two research journals. In fact, when the moves or textual spaces expressed in such abstracts are revealed, it can also provide knowledge of acquisition of genre knowledge (especially of the abstracts), sensitivity to cognitive structures and the way of exploiting genre knowledge. Genre repertoires, that are the rhetorical moves, thus, represent a cluster of genres that typically get used in the abstracts. This genre repertoire is one of the GA in its most basic form and also the process of determining the genres within a given communication. Finally, another objective is to provide the guide of writing an abstract so as to provide much clearer strategy or way to write an abstract of research articles, for the prospective writers both of Ventura and Liceo journals.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

In this chapter, the researcher discusses methodological phases that are applied in the present research. In connection with this effort, it is important to describe the research design, data collection, subjects of the study, instruments, and data analysis.

**3.1 Research Design**

This study applies qualitative methods by employing a content analysis. Since the data used in this research is taken by means of purposive sampling, the selection of the data is based on some criteria as referred to the sampling technique in qualitative research theory (Ary et al., 2002; Miles and Huberman, 1994:16-39; Seidman, 1991).
The criteria are as the following. First of all, the articles have been published in accredited journals and therefore all articles including the abstracts are considered complied with the stipulated writing style of the journals. Another criterion is based on the assumption that the articles have undergone a thorough and rigorous selection so that they are legible for publication. The analysis is done firstly based on the number of the moves as stipulated by the instrument used in this study by Samraj (2002). The results are calculated in percentage such as the moves (macro-textual level). This is content analysis. Both the moves of the abstracts of Ventura journal and those of Liceo journal are presented in a table, thus the two features of textual spaces of the two journal are shown.

3.2 The Subjects

Since this research uses the materials of research journal articles’ abstracts for analysis, the subjects (the selected data analyzed) refer to the abstracts of the two research journal articles of Liceo research journal articles and Ventura research journal articles. These two research journal articles’ abstracts are gathered purposively and 20 abstracts of each were taken for analysis. Thus, totally there are 40 abstracts. These written documents are considered the products of writing, representing the specific discourse community (Swales, 1990; Halliday, 1973; Dudly, 1995; Bhatia, 2001, and Samraj, 2002). In addition, the written documents are the abstracts of research journal articles’ abstracts. So, the accredited journals which have undergone peer review and editing process are considered the discourse communities.

3.3 The Instruments

The researcher is considered the key instrument (human instrument) in which he is provided with some knowledge of the relevant literature to help him to be sensitive with the data analysis. The other instruments to be shared with the investigator for triangulation are based on Samraj’s in Flowerdue (2002: 40-56), Hyland’s (1992) taxonomy as he adopted from Swales (1990). Another instrument is advocated by some proponents such as Rathbone (1995), Swales (1990), and Samraj (2002). The abstracts in each of the last two publications were taken as the subjects of analysis. From this, the data were gathered and ready for the following step for analysis.
Table 3.1: Abstract model adapted from Samraj’s model of abstracts in Flowerdew (2002) as developed from Swales’ (1990) Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Move</th>
<th>Linguistic Realizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Situating the research topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i.e., Managing Higher Education always starts from creating a vision, a mission, the goal and then the objectives to be achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i.e., This research attempts to see the effects of the factors such as financing sources, students enrolment system, and learning process on the higher education’ sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i.e., This research employs a survey using questionnaires related to the influential factors with five scales as adopted from Likert’s and are distributed to some colleges or universities ……</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i.e., the college with a small number of students is due to the lack of prepared student’s enrolment system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Conclusion/recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i.e., It is generalized that the college or university with a good student’s enrolment system tends to still exist or remain sustainable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6. Data Analysis

First of all, the abstracts are analyzed using Textual Space (Swales, 1990 and Samraj, 2002). From this analysis, the textual spaces were gathered and shown in tables. Secondly, the textual space of each abstract was classified and presented in tables (Swales, 1990; Samraj, 2002).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4. The Features of the Two Journals

It is clear that the two research journals (Liceo and Ventura) have their own specific features in their abstracts writing. Since abstracts are important in research journal articles, looking at these features of abstract composition appears interesting and inspiring for the research article writers of each journal. Here are the features of the abstract of the two research journal articles.
Table 4.1 The characteristics of abstracts in Liceo and Ventura Research Journal Articles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>∑ Words Move</th>
<th>Move 1</th>
<th>Move 2</th>
<th>Move 3</th>
<th>Move 4</th>
<th>Move 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L V</td>
<td>L V</td>
<td>L V</td>
<td>L V</td>
<td>L V</td>
<td>L V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>195 252</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>276 218</td>
<td></td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>206 187</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>205 205</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>231 215</td>
<td></td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>222 161</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>188 188</td>
<td></td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>184 209</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>121 177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>158 182</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>212 250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>280 239</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>200 197</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>126 186</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>239 247</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>202 248</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>183 145</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>116 204</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>128 205</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>181 162</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOT</td>
<td>3853 4077</td>
<td>7 15</td>
<td>17 19</td>
<td>16 20</td>
<td>18 20</td>
<td>12 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Each Move</td>
<td>35% 75% 85% 95% 80% 100% 90% 100% 60% 70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:  
L= Liceo  
V= Ventura  
x = with the move  
Blank= without the move  
From each total number of the words, the average of each abstract is 192 for Liceo and 203 for Ventura
As shown in Table 4.1, it can be described that the authors of Liceo research journal articles, wrote their abstracts as the following. First of all, only 35 percent of the authors wrote the topic of their research as identified by Move 1, (7 authors). Secondly, 85 percent of the authors wrote the purpose of the research as shown in Move 2 (17 authors). Thirdly, 80 percent of the authors wrote the methodology of the research as revealed in Move 3 (16 authors). Fourthly, 90 percent of the authors wrote the results of the research as shown in Move 4 (18 authors). Last of all, only 60 percent of the authors wrote the conclusion/recommendation of the research results as presented in Move 5 (12 authors).

When considering the number of the words entailed in each of the abstracts by the authors of Liceo research journal, it can be described as follows. First, the average number of the words among the abstracts studied is 192 words. It is apparently stipulated that the requirement of the number of the words of each abstract is 200 words. Therefore, it can be judged that this average number of the words is obviously commensurate with such requirement. However, when looking at each abstract, it appears that there are some authors deviating from this stipulation. Just look at the abstract no 2, 12, and 15, these three abstracts contain 276 words and 280 words, and 239 words respectively. On the other hand, when looking at abstract no 14, 18, and 19, it appears that the authors of these abstracts also deviated from the stipulated number of the words. The abstracts embody 126 words, 116 words, and 128 words respectively, meaning that these abstracts deviate from the stipulated requirement stating that the abstract should consist of 200 words.

The most critical aspects are in Move 2, Move 3, and Move 4 as obligatory for some respects in research writing (Tuckman, 1976; Swales, 1990, Samraj, 2002, and Djuwari, 2010). In Liceo journal are as follows. First, in abstract no 1, 4, 11, and 14; the authors did not express the purpose of the research. Secondly, in abstract no 8, 11, 12, and 15; the authors did not mention the methodology of the research. Third, in abstract no 9 and 18; the authors did not state the results of the research. Considering that these three Moves (purpose, method, and results) are important information for the readers—when they read the research journal articles—the authors of research journal should write such information in their abstracts (Tuckman, 1976; Swales, 1990;
Like Liceo journal, the Ventura also has its own characteristics of the abstract composition. As in Table 4.1, the specificity can also be described. Ventura journal’s abstracts are described as follows. First of all, 75 percent of the authors wrote the purpose of their research as identified by Move 2, (15 authors). Secondly, 95 percent of the authors write the purpose of the research as shown in Move 2 (19 authors). Thirdly, 100% of the authors wrote the methodology of the research as revealed in Move 3 (20 authors). Fourthly, also 100 percent of the authors wrote the results of the research as shown in Move 4 (20 authors). Last of all, only 70 percent of the authors wrote the conclusion/recommendation of the research results as presented in Move 5 (14 authors).

When considering the number of the words embodied in each of the abstracts by the authors of Ventura research journal, it can be described as follows. First, the average number of the words among the abstracts studied is 203 words (4077/20). As stipulated that the requirement for the number of the words of each abstract is about 200 to 250 words, it can be judged that this average number of the words meets such requirement. However, when looking at each abstracts it also appears that there are some abstracts which deviate from this requirement. Just take it for granted, in abstract no 6, 17, and 20, in which these three abstracts contain less than 200 words: each contains 161 words, 145 words, and 162 words. On the other hand, when looking at abstract no 1, it appears that this abstract contains 252 words (a little bit deviating from maximum number of the words, 250 words.

Also, the most critical aspect is when taking into account Move 2, Move 3, and Move 4 as the obligatory moves in research writing. For example, in abstract no 16; the author did not express the purpose of the research. Again, the three Moves (purpose, method, and results) are important information for the readers. Therefore, the authors of research journal should write such information in their abstracts (Swales, 1990; Samraj, 2002, Djuwari, 2009). More importantly, in Liceo journal, there are four authors who did not mention the methods of the research and two authors who did not mention the results of the research. In Ventura, one author did not mention the purpose of the research.
However, both Liceo and Ventura have similarities. These two journals have their authors without stating Move 1 (Situating the research topic). Authors of the abstract nos. 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20 in Liceo journal did not mention Move 1 (situating the research topic) and neither did the authors of abstract no 2, 5, 9, 10, and 11 in Ventura journal. Besides that, the authors of abstract nos. 1, 3, 9, 10, 13, 14, 16, and 17 in Liceo journal did not entail Move 5 (Conclusion/recommendation) and neither did the authors of abstract no 6, 7, 11, 13, 15, and 20 in Ventura journal. When using Swale’s (1990) model, abstract without Move 1 is applicable but when it is scrutinized using the instrument employed in this comparative study, the abstracts above are not proper. The five Moves of the abstract are adopted as suggested by Samraj (2002) and also by Djuwari (2009). Thus, ideally an abstract should consist of Move 1 (situating the research topic), Move 2 (purpose), Move 3 (methods), Move 4 (Results), and Move 5 (conclusion/recommendation).

CONCLUSIONS

In general, the two journals of Liceo and Ventura have both similarities and differences. The similarities are on their specificity in Move 1 (situating the research topic) and Move 5 (conclusion/recommendation) in their abstracts. In both journals, there is a critical problem for the authors who did not write the purpose and results of the research. Three authors of Liceo did not write the purpose of the research, four authors did not write the methodology of the research, and two authors did not write the results of the research. Like the authors of the Liceo journal, there is one author of Ventura journal who did not write especially the purpose of the research. Yet, these obligatory moves of research abstract are important in research journal articles. For the abstracts of the journal articles to meet the structure commonly adapted internationally are complied with the proposed abstract writing, five moves should be embodied in them. The moves are the textual spaces that should be embodied in an abstract. Moves 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 are the textual spaces in which an abstract should be composed by the author by entailing these textual spaces.
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