# Rhetorical Moves of PhD Dissertation Abstracts in Educational Administration

## Nachanich Fangsa

## Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Suan Dusit Rajabhat University

**Abstract**

This study investigated the rhetorical move pattern of PhD dissertation abstracts (DA) in educational administration (EA). The corpus was made up of 100 abstracts, retrieved from Dissertations International Abstract and ProQuest via Thailis e-database sources, published during 1977-2007. The method adopted was a move analysis of textual organization, using Santos (1996)'s five-move model and Paltridge & Strafield (2007) proposed framework. The results indicated that rhetorical move pattern followed the prototype abstract. The distribution of obligatory moves were found at rates 98%, 96%, 92% and 72% , which were closely correlated with those found in the guideline model. The rhetorical move pattern of PhD DA is *describing the study/stating the purpose of the study*, *describing the methodology, presenting the results and concluding.*

**Key words**

PhD DA, Rhetorical Move, Move analysis.

**Introduction**

On this current digital knowledge decade, it can not be denied that most researchers use on-line publications extensively as resources for their research papers or articles. In particular for searching previous research, abstract is a part of the full paper be certain to appear on their electronic search. It is the most essential part of a research paper or article, which offers a preliminary overview and captures the essence of the whole study (Salager-Meyer, 1990; Hartley, 2003). As also pointed out by Paltridge and Starfield (2007), "the abstract is an important piece of work as it is one of the first things an examiner will look at."(p.155). An on-line published abstract undoubtedly provides some useful of theoretical knowledge of the disciplines and in turn, offer qualified writing conventions. The PhD DA, for example, as formatted or regulated by the publishing company not to include over 350 words in length, is written conventionally in a concise language while underlying the significant features of the study. This constructive attribute of the abstract; however, sometimes causes the comprehension problem to novice researchers, whose native language is not the English. In order to

optimize understanding of the abstract, novice researchers need to make efforts and need language capability to identify and recognize the textual structures and the communicative functions conveyed in linguistic signals as claimed by Graetz (1985). He states it that if readers can recognize the linguistic signals of the different functions of abstracts, they can more easily understand those journal abstracts. At the same time, a recognition of rhetorical functions, the choice of grammatical forms purposed to convey meaning through the structure of abstract, on the process of their data searching, will facilitates their abstract writings For two decades, there have been a number of studies on the structure of research article abstracts (RA), for example, Anderson & Maclean (1997), Busch-Lauer (1995a, 1995b), Huckin (2001), Pho (2008), Samraj (2002a). However, very few studies investigate the organizational structure of PhD thesis/DA, for example, Paltridge and Starfield (2007) and Swales (2009). The present study thus aims at delineating the prototypical structure of the PhD DA in EA.

Theoretical framework

The study of rhetorical structure of the abstract was accounted for the study of language after Swales's breakthrough of research article (RA) introductions in 1981 (IMRD: Introduction-Method-Result-Discussion) in different fields of science. Swales claims that RA introductions have a structure within which a series of moves (parts) appear in a predictable order. Later, in 1990, he offered a revised version called Create a Research Space (CARS) to fully capture the rhetorical move in RA introductions written in English with moves and submoves. Recently in 2004, Swales proposed a new pattern adding more submoves under *Presenting the Research Move* (Move 3). Last year in his 2009 work, he mentioned 5 moves existing in abstract in general. The approach has drawn much attention for researchers for over 20 years. Up until now, his paradigms have still illuminated a discovering of abstract pattern in various disciplines. A number of researchers studied moves and submoves underlying RA abstract across disciplines, for example, medicine (Meyer, 1990a), linguistics (Lorés Sanz, 2004), applied linguistics (Santos, 1996; Yang & Allison, 2003), and applied linguistics and educational technology (Pho, 2008). Some of them followed his guideline pattern, while others initiated a new pattern. In Santos 1996 study, for example, he developed five moves notions structured in applied linguistics (AL) abstract. The pattern are structured

*Move 1: Situating the research and subdivided into Submove1A-Stating current knowledge; Submove 1B-Citing previous research; Submove 1C-Extended previous research; Submove2-Stating a problem, Move 2: Presenting the research and subdivided into Submove 1A- Indicating main features; Submove 1A- Indicating main purpose; Submove 2- Hypothesis raising, Move 3: Describing the methodology, Move 4: Summarizing the results and Move 5: Discussing the research and also subdivided into Submove 1-Drawing conclusions; Submove 2-giving recommendations.*

Santos's 1996 model details the move and steps very delicately that it was applied for Pho (2008)'s

study . He studied a whole structure of 40 RA studies in AL and educational technology (ET) areas. A part of the results of RA abstract in ET and AL is quite similar. They indicated moves structured as *Presenting the research-Describing the methodology—Summarizing the findings—Discussing the research.*

In addition to mentioned RA abstract guided principles, Paltridge & Starfield (2007) viewed the typical structure of a PhD thesis abstract as an *overview-methodology-finding* (p.158). Focusing on its structure, through which communicative purposes are conveyed, it functions in an orderly manner similar to Santos's model. The structure of both patterns serve three major identical functions, first; giving introductions to the study, second; explaining the method in the study, third; giving conclusion. Though the terminologies for labeling the moves are different, they carry common purposes. An *overview* can be denoted *Situating the research, Presenting the research, while finding can represent Summarizing the findings-Discussing the research.* It is obvious that Santos's notion offers quite a full and careful explanation in contrast to that of Paltridge & Starfield. Due to the thoroughness of the move labels elaborated by Santos, it is employed as the analytical tool for the corpus in this present study.

**Analytical procedures**

    1) <u>Validity of the corpus</u>

To ensure the validity of the corpus, the researcher set the following criteria in terms of its size and homogeneity.

Size of the corpus: The corpus is made up of 100 abstracts, totaling 3,005,241 words. The longest one contains 345 words, while the shortest one contains 295 words. They vary in length from 20 sentences up to 25 sentences.

Homogeneous discipline: All the abstracts are in the field of EA, from different leading universities in North America and Canada. They were published during 1997-2007.

    2) <u>Description of the corpus</u>

About half of the corpus was written by Thai scholars, while the other half were written by non-Thais (native speakers of English and speakers of other languages). They are, for example, Illinois State University, the University of Pittsburgh, the University of Washington, the University of Texas Austin, etc.

Selection of the abstracts: This study aims to serve the EA community. The EA DAs were therefore utilized as the target corpus. It is atypical because database sources can be accessed only by scholars or faculty members of universities that are subscribers through the Office of Higher Education Commission, Thailand. Though obtained for the present study from the Thailis e-database (digital collection), these large-scale texts emerged from two original resources: Dissertation Abstracts International and ProQuest, which both used the same general conventions for abstracts. Fifty-one percent of abstracts were retrieved from DAs International and

the other 49%, were from ProQuest. A hundred out of 108 abstracts were selected based on keeping a balance of equal length for all.

Coder selection: Two factors taken into consideration were background of the coders and the coding scheme. In terms of coders, there were three coders involved in this procedure. Two are EFL lecturers who graduated in the field of linguistics. One worked in the central office of EA and was familiar with EA tasks, while the other has been teaching English for over 10 years. The remaining coder is a native speaker of English who teaches English at Suan Dusit Rajabhat University.

Coding: The researcher explained the criterion for identifying and dividing a move unit to the coders. We assembled to discuss, argue and then reach a resolution for the criteria for coding. The coding scheme includes a spreadsheet designed with the five themes and sub-themes illustrated. The researcher distributed the spreadsheet files to the other coders to work on using computers and they were instructed to drag and drop move units from the abstracts in the corpus into the theme and sub-theme slots. Finally, we all checked and discussed the results with one another.

**Move analysis**

The researcher adapted the linguistic concepts defined by Connor and Mauranen (1999) towards the identification of moves in texts, that is, first, their assertions towards the move length that "moves can vary in length and size from several paragraphs to one sentence, but normally contain at least on proposition."(p.51), and second, "the rhetorical purpose of the text and the basic linguistic clues, including course markers (connectors and other metatextual signals), marked themes, tense and modality changes, and the introduction of new lexical references" (p.52).

At the outset, the themes in the five-move model of Santos (1996) were set as a framework for dividing textual features into move units. Furthermore, the identification of a move was encoded following these steps:

1. The researcher, as an EFL lecturer, read the DAs carefully to grasp the semantic and communicative functions, which were recognized through the lexical references.

2. The researcher identified the relationship between the lexical reference and its linguistic boundaries, i.e. keywords reflecting a theme which was closely related to the move categories created by Santos (1996). Linguistic recognition helped to break down statements into distinct move units. One move unit was identified based on the assumption of one propositional function, which may be conveyed through one sentence length or several paragraphs. So, one propositional function may be formed in a sentence, a phrase or a word of the text.

3. The researcher rechecked and reviewed move units thoroughly and then examined whether the moves successfully reflected the accepted cognitive structure of the abstracts and achieved by text representation

successfully.

     4. The researcher checked understanding with a native English-speaking teacher to ensure the reliability of the encoding of the move units.

     5. The frequency of occurrence was manually counted and calculated a percentage.

## Results

     The results revealed that most of the abstracts in the corpus have four to five moves. In particular, the corpus basically have four obligatory moves. They are moves 2, 3, 4, and 5, appearing the most frequently in the 100 abstracts, at rates of 98%, 96%. 92%, and 72% respectively. Following the labeled framework, moves mannered orderly are the *Presenting the research* (PTR) move, the *Describing the methodology* (DTM) move the *Summarizing the research* (STR) move and *Discussion the research* (DTR) move as can be seen in Table below.

**Table :** Frequency of moves

| Core Move | Move Analysis Unit | PhD DA | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | | Move & Submove | |
| | | Frequency | Percentage |
| | **M1: STR** | 39 | 39% |
| | SM 1A−SCK | 27 | 27% |
| | and/or | | |
| | SM 1B−CPR | 6 | 6% |
| | and/or | | |
| | SM 1C−EPR | 5 | 5% |
| | and/or | | |
| | SM 2−STP | 9 | 9% |
| √ | **M2: PTR** | 98 | 98% |
| | SM 1A−IMF | 56 | 56% |
| | and/or | | |
| | SM 1B−IMP | 57 | 57% |
| | and/or | | |
| | SM 2−HR | 4 | 4% |
| √ | **M3: DTM** | 96 | 96% |
| √ | **M4: STR** | 92 | 92% |
| √ | **M5: DTR** | 72 | 72% |
| | SM 1−DC | 57 | 57% |
| | and/or | | |
| | SM 2−GR | 55 | 55% |

The examples of each typical move are analyzed with their descriptions below.

Move1: Situating the research

Though Move 1, according to Santos (1996), has the function of attracting readers to read the rest of the study, it had a low frequency of occurrence in the results of the present study. Only 39 instances of the textual element *Situating the research* were found in the corpus. Most of these were accomplished by means of *Stating current knowledge* or introducing the reader to present the state of knowledge. There were 27 instances identified of submove 1A—*Stating current knowledge,* six instances of submove 1B—*Citing previous research,* five instances of submove 1C—*Extending previous research,* and nine instances of submove 2—*Stating the problem* as shown below.

Submove 1A—Stating the current knowledge

Twenty-seven occurrences of submove 1—*Stating current* knowledge—were identified in the corpus. Following Santos's definition of *stating of current knowledge,* the author categorizes the field as stating that a given topic is of considerable professional concern, states current ideas or practices, or offers a generalization.

Instance 1: *Although many colleges and universities are engaged in various forms of distance learning,...* (ref. 81)

The author stated that current practice is for tertiary institutions to engage in various forms of distance learning.

Instance 2: *Leadership is very important for both teachers and principals in order to move forward and meet the goals of reform,...* (ref. 61)

The author generalized about the importance of leadership for both teachers and principals.

Instance 3: *In 1999, Thailand realized that the segregation of students with disabilities was restricting these student's educational opportunities; therefore, the government mandated that all Thai schools implement inclusive education (National Education Act, 1999).* (ref.31)

The author stated that the subject was of considerable of professional concern.

Submove 1B—Citing previous research

Six instances were categorized as *Citing previous research.* As Santos mentioned (1996), the state of previous research is accompanied by the naming of a specific researcher.

Instance 4: *Five elements were similar to the Seashore Louis, Kruse, Marks (1994) model of professional community.* (ref. 18)

The author named specific researchers; in this case, the text elements lose their status of stating current knowledge.

Submove 1C—Extending previous research

Six instances of submove 1C—*Extending previous research*—occurred. Santos (1996) defined this as the move

in which the researchers provide a weak challenge to previous research while presenting their research as being in accord with current research trends, or it is the author's effort to make clear that the current research is part of an ongoing debate, such as extending the status of previous research.

Instance 5: *Numerous studies have focused on leadership, women administrators in educational administration, and the career paths of college presidents in higher education, but not much is known about leadership styles of community college leaders.* (ref.13).

This study was undertaken to add to this body of knowledge.

Instance 6: *Research of leadership styles and skills, social construction of gender, and mentorship in the career paths of men and women provided a foundation for the study.* (ref.8 )

In instances 5 and 6, the authors provided a weak challenge to previous research, stating only that it was necessary to extend the research. The submoves indicated the new directions for research to investigate, or stated the topics that haven't yet been explored.

Submove 2—Stating a problem

Nine instances were found under the category of *Stating a problem*. Santos (1996) defines that problem statements point out that previous research has not been thoroughly successful or complete. *Stating a problem* can take a variety of forms, but generally falls into two categories: (1) statements that previous research is still embryonic; or (2) statements that, despite long and intense discussion, there is still a continuing of debate in current research. The present research, however, found few instances categorized as Stating a problem.

Instance 7: *Previous research at other higher educational institutions that found a deficiency of academic information provided a lack of academic information-seeking skills on the part of students.* (ref. 49)

Instance 8: *.........few empirical studies have examined this component of educational leadership.* (Ref. 99)

Instances 7 and 8 stated that previous research is deficient and insufficient respectively.

Move 2—Presenting the research

Ninety-eight instances of Move 2—*Presenting the research* were found constituting almost all of the corpus of 100 texts. In this category, 56 moves appear to indicate the main features, SM 1A, 57 moves appear to indicate the main purpose; SM 1B type; and four moves appear to raise a hypothesis, SM 2.

Submove 1B—Indicating main features

Instance 9: *This study investigates and compares the skills, knowledge, and activities engaged in as a principal and an assistant principal and their relationship to the preparation of an aspiring middle school principal.* (ref.49)

In this paper, the author presented his research using the verbs investigates and compares.

Submove 1B—Indicating main purpose

Instance 10: *The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between three communicative*

*processes and treatment outcomes between two types of consultative problem-solving models, the Functional Behavioral Assessment (FBA) model and the Conjoint Behavioral Consultation (CBC) model.* (ref.50 )

In this instance, the author announced his research with by stating the purpose, beginning with the phrase The purpose of this study and continuing with the verb phrase was to investigate.

Submove 2—Hypothesis raising

The other mean to introduce the research to be reported is by raising a hypothesis. Santos (1996) categorized as SM2—*Hypothesis raising*—those sentences citing a hypothesis or containing questions to be answered by the research. These sentences play a supporting role for SM 1B or SM 1A, or use the past tense and/or modals. In this research, four instances of hypothesis raising were found.

Instance 11: *Predictions were that there would be a higher proportion of functional, directive, and behavioral communication in cases with large treatment effect sizes.* (ref. 50)

In instance 11, the authored raised a hypothesis about *the present the research*

Instance 12: *What constitutes* **'educational administration'**? *There are numerous conceptions and theories that address this question, yet the continuing debate in this field of research suggests none is sufficient.* (ref. 97)

In instance 12 the author raised a question to present the research.

Move 3—Describing the methodology

This move indicates how the research was conducted. The researcher, therefore, needs to offer some description for the readers to know how the research was actually carried out in relation to the research design, subjects, procedures, materials, instruments, and variables according to the type of experiment. In this research, the results revealed that Move 3 appeared in 96 of 100 research abstracts.

Instance 13: *Participants for this study consisted of 39 full-time teachers and administrators who responded to two phases of open-ended questionnaires related to three research questions:......* (ref.75)

The author described the subjects and the instruments.

Instance 14: *Six distinguished hospitality experts who had strong connections with hospitality education programs in Thailand selected the 20 Delphi experts in this study from 60 hospitality educators who were individually nominated most frequently.* (ref. 51)

The author described the subjects and the procedure for choosing the subjects.

Move 4—Summarizing the results

The move summarizes briefly the main findings of the research and indicates how the data were handled.

Instance 15: *Results revealed that a six factors model fit well with the data in the Thai context.* (ref.74)

The author summarized briefly the main findings of the research.

Move 5—Discussing the research

The move contains elements relating the results to previous research or giving implications for the results obtained. In some cases, the discussion may advance to 'drawing conclusions', which is labeled SM 1, and to 'giving recommendations', which is labeled SM 2.

SM 1—Drawing conclusions

Instance 16: *Leadership opportunities, the development of leadership qualities, and the cultivation of a belief that the role is rewarding influenced teachers' intentions and behaviors to aspire.* (ref.6)

In this instance, the author the author presented conclusion about factors influencing teachers' intentions.

Submove 2—Giving recommendations

Instance 17: *Consequently, future efforts to encourage teachers to pursue the principalship should provide leadership opportunities, develop their leadership qualities, and emphasize the positive aspects of the role.* (ref.6)

In instance 17, the author then gave recommendations for providing leadership.

Instance 18: *These results and limitations of the study are discussed along with implications for school psychology practice and future research on school-based problem solving models.* (ref. 50)

In this instance, the researcher deemed that these embedded textual elements of SM 1 and SM 2 should be labeled hybrid moves.

Though, in some cases, the results of present this study did not parallel Santos' (1996) findings. For example, one abstract began the PTR by stating the purpose, immediately followed by stating the problem. Stating the problem is a supporting detail in STR and appeared before stating the purpose in the original model.

The move patterns found in the field of EA are structured in a manner similar to that used in AL found by Santos (1996). That is to say, the author were likely to construct the text with Move 2: PTR, was used in 98% of the abstracts studied; Move 3: DTM was used in 96% of abstracts; Move 4: STR was used in 92% of cases; and Move 5: DTR, used in 72% of cases. In AL, Move 2, Move 3, Move 4 and Move 5 were used at rates of 93%, 92%, 75% and 58%, respectively. Thus, the present study found that the rhetorical moves were structured following the guideline pattern. A detailed comparison is given in Table below.

**Table :** Comparison of occurrence of moves in educational administration and applied linguistics

| Core Move | Move Analysis Unit | Present Study Educational Administration | | Santos's Study Applied linguistics | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Move & Submove frequency | Percentage | Move & Submove frequency | Percentage |
| | **M1: Situating the research** | 39 | 39% | 40 | 40% |
| | Submove 1A—Stating current knowledge | (27) | 27% | (30) | 30% |
| | and/or | | | | |
| | Submove 1B—Citing previous research | (6) | 6% | (7) | 7% |
| | and/or | | | | |
| | Submove 1C—Extending previous research | (5) | 5% | (3) | 3% |
| | and/or | | | | |
| | Submove 2—Stating the problem | (9) | 9% | (24) | 24% |
| √ | **M2: Presenting the research** | 98 | 98% | 93 | 93% |
| | Sub-move 1A—Indicating main features | (56) | 56% | (77) | 77% |
| | and/or | | | | |
| | Submove 1B—Indicating main purpose | (57) | 57% | (26) | 26% |
| | and/or | | | | |
| | Submove 2—Hypothesis raising | (5) | 5% | (18) | 18% |
| √ | **M3: Describing the methodology** | 96 | 96% | 92 | 92% |
| √ | **M4: Summarizing the results** | 92 | 92% | 75 | 75% |
| √ | **M5: Discussing the research** | 72 | 72% | 58 | 58% |
| | Submove 1—Drawing conclusions | (57) | 57% | (50) | 50% |
| | and/or | | | | |
| | Submove 2—Giving recommendations | (55) | 55% | (12) | 12% |

## Discussion and Conclusion

From over a 70% appearance of Moves 2, 3, 4 and 5 of the 100 abstracts, we can conclude that moves 2, 3, 4 and 5 are core moves or obligatory moves. Move 2: *Presenting the research,* Move 3: *Describing the methodology,* Move 4: *Summarizing the results* and Move 5: *Discussion the research* (either by concluding and giving recommendations for further research) played a significant role in the PhD DA of the field of EA. They occurred most frequently at rates of 98%, 96%, 92% and 72% respectively. While, Move 1: STR appeared least frequently, at a rate of 39%. The lower percentage of Move 1 obviously implies that authors

were likely to begin their summaries immediately by describing and/or stating purpose strategy rather than giving introductions. Yet, fewer authors situated the research (move1), either situating current knowledge (submove1A), or citing previous research (submove1B), and/or extending previous research (submove1C) in preceding their reports of theses/dissertations. The co-occurrence of submove1A, submove1B, and submove1C under Move1 was never found, while there was a little evidence showed occurrence of submove1B and submove1C. This finding of Move 1 is opposed to Hyland's (2004) argument that there is an increasing trend of the appearance of *Situating the research* moves (move 1) in abstracts. A moderate evidence of Move1 was probably caused by the limited space where the writers need to keep a room for core moves, such as explaining methodology.

Further looking closely at PTR moves, where the authors normally intend to announce what the current study is about or state the purpose of the study. Interestingly, the results have shown the authors basically narrated the works (move2), by means of indicating main features (SM1A) and stating the purpose (SM1B) with almost equal times in this discipline. The frequency of occurrence of SM1A and SM1B were at rate 56% and 57%. According to the findings from submove 1, the descriptive statement varied among Present Simple Tense, Past Simple Tense and Present Perfect Tense, which was influenced by a view of writers towards their research papers. Writing in Present Simple Tense means the writer views it as a summary of the paper, while written in Past Simple Tense or Present Perfect Tense indicates a report of the study (Coley & Lewkowicz, 2003). A few examples are *This study investigates..., This study investigated the status of strategic planning...,* The research in Thailand has explored. Some further examples are given in table below. While Swales (1993) gave ideas on tense usage in purposive statements that in cases where the deictic refers to the type of inquiry (for example; investigation, study, experiment, etc.), the authors may choose between the present and the past. However, in cases where the deictic refers to the genre (for example; paper, report, note, review, etc.), tense is restricted to the present, for example, "*The purpose of this investigation is/was to...*", "*This report is to...*".

**Table :** Illustration of sentence patterns in PTR move

| SM 1A Move | SM 1B Move |
| --- | --- |
| This study investigates..... | The purpose of this study was to investigate the ability of |
|  | Thai freshmen university students..... |
| It also investigates..... | This study used ethnographic interview research methods to investigate..... |
|  | This study was an exploratory research designed to investigate..... |
|  | This study used participatory action research to investigate..... |
|  | The aim of this study was to investigate..... |
|  | This research was undertaken to investigate..... |

Next, the DTM move resumes one of the key roles in PhD DA. The moves in the corpus are used to describe research methodology, concerning subjects, instruments and data collection. It is clearly seen from the corpus that individual move contains a bundle of linguistic features in order to maintain its complex functions. It happens that there are a lot of phrases within one sentence. The move dominates the abstract in general. Almost of them occur separately with other moves, unlike other core moves, such as, *Situating the research* together with Presenting the research (STR_PTR) and *Summarizing the results* together with *Discussion the research* (STR_DTR).This move has a unique quality in respect of its distinctive appearance. Only 4 cases of the corpus missed the moves.

The STR move, according to the framework, defines the described findings, data, analyses to be reported, descriptive statement, evaluation, argument and a comparison of similarity and difference. While the DTR move confines concluding statements, explanations for the results summarized, making a claim, suggestion and recommendations. Based on the aforementioned grounds, the analyses revealed there are 57 cases combined in two moves within condensed linguistic features. The hybrid move exercises two functions between reporting their works and, for example, offering suggestions or concluding their works. In this sense, the beginning stretch along the continuum of hybrid move is confined with one word such as, The ‘*findings*’ suggest that..... The ‘*results*’ suggest that..... The ‘*results*’ of the data from.....represent a paradigmatic shift. Moreover, five cases even have the term ‘Findings and Conclusion’ labeled at the initial section of abstract. While, the corpus revealed clearly that the division between reporting the findings and recommending for further research was distinct. In other words, the corpus showed SM 1—‘*drawing conclusions*’ occur independently and has a high tendency to be missing. The results indicates 45 percent was missing.

In conclusion, this investigation justifies there are the rhetorical moves structured within the PhD DA abstracts in educational discipline. The abstract is consisted of segments of the text, that indicate specific functions in parallel with the applied linguistics field: *Situating the research, Presenting the research, Describing the methodology, Summarizing the results and Discussing the results. In addition, Presenting the research, Describing the methodology, Summarizing the results and Discussing the results* serve core functions for the abstract. For Presenting the research, we rename it as *Describing the study/Stating purpose of the study* in conforming to the findings mentioned. Further, interesting moves are *Summarizing the results and Discussing the results.* Following the framework of the study, those moves created overlapping territory as resulted in the hybrid move creation indicated by our results. In this sense, to provide a reliable scope between the line of STR move and DTR move and to validate our results, we devised new labels the STRmove with the PTFmove. The PTF move defines presentations of actual findings/its summaries, reporting of what the study found descriptively. While a follow-up stage of suggestions, comparison of difference/similarity, interpreting, argument

including making claims, giving recommendations are confined to CTR move *(Concludings)*. Thus, for this reason, it can be concluded that PhD DA contains four moves: 1) *Describing the study/Stating the purpose of the study* (DTS)/(SPS), 2) *Describing the study method* (DSM), 3) *Presenting the findings* (PTF) and 4) *Concluding the results* (CTS) as shown in Table below.

| Move | Structure of PhD Dissertation in Educational Administration |
|------|--------------------------------------------------------------|
| Move 1 | Describing the study /Stating purpose of the study |
| Move 2 | Describing the method |
| Move 3 | Presenting the findings |
| Move 4 | Concludings |

However, to write the concluding remarks, for non-native writers, seems to require a lot of effort to find a lexis for interpreting the findings. The next study should further consider lexis in Move taking concluding's role, where normally involves discussion section in the move for a research paper genre. The different moves contain different communicative functions and distinctive verb forms. The distinctive lexical items used either in reporting new information or to be discussed should therefore be reflected uniquely in this kind of academic writing.

It is hoped that the global structure of the obligatory move from this study will provide conventions for PhD candidates composing their summaries of theses/dissertation and facilitating novice writers to write abstracts in a professional manner together with showing a comprehensive understanding for their research papers.

## References

Anderson, K., & Maclean, J. (1997). A genre analysis study of 80 medical abstracts. *Edinburgh Working Papersin Applied Linguistics*, 8, 1-23.

Busch-Lauer & Ines-a. (1995a). Abstracts in German medical journals: A Linguistic analysis. *Information Processing & Management*, 31(5), 769-776.

Busch-Lauer & Ines-a. (1995b). Textual organization in English and German medical abstracts. In B. Warvik, S.-K. Tanskanen and R. Hiltunen (Eds.), *Organization in Discourse: Proceedings from the Turku Conference* (pp.175-86). Turku, Finland: University of Turku.

Hartley, J. (2003). Abstracts, introductions and discussions: how far do they differ in style?", *Scientometrics*, 57(7), 389-98.

Huckin, (2001) Huckin, T. (2001). Abstracting from abstracts. In M. Hewings (Ed.), *Academic Writing in Context* (pp. 93-103). Birmingham: University of Birmingham Press.

Hyland, K. (2004). Graduates' gratitude: the generic structure of dissertation acknowledgements, *English for*

*Specific purposes*, 23(3), 303-324.

Lores, R. (2004). On RA abstract: From rhetorical structure to thematic organization. *English for Specific Purposes*, 23, 280-302.

Maurannen, A. (1993). Contrastive ESP rhetoric: Metatext in Finnish-English economic texts. *English for Specific Purposes*, 12,3-22

Paltridge, B. & Starfield, S. (2007). *Thesis and dissertation writing in a second language: A handbook for supervisors.* Abingdon: Oxon.

Pho, P. D. (2008). Research article abstracts in AL and educational technology: A study of linguist realizations of rhetorical structure and authorial stance. *Discourse studies*, 10(2), 231-250. DOI: 10.117/1461445607087010.

Samraj, B. (2002a). Disciplinary variation in abstracts: The case of wildlife behaviour and conservation biology. In J. Flowerdew (Ed.), *Academic discourse* (pp. 40-56). Harlow; New York: Longman.

Santos, M.B. (1996). *Academic abstracts: A genre analysis.* Unpublished Master's thesis, Federal University of Santa Catarina, Brazil.

Salanger-Meyer, F. (1990a). Discoursal flaws in medical English abstracts: A genre analysis per research-and text-type. *Text, 10*(4), 365-384.

Salanger-Meyer, F.(1990b). Discoursal movements in medical English abstracts and their linguistic exponents: A genre analysis study. INTERFACE: J*ournal of Applied Linguistics, 4*(2), 107-124.

Saranastaporn, S. (2009). *Effective reading and writing English texts.* Bangkok: Wang Aksorn Press Printing.

Swales, J. M. (1981). Aspects of Article Introductions. Birmingham, U.K.: University of Aston.

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

Swales, J. M (1992). *Rethinking genre: Another look at discourse community effects.* Paper presented at the Rethinking Genre Colloquium, Ottowa, Ontario, Canada.

Swales, J. M. (1993). *Genre Analysis: English in academic and research settings.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Swales, J. M. & Feak, C.B. (1994). *Academic Writing for Graduate Students,* Ann Arbor University of Michigan Press.

Swales, J.M. (2004). *Research Genres.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Swales, J.M. & Feak, C. B. (2009). *English in Today's Research World: Abstracts and the writing of abstracts.* The Michigan Series in English for Academic & Professional Proposes

Yang R., & Allison, D. (2003). Research articles in applied linguistics: moving from results to conclusions. *English for Specific Purposes, 22*(4), 235-385.