

Decoding Communicative Intent: Rhetoric Moves and Metadiscourse in DepEd Funded Research Papers

Jennifer M. Oestar

oestarjennifer@gmail.com

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6938-176X>

Manuel S. Enverga University Foundation/ DepEd Lucena City
Lucena City, Philippines

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.54476/apjaet/84088>

Abstract

This study sought to decode the communicative intent of the analyzed rhetoric moves and metadiscourse markers of basic and action research funded under the Department of Education's Basic Education Research Fund (BERF). Genre Analysis was used to analyze the corpora of the 30 BERF papers completed from 2016-2022. With the aid of coding sheets, the following structures were used: a combination of Hardjanto's (1997; 2017) and Kosasih's (2018) Abstract; Swales and Feak's (2012) Introduction, Mc Combes' (2019; 2021) Research Questions; Kwan's (2006) Literature Review; DepEd's Innovation, Intervention, and Strategy; a combination of Lim (2006), Peacock (2011), Kanoksilapatham (2012) and Huang's (2014) Methodology; Swales and Feak's (2012) Results and Discussion, and Yang & Allison's (2003) Conclusion and Recommendation moves and steps framework. Using the Krippendorff alpha coefficient, the inter-rater reliability of the coders was set at almost perfect agreement (0.838 or 84%). Generally, 26 obligatory, 31 optional, and 25 non-obligatory moves and steps were identified per the research section. Metadiscourse markers were determined utilizing AntConc 4.0.10 and were ranked as follows: (1) Evidentials, (2) Transition, (2) Self-mentions, (4) Code glosses, (5) Frame Markers, (6) Attitude Markers, (7) Hedges, (8) Engagement Markers, (9) Boosters, and (10) Endophoric Markers. Integrating the rhetoric moves, steps, and markers, the researcher came up with the six communicative intents (Inform, Outline, Convince, Explain, Present, Integrate) in writing research. A structure for writing BERF research proposal and completed papers were crafted in response to the findings. This study shall promote the culture of research, contribute to the growing literature, address gaps, and open opportunities for follow-up studies.

Keywords: Communicative intent, genre analysis, metadiscourse, rhetoric moves, research papers

Introduction

Education research has always been vital for improving educational policies, programs, and practices (Zhang & Wannaruk, 2016), thus, making research writing a part of teachers' professional development (Hine, 2013; Hong & Lawrence, 2011; Marzo, 2017; Merle, 2016). Consequently, the art and science of conducting research has grown in popularity and is now one of the most important professional development concerns which are linked to educators' capacity to teach (Erba, 2013; Mehrani, 2017; Morales et al., 2016) and are a crucial component for the dissemination of academic knowledge (Ghasempour & Farnia, 2017).

Del Saz-Rubio (2019) suggested that researchers must be familiar with the rhetorical structure of the various parts that comprise a research article, as well as the use of specific interpersonal features that will assist them in convincing the readers of the validity of their research. However, it has been discovered that there were difficulties in writing a research article (Al-Shaibani, 2016; Zibalas & Šinkūnienė, 2019) due to differences in styles, language use, and policies. Kutlay (2012) and Morales (2016) added time constraints and a lack of know-how on research composition as additional problems.

While numerous research has investigated the relationship between some linguistic aspects and rhetorical move structures, little has been done to investigate the connection between metadiscourse use and rhetorical move patterns (Byun, 2014). Further, Condes (2019) recommended that research writers must be enlightened on the concepts of metadiscourse and stance as they apply to research writing so they could raise their academe's prominence by making their research findings, assertions, and claims acceptable and compelling to the academic community.

The concept of this study considered the Research Management Guidelines (RMG) set by the Department of Education in the grant of the Basic Education Research Fund (DepEd Order 39 s. 2016). The researcher wanted to find out how the different aspects such as rhetoric moves, metadiscourse markers, and communicative intent were applied in research-funded papers.

Even though there is an outline on preparing research proposals for Basic Education Research Fund (DO 43, s. 2015, Annex 3. a and 3.b.), there is no discussion on the cognitive structuring of the moves and steps as well as discourse markers to be used for each research section. The researcher noticed that the BERF templates only outline title headings (DO 16, s. 2017, Annex 2) for each part of the research proposal but none has been mentioned about the structure of the completed paper (DO 43, s. 2015). This may create confusion on what should be mandatorily included (obligatory), may be included (optional), and may not be part (non-obligatory) of each section of the paper.

More so, according to the data from the Policy, Planning, and Research Division of DepEd CALABARZON, no study is yet dealing with the analysis of the rhetorical moves, discourse markers, and communicative intent in writing research under BERF. This study is necessary to be conducted as a prime mover in determining research gaps and finding solutions in improving writing research proposals and completed papers.

Objectives of the Study

This study analyzed the rhetorical moves and metadiscourse markers that would decode the communicative intent in writing basic and action research papers under DepEd's Basic Education Research Fund (BERF). Specifically, this sought to answer the following questions:

1. Analyze the rhetoric structures (moves and steps) of the basic and action research papers under the Department of Education's Basic Education Research Fund, in terms of:
 - 1.1. Abstract;
 - 1.2. Introduction;
 - 1.3. Research Question;
 - 1.4. Literature Review;
 - 1.5. Innovation, Intervention and Strategy;
 - 1.6. Methodology;
 - 1.7. Results and Discussion; and
 - 1.8. Conclusions and Recommendations.

2. Identify the moves and steps in BERF research papers are obligatory, optional, and non-obligatory.
3. Analyze the metadiscourse markers found in the BERF basic and action research papers as to research themes indicated in DepEd Order No. 43, s. 2015:
 - 3.1. Textual
 - 3.1.1. Transitions;
 - 3.1.2. Frame markers;
 - 3.1.3. Endophoric markers;
 - 3.1.4. Evidentials; and
 - 3.1.5. Code glosses.
 - 3.2. Interpersonal
 - 3.2.1. Hedges;
 - 3.2.2. Boosters;
 - 3.2.3. Attitude markers;
 - 3.2.4. Engagement markers; and
 - 3.2.5. Self-mentions.
4. Decode communicative intent is decoded from the rhetoric structures (moves and steps) and metadiscourse markers identified in the BERF basic and action research.

Methodology

Research Design. The study employed genre analysis. Musa, Khamis, and Zanariah (2015) supported this method when they stated that this method is one of the most common for analyzing a text's rhetorical structure. Similarly, genre analysis as described by Casañ-Pitarch (2017), refers to the process that describes these communicative purposes that establish the standards for what is generally acceptable in terms of how content should be written or spoken, what issues it would address, and how it could be done so. To do this, the researcher employed moves and steps analysis.

According to Basturkmen (2014) in Uzun (2016), move analysis is a qualitative investigation based on the examination of repetitive patterns in texts. The researcher infers and proposes specific moves and steps for each unit during analysis after dividing the text into units based on their rhetorical functions. The frequency of moves was counted, and percentages were reported to compare corpora. The study also employed a corpus-driven approach in identifying the frequency and ranking of the occurrences of the types of metadiscourse markers in the research corpora. This approach makes use of computer software to analyze language data. This study's corpora included completed research from BERF Cycle 1 (2016) to BERF Cycle 6 (2022). Thirty research papers (in publishable format) from the five cycles were randomly chosen. Topics were segregated from DepEd themes comprising *teaching and learning, child protection, governance, human resource development, cross-cutting themes of disaster risk reduction and management, gender and development, and inclusive education.*

Profile of the Corpora. Six research papers (three action research and three basic research) were designated for every theme. The five research themes were equally distributed to 30 research papers. Griffin and Hauser (2000), as mentioned in Andrey (2016), support this choice of corpus number, stating that a sample size of 30-40 corpora is the best number to be studied. For ease of reference and to maintain

the confidentiality of the writers, the research papers were formatted by removing the title, names of the author, and institution. Each paper was randomly coded from R1-R30 to establish corpora.

Sampling Design and Procedures. This study applied purposive sampling where the researcher chose the corpora based on its classification and adherence to research types and themes. Purposive sampling is a sort of nonprobability sampling in which a researcher actively chooses selected elements or persons for inclusion in a study to ensure that the elements have specific features relevant to the investigation. Communication letters were also sent to DepEd Offices and respective researchers asking for consent to use their study as corpora. More so, confidentiality and non-disclosure agreements were signed by the researcher and the author.

Intercoder and Inter-rater Reliability. The study sought assistance from two intercoders who validated the coding and corpora analysis. The researcher compared her analysis and the analysis of the two intercoders. Many texts recommended 80% agreement as the minimum acceptable inter-rater agreement (McHugh, 2012) and conflicts should be addressed by comparing moves and addressing discrepancies. If there would be a disagreement about how to distinguish a specific move in a sentence, both the raters and the researcher would talk about it and come up with an agreement following the formula for reliability. To compare the researcher’s and intercoders’ analyses, methods of determining inter-rater reliability were employed using Krippendorff’s alpha coefficient. It was designed to quantify the agreement among observers, coders, judges, raters, or measuring instruments in identifying distinctions between normally unstructured occurrences or assigning numerical values to them.

According to Krippendorff (2011), inter-rater reliability refers to how consistently numerous judges rate items or questions on a test with similar scores.

Value	Interpretation
<0	No Agreement
0-0.19	Poor Agreement
0.20-0.39	Fair Agreement
0.40-0.59	Moderate Agreement
0.60-0.79	Substantial Agreement
0.80-1.00	Almost Perfect Agreement

The researcher was able to cross-validate the inter-rater reliability. The interrater agreement fell under *substantial* and *almost perfect agreement*. Out of 77 cases, Intercoder 1 and 2 have a total of 60 agreements and 17 disagreements, Intercoder 1 and 3 have 66 agreements and 11 disagreements, while Intercoder 2 and 3 have 69 agreements and 8 disagreements. Averaging the three intercoders’ level of agreement, the final level of agreement was 0.838 or 84% with an interpretation of *almost perfect agreement*.

Intercoder Reliability Analysis in Krippendorff’s Alpha Coefficient

Value of Krippendorff’s	Level of Agreement	Percentage of Agreement	Interpretation
Intercoder 1 & Intercoder 2	0.771	77%	Substantial Agreement
Intercoder 1 & Intercoder 3	0.852	85%	Almost perfect agreement
Intercoder 2 & Intercoder 3	0.892	89%	Almost perfect agreement
	0.838	84%	Almost perfect agreement

since DepEd research papers have their *Context and Rationale* part of *Introduction* (DepEd Order No. 16, s. 2015).

1.3. In terms of Writing Research Questions

Table 3
Rhetoric Moves, Steps, and Obligatoriness in Writing Research Questions

Moves and Steps	Intent/ Purpose	RESEARCH QUESTION													f	%	Obligatoriness	
		Theme 1		Theme 2		Theme 3		Theme 4		C.C. Theme 1		C.C. Theme 2		C.C. Theme 3				
		BR	AR	BR	AR	BR	AR	BR	AR	BR	AR	BR	AR	BR				AR
		R1- R3	R4- R6	R7- R9	R10 - R12	R13 - R15	R16- R18	R19 - R21	R22 - R12 4	R25	R26	R27	R28	R29	R30			
Move 1	Contextualize the problem																	
Step 1	Context (stating locale, time frame, respondents)	1	4		11	14	17	19, 20	22							8	26.67 %	NO
Step 2	Precise issue (purpose/ aim)	1,2, 3	4, 5, 6	9	10, 12	13, 14, 15	16	19, 20, 21	22, 24	25	26	27				21	70.00 %	Ob
Move 2	Why it matters																	
Step 1	Relevance (why need to be studied)					14				25					30	3	10.00 %	NO
Move 3	Set aims and objectives																	
Step 1	What to do/ information needed?	1,2, 3	4, 5, 6	8, 9	10, 11, 12	13, 14, 15	16, 17, 18	19, 20, 21	22, 24	25	26	27			30	26	86.67 %	Ob
Step 2	Offer Solutions/ outputs	1,2, 3	4, 6	8, 9	10	13, 14	16, 17	19, 20, 21	24	25	26	27				19	63.33 %	Op

Theme 1- Teaching and Learning, Theme 2- Child Protection, Theme 3-Governance, Theme 4-Human Resource Development, Cross Cutting Theme 1 (Disaster Risk Reduction and Management), Cross Cutting Theme 2 (Gender and Development), Cross Cutting Theme 3 (Inclusive Education)

The analysis of the moves and steps was guided by the framework of Mc Combes (2019; 2021). The moves and steps identified in these findings were supported by the recommendations of Mc Combes (2022). According to her, to drive a research paper, project, or thesis, one needs a suitable research question. It identifies precisely what you want to learn and provides your work with a clear focus and purpose. All research questions should be focused on a single problem or issue, researchable using primary and/or secondary sources, feasible to answer within the timeframe and practical constraints, specific enough to be thoroughly answered, complex enough to develop the answer over the course of a paper or thesis, and relevant to your field of study and/or society at large.

This implied that research questions served as the skeleton of BERF research papers. This section tends to guide the researcher during the study. Hence, Calderon and Gonzales (2016) recommended that the general statement of the problem or questions should be formulated first before conducting the research.

1.4. In terms of Writing Literature Review

It has been also noted in the succeeding table that out of 30 research papers analyzed, 15 are basic research and the remaining 15 are action research. This classification made by the researcher is aligned to DO 16, s. 2017 stated that basic research includes *Literature Review* while action research includes *Innovation, Intervention, and Strategy*.

Table 4
Rhetoric Moves, Steps, and Obligatoriness in Writing Literature Review

Moves and Steps	Intent/Purpose	LITERATURE REVIEW											f	%	Obligatoriness			
		Theme 1		Theme 2		Theme 3		Theme 4		C.C. Theme 1		C.C. Theme 2				C.C. Theme 3		
		BR R1-R3	AR R4-R6	BR R7-R9	AR R10-R12	BR R13-R15	AR R16-R18	BR R19-R21	AR R22-R24	BR R25	AR R26	BR R27				AR R28	BR R29	AR R30
Move 1	Establishing one of the territories of one's own research by																	
Step 1	Surveying the non-research-related phenomena or knowledge claims	1, 2,3	4	8	13, 14, 15	16	19, 20			26	27				13	59.10 %	Op	
Step 2	Claiming centrality	1,2	4		14, 15	16	19, 20		26						8	36.37 %	Op	
Step 3	Surveying the research-related phenomena	1,2,3	4	8,9	13, 14, 15	16	19, 20	24	26	27					15	68.18 %	Ob	
Move 2	Creating a research niche (in response of move 1)																	
Step 1	Counterclaiming	2,3	4	8,9	14, 15	16	19				27				10	45.45 %	Op	
Step 2	Gap-indicating	1,2		9	13, 15	16	19, 20		26						9	40.91 %	Op	
Step 3	Asserting confirmative claims about knowledge or research practices surveyed	1,2		8,9	14		19, 20		26	27					9	40.91 %	Op	
Step 4	Asserting the relevancy of the surveyed claims to one's own research	1,3			13	16	19, 20	24	26						8	36.37 %	Op	
Step 5	Abstracting or synthesizing knowledge claims to establish a theoretical position or a theoretical framework					16	20		26						3	13.64 %	NO	
Move 3	Occupying the research niche by announcing																	
Step 1	Research aims, focuses, research questions or hypotheses	1													1	4.55%	NO	
Step 2	Theoretical positions/theoretical frameworks)				15, 16						27				3	13.64 %	NO	
Step 3	Research design/processes)														0	0.00%	NO	
Step 4	Interpretations of terminology used in the study														0	0.00%	NO	

Theme 1- Teaching and Learning, Theme 2- Child Protection, Theme 3-Governance, Theme 4-Human Resource Development, Cross Cutting Theme 1 (Disaster Risk Reduction and Management), Cross Cutting Theme 2 (Gender and Development), Cross Cutting Theme 3 (Inclusive Education)

However, it was observed that three basic research have no *Literature Review* and two action research have *Literature Review* instead of *Innovation, Intervention and Strategy*. It can be gleaned from the observation that the RRL and IIS sections were not fully applied in BERF papers of the analyzed corpora.

1.5. In terms of Innovation, Intervention, and Strategy

Table 5
Rhetoric Moves, Steps and Obligatoriness in Innovation, Intervention, and Strategy

Moves and Steps	Intent/ Purpose	INNOVATION, INTERVENTION AND STRATEGY							f %	Obligatoriness	
		Theme 1	Theme 2	Theme 3	Theme 4	C.C. Theme 1	C.C. Theme 2	C.C. Theme 3			
		AR R4-R6	AR R10-R12	AR R16-R18	AR R22-24	AR R26	AR R28	AR R30			
Move 1	Idea	6	10, 11, 12	17	24			30	7	46.67%	Op
Move 2	Problem	5						30	2	13.33%	NO
Move 3	Procedure/ System	5, 6	10, 11, 12	17	24			30	8	53.33%	Op
Move 4	Solution/Output	5, 6	10, 12		24			30	6	40%	Op

Theme 1- Teaching and Learning, Theme 2- Child Protection, Theme 3-Governance, Theme 4-Human Resource Development, Cross Cutting Theme 1 (Disaster Risk Reduction and Management), Cross Cutting Theme 2 (Gender and Development), Cross Cutting Theme 3 (Inclusive Education)

The table presents the distribution of the moves and steps in the Basic Education Research Funded Papers' *Innovation, intervention, and Strategy* section across research themes. The analysis of the moves and steps was guided by the framework of Swales and Feak (2012). *Optional* moves were found in *Move 1* (Idea), *Move 3* (Procedure/ System), and *Move 4* (Solution) while *Move 2* (Problem) was non-obligatory.

The Idea is the discussion of the rationale of the *Innovation, Intervention or Strategy*. Policy context may be included here. Problem mentions the discussion of the situation or experience that drives the researcher to propose the innovation or strategy. Procedure/ System mentions the innovation, intervention, or strategy and will be resolved. The solution discusses the implementation process of the innovation, intervention, or strategy in the three phases: pre-implementation, during implementation and post-implementation. Here, data analysis procedures for quantitative data and/or qualitative data are briefly mentioned.

1.6. In terms of Obligatoriness in Methodology

It can also be gleaned from the findings in the succeeding table that *Move 1; Step 2* (Recount Steps in Data Collection) is the most prevalent inclusion in *Methodology* section with 80% obligatoriness. It was supported by the findings of Peacock (2011) stating that discussion of procedure appeared mostly in papers. This was also comparable to the scoring guidelines applied in evaluating BERF paper proposals wherein *Methodology* section receives the highest pointing system of 40% (DO 16, s. 2015).

The findings necessitate that BERF researchers should pay attention to the thorough discussion of the steps in data collection and other contents of the *Methodology* section. In this manner, a higher chance of being accepted for research funding since the passing rate for BERF proposals are at least 70% (DO 16, s. 2015).

Table 6
Rhetoric Moves, Steps and Obligatoriness in Methodology

Moves and Steps	Intent/ Purpose	METHODOLOGY SECTION															f	%	Obligatoriness
		Theme 1		Theme 2		Theme 3		Theme 4		C.C. Theme 1		C.C. Theme 2		C.C. Theme 3					
		BR R1-R3	AR R4-R6	BR R7-R9	AR R10-R12	BR R13-R15	AR R16-R18	BR R19-R21	AR R22-R24	BR R25	AR R26	BR R27	AR R28	BR R29	AR R30				
Move 1	Describing data collection procedures																		
Step 1a	Describe the location of the sample	2		8,9	11, 12	13, 15	16	19, 20	22, 23, 24		26	27	28		30	17	56.67%	Op	
Step 1b	Describe the size of the sample population	2,3	4, 5, 6	8, 9	11, 12	13, 14, 15	16, 18	19, 20	22		26		28	29	30	21	70.00%	Ob	
Step 1c	Indicating the data size	1,2,3	5, 6		10, 11, 12	14, 15	17, 18	19, 20, 21	22, 23, 24	25	26	27		29	30	23	76.67%	Ob	
Step 1d	Describe the sampling technique	1,2,	6		11, 12	13, 14, 15	16, 18	20, 21	22, 24	25		27	28	29	30	19	63.33%	Ob	
Step 2	Recount steps in data collection	1,2,3	4, 5	7, 8, 9	11, 12	13, 14, 15	16, 17, 18	19, 21	22, 23, 24	25				29	30	24	80.00%	Ob	
Step 3a	Highlight advantages of using sample		6			15										2	6.67%	NO	
Step 3b	Demonstrate representativity of sample				12	14, 15		20, 21	23	25		27	28	29		10	33.33%	Op	
Step 4	Declaring ethical statements	1,2, 3			12	13, 14, 15	16, 18	20, 21	23	25			28	29		15	50.00%	Op	
Move2	Delineating procedures for measure variables																		
Step 1	Present an overview of the design	1,2,3	4, 5	9	10, 11, 12	13, 14, 15	16	20, 21	22, 23, 24			27		29	30	21	70.00%	Ob	
Step 2a	Specify measurement items	2	5, 6			13, 14	17	19,	22			27			30	10	33.33%	Op	
Step 2b	Define variables															0	0.00%	NO	
Step 2c	Describe method of measuring variables	1,2,3	4, 5, 6	7, 8, 9	10, 11	13, 14, 15	16, 17, 18	19, 20, 21	22, 23, 24	25	26	27	28	29	30	29	96.67%	Ob	
Step 2d	Statistical test techniques	2,3	5, 6		10, 11	13	16	19, 20, 21	22, 24			27		29	30	16	53.33%	Op	
Step 3a	Cite research to justify methods	1	5,	9	11, 12		18	21								7	23.33%	NO	
Step 3b	Highlight acceptability of method	3		8	11, 12		16, 18	19	22	25		27		29	30	12	40.00%	Op	
Move 3	Elucidating data analysis procedure																		
Step 1	Relate analysis procedure	1,3	5	7, 8, 9	11	13, 15	17	19, 20, 21	22, 23, 24				28	29	30	19	63.33%	Ob	
Step 2	Justify analysis procedure	1	5			15		20, 21	23				28			7	23.33%	NO	
Step 3	Preview results															0	0.00%	NO	

Theme 1- Teaching and Learning, Theme 2- Child Protection, Theme 3-Governance, Theme 4-Human Resource Development, Cross Cutting Theme 1 (Disaster Risk Reduction and Management), Cross Cutting Theme 2 (Gender and Development), Cross Cutting Theme 3 (Inclusive Education)

1.7. In terms of Results and Discussion

Table 7
Rhetoric Moves and Steps in Results and Discussion

Moves and Steps	Intent/ Purpose	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION SECTION														f	%	Oblig atori ness
		Theme 1		Theme 2		Theme 3		Theme 4		C.C. Theme 1		C.C. Theme 2		C.C. Theme 3				
		BR R1- R3	AR R4- R6	BR R7- R9	AR R10- R12	BR R13- R15	AR R16- R18	BR R19- R21	AR R22- R24	BR R25	AR R26	BR R27	AR R28	BR R29	AR R30			
Move1	Background Information (Research purposes, theory, methodology)	1,2,3	4, 5, 6	7, 8, 9	10, 11, 12	13, 14, 15	16, 17, 18	19, 20, 21	22, 23, 24	25	26	27	28	29	30	30	100 %	Ob
Move 2	Summarizing and reporting key results	1,2,3	4, 5, 6	7, 8, 9	10, 11, 12	13, 14, 15	16, 17, 18	19, 20, 21	22, 23, 24	25	26	27	28	29	30	30	100 %	Ob
Move 3	Commenting on the key results (making claims, explaining the results, comparing the new work with the previous studies, offering alternative explanations)	1,2,3	4, 5, 6	7, 8, 9	10, 11, 12	13, 14, 15	16, 17, 18	19, 20, 21	22, 23	25	26	27		29	30	29	96.67%	Ob
Move 4	Stating the limitation of the study														30	1	03.33%	NO
Move 5	Making recommendations for future implementation and for future research															0	0.00 %	NO

Theme 1- Teaching and Learning, Theme 2- Child Protection, Theme 3-Governance, Theme 4-Human Resource Development, Cross Cutting Theme 1 (Disaster Risk Reduction and Management), Cross Cutting Theme 2 (Gender and Development), Cross Cutting Theme 3 (Inclusive Education)

The table presents the distribution of the moves and steps in Basic Education Research Funded Papers' *Results and Discussion* section across research themes. The analysis of the moves and steps was guided by the framework of Swales and Feak (2012). The BERF paper analyzed in the corpora Confirmed George Mason University Writing Center's claimed (2019) that *Results, Discussion*, and even *Conclusions* can be presented variously depending in the nature of the study. It implied that BERF papers fall in Option 2: *Results* and *Discussion* integrated.

1.8. In terms of Writing Conclusions and Recommendations

The table presents the distribution of the moves and steps in Basic Education Research Funded Papers' *Conclusion and Recommendation* section across research themes. The analysis of the moves and steps was guided by the framework of Yang and Allison (2003). Additionally, Merle (2016), suggested that the study's major findings as well as general remarks generated from the research should be included

in the *Conclusions* part of a DepEd research paper. The facts and conclusions must be presented in the order of the research's specific questions.

Table 8
Rhetoric Moves, Steps and Obligatoriness in Writing Conclusions and Recommendations

Moves and Steps	Intent/Purpose	CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION SECTION														f	%	Obligatoriness
		Theme 1		Theme 2		Theme 3		Theme 4		Cross-Cutting Theme 1		Cross-Cutting Theme 2		Cross-Cutting Theme 3				
		BR R1-R3	AR R4-R6	BR R7-R9	AR R10-R12	BR R13-R15	AR R16-R18	BR R19-R21	AR R22-R24	BR R25	AR R26	BR R27	AR R28	BR R29	AR R30			
Move 1	Summarizing the study	1,2,3	4, 6	8, 9	11, 12	13, 14, 15	16, 17, 18	19, 20, 21	22, 23, 24	25	26	27	28	29	30	27	90.00%	Ob
Move 2	Evaluating the study																	
Step 1	Indicating significance/advantage	1,2	4,5,6	9	12	14	16,18	24						29		12	40.00%	Op
Step 2	Indicating limitations							24								1	3.33%	NO
Step 3	Evaluating methodology					15	16,17									3	10.00%	NO
Move 3	Deductions from research																	
Step 1	Recommending further research	1,2,3	4	7,8,9	12		16	20,21	23		26	27	28			15	50.00%	Op
Step 2	Drawing pedagogic implications	1,2,3	4,5,6	7,8,9	10,11,12	13,15	16,18	19,20,21	22,23,24	25	26	27	28	29	30	28	93.33%	Ob

Theme 1- Teaching and Learning, Theme 2- Child Protection, Theme 3-Governance, Theme 4-Human Resource Development, Cross Cutting Theme 1 (Disaster Risk Reduction and Management), Cross Cutting Theme 2 (Gender and Development), Cross Cutting Theme 3 (Inclusive Education)

The *Conclusion* suggests that each of these final chapters was written in sequential order (*Results, Discussion, and Conclusions*) as found by Nguyen and Pramoolsook (2016). In the case of the BERF-analyzed paper, *Results and Discussion* section are integrated while *Conclusions* and *Recommendations* sections appeared separately.

2. Metadiscourse Markers in DepEd Funded Papers

Table 2
Frequency and Ranking of Metadiscourse Markers used in BERF Papers

Category	Frequency	Percentage	Rank
Textual			
Transition	412	25.54%	2
Frame markers	138	7.55%	5
Endophoric markers	40	2.19%	10
Evidentials	494	27.02%	1
Code glosses	179	9.79%	4
Interactional			
Hedges	84	4.60%	7
Boosters	73	3.99%	8
Attitude markers	113	6.18%	6
Self-mentions	226	12.36%	3
Engagement markers	69	3.77%	9
Total	1828	100.00%	

This presents the metadiscourse features of DepEd BERF papers. The analysis was guided by Hyland's (2005) Metadiscourse Taxonomy which stated that metadiscourse markers can be divided into two categories: *textual* and *interpersonal*. It was textually analyzed using AntConc 4.10 Corpus Analysis Toolkit.

The textual metadiscourse taxonomy, according to Hyland (2005), is divided into five subcategories: *logical connectives*, *frame markers*, *endophoric markers*, *evidentials*, and *code glosses*. On the other hand, *hedges*, *boosters*, *attitude markers*, *self-mentions*, and *engagement markers* are the five subcategories within the interactional metadiscoursal category.

The table shows the frequency, percentage, and rank of the summary of metadiscourse markers found in Basic Education Research Fund completed papers. *Evidentials* have the greatest number of occurrences while the *endophoric markers* (27.02%) were the least (2.19%).

Textual markers (*transition*, *frame markers*, *endophoric markers*, *evidentials*, and *code glosses*) have a total of 1, 263 hits in the AntConc 4.0.10 while *interactional markers* (*hedges*, *boosters*, *attitude markers*, *self-mentions*, and *engagement markers*) have a total of 565 hits. *Transitions*, *code glosses*, and *endophoric markers* are the most utilized metadiscourse elements since they clarify connections and linkages according to Hyland (2010). This is parallel to the study's findings since the three markers are textual markers with a great number of hits.

3. Communicative Intent of the Identified Moves and Steps and Metadiscourse Markers

The analysis of the communicative purpose of the identified moves and steps in BERF papers was based on Pho (2008) who believed each move has its communicative purpose, which, together with other moves, contributes to the general communicative purpose of the text. According to him, a text's overall communicative purpose is achieved through the combination of many separate moves each with its own communicative purpose.

The findings revealed that for writers to arrive at the appropriate moves and steps in research writing, they must first clarify their communicative intent or purpose. It can also be reflected that the presence of metadiscourse markers aids in identifying the moves and steps of the paper. Hence, there is a direct connection between the communicative intent of the moves and steps and metadiscourse markers. The integration of the moves and steps and the metadiscourse markers identified the communicative intent of the researcher in writing. In summary, the researcher arrived at six communicative intents involved in research writing: *Inform*, *Outline*, *Convince*, *Explain*, *Present*, and *Integrate*.

Conclusions

Based on the analysis of the corpus gathered, the following conclusions were derived:

1. The rhetoric moves and steps of the BERF papers were analyzed using varied frameworks supported by the researcher's readings on Cognitive Structuring:
 - 1.1. The *Abstract* section has five moves and 15 steps which are both applicable in basic and action research.
 - 1.2. The *Introduction* section has three moves and 12 steps which are both applicable in basic and action research; however, in basic research, it was titled Context and Rationale while in action research it was titled as Introduction.

- 1.3. The *Research Questions* has three moves and five steps which are both applicable in basic and action research.
 - 1.4. The *Literature Review* has three moves and 12 steps which is an important section in basic research; however, it was also found in the earlier cycles of action research.
 - 1.5. *Innovation, Intervention and Strategy* section has four moves. It is found in action research only.
 - 1.6. *Methodology* section has three moves and 18 steps which are both found in basic and action research.
 - 1.7. *Results and Discussion* section has five moves which are both found in basic and action research.
 - 1.8. *Conclusions and Recommendations* have three moves and five steps which are both found in basic and action research.
2. In terms of obligatoriness of the moves and steps, the analyzed BERF papers have the following results:
 - 2.1. The *Abstract* section's moves have six obligatory, four optional, and five non-obligatory steps.
 - 2.2. The *Introduction* section's moves have four obligatory, six optional, and no non-obligatory steps.
 - 2.3. The *Research Questions* section's moves have two obligatory, six optional, and five non-obligatory steps.
 - 2.4. *Literature Review* section's moves have one obligatory, six optional, and five non-obligatory steps.
 - 2.5. *Innovation, Intervention and Strategy* section has no obligatory, three optional, and one non-obligatory move.
 - 2.6. *Methodology* section's moves have seven obligatory, six optional and five non-obligatory steps.
 - 2.7. *Results and Discussion* section has three obligatory, no optional, and two non-obligatory moves.
 - 2.8. *Conclusions and Recommendation* section's moves have three obligatory, no optional and two non-obligatory steps.
 3. The metadiscourse markers found in the analyzed Basic Education Research Fund papers were ranked as follows: (1) *Evidentials*, (2) *Transitions/ Logical connectives*, (3) *Self-mentions*, (4) *Code glosses*, (5) *Frame Markers*, (6) *Attitude Markers*, (7) *Hedges*, (8) *Engagement Markers*, (9) *Boosters*, (10) *Endophoric Markers*. These are present in all themes of BERF papers regardless of being action or basic research.
 4. Upon integrating the rhetoric moves, steps, and metadiscourse markers, the researcher was able to generate six communicative intents from the BERF research papers. The writer has these intentions:
 - 4.1. *Inform* the readers of background information and the previous findings related to the current study.
 - 4.2. *Outline* the purpose or objective, the goals of the research, or the problems the authors wish to tackle.
 - 4.3. *Convince* the reader that the study is worth conducting by stating its significance/ advantage.
 - 4.4. *Present* general findings of the study through linear and non-linear text.
 - 4.5. *Explain* how the study must be conducted, and how data must be gathered, interpreted, and analyzed.
 - 4.6. *Integrate* the interpretation of the results, implications for further research, and/ or applications of the findings.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions of the study, the following are recommended:

1. Researchers and BERF applicants must include the obligatory moves and steps and follow frameworks suited for the type of papers they are writing. They are recommended to use a moves and steps checklist to help them track the contents lacking in their research proposals and completed papers. Likewise, they are also encouraged to use a wide range of metadiscourse markers to improve the flow of their writing.
2. Technical Assistance providers and evaluators shall use the findings of this study as their bases for guiding teachers in writing basic and action research. The guidepost and coding sheet may also serve as a criterion in evaluating the contents of the research proposals and completed papers submitted to them.
3. DepEd may adopt the findings of this study for training, benchmarking, and capability-building activities. These may augment better solutions to the problems of promoting the culture of research and increasing the percentage of BERF grantees in their levels of governance.
4. Future researchers may use the study as the basis for conducting a relative study regarding rhetorical moves and steps, metadiscourse markers, and communicative intent. Likewise, they are recommended to use a combination of frameworks suitable to their study in analyzing different fields. The findings of the study shall contribute to the growing body of literature and the limitations and gaps shall open the opportunity to come up with another study.

References

- Anthony, L. (2022). AntConc (Version 4.0.10) [Computer software]. Tokyo, Japan: Waseda University.
- Bhatia, V.K. (2010). Interdiscursivity in professional communication. *Discourse and Communication*, 21(1), 32-50
- Byun, J. (2014). The rhetorical structure and metadiscourse of student-produced research article abstracts (RAAs). [Paper presentation]. Korea Association of Teachers of English (KATE) International Conference
- Casañ-Pitarch, R. (2016). A proposal for genre analysis: The AMS model. *EPiC Series in Language and Linguistics*, 2, 235-246.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/316860859_A_Proposal_for_Genre_Analysis_The_AMS_model
- Del Saz-Rubio, M.D.M. (2019). A contrastive genre-based approach to the rhetorical structure and use of interactional metadiscourse in the results and discussion section of food science & technology papers. *Miscelánea*, 59, 13-46. <https://riunet.upv.es/handle/10251/159533>
- Department of Education Order No. 16, s. 2017. Research Management Guidelines. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2017/03/20/do-16-s-2017-research-management-guidelines/>

- Department of Education Order No. 43, s. 2015. Revised Guidelines for the Basic Education Research Fund (BERF). <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2015/09/16/do-43-s-2015-revised-guidelines-for-the-basic-education-research-fund-berf/>
- Erba, B. (2013). The practice and challenges in conducting action research: The case of Sululta Secondary School. <http://etd.aau.edu.et/handle/123456789/7569>
- Hine, G.S.C. (2013). The importance of action research in teacher education programs. *Issues in Educational Research*, 23 (2): Special Issue. <http://www.iier.org.au/iier23/hine.pdf>
- Hong, C. E & Lawrence, S.A. (2011). Action research in teacher education: Classroom inquiry, reflection, and data-driven decision making. *Journal of Inquiry & Action in Education*, 4(2). <http://www.wpunj.edu/dotAsset/330733.pdf>
- Hyland, K. (2005), *Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing*. London: Continuum.
- Hyland, K. (2010). Metadiscourse: mapping interactions in academic writing, *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 9(2), 125-143
- Krippendorff, K. (2011). *Computing Krippendorff's Alpha-Reliability*. https://repository.upenn.edu/asc_papers/43
- Kutlay, N. (2012). A survey of English language teachers' views of research. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 70, 188-206. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.01.055>
- Mercado, F. M. (2008). Cognitive structuring of research articles in Philippine journals. *Philippine E-Journals*. Philippine Journal of Linguistics. 39 (1).
- Merle, J.A. (2016). *DepEd Quezon classroom-based action research (DepEd Quezon CARES): A vehicle to Intensified Instruction*. Planning and Research Section, Division of Quezon.
- Morales, R. C. (2012). Conclusions in research articles: A Filipino-Japanese contrastive rhetorical study. *Philippines ESL Journal*, 8. www.philippine-esl-journal.com/V8_A4.pdf
- Musa, N.F., Khamis, N. & Zanariah, J. (2015). The structure of method section in engineering research articles. *Asian Social Science*. 11 (17). ISSN 1911-2017. Canadian Center of Science and Education. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ass.v11n17p74>
- Nguyen, L., T., T. & Pramoolsook, I. (2016). A move-based analysis of TESOL master's thesis conclusion chapters by Vietnamese postgraduates. *Global Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*. 6(1), 2-12
- Peacock, M. (2011). The structure of the methods section in research articles across disciplines. *The Asian ESP Journal*, 7 (2), 97-123
- Pho, P. D. (2008). Research article abstracts in applied linguistics and educational technology: A study of linguistic realizations of rhetorical structure and authorial stance. *Discourse Studies*, 10 (2), 231-250

- Povolná, R. (2018). Conference abstracts in English: A challenge for non-Anglophone writers.' In: Mur-Dueñas, P. and Šinkūnienė, J. (eds) *Intercultural Perspectives on Research Writing*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 151-172
- Swales, J. M., & Feak, C.B (2009). *Academic writing for graduate students: Essential tasks and skills*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Swales, J. M., & Feak, C.B. (2012). *Academic writing for graduate students, 3rd Edition: Essential tasks and skills*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Swales, J. M. (2004). *Research genres: Explorations and applications*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524827>
- Uzun, K. (2016). A genre analysis of the methodology sections of descriptive medical-surgical nursing articles. *Journal of Computer and Education Research*. 4(7) 65-81
- Wang, L. & Zhang, Y. (2016). An analysis of metadiscourse in the abstracts of English academic papers. *Global Journal of Human Social Science: G Linguistics & Education*. 16 (9), ISSN: 2249-460x
- Zibalas, D. & Šinkūnienė, J. (2019). Rhetorical structure of promotional genres: the case of research article and conference abstracts. *Discourse and Interaction*. 12 (2). 95-113. ISSN 1802-9930. <https://doi.org/10.5817/DI2019-2-95>
- Zhang, B. & Wannaruk, A. (2016). Rhetorical structure of education research article methods Sections. *PASAA*. 51. 155-184. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1112248>

Copyrights

Copyright of this article is retained by the author/s, with first publication rights granted to APJAET. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4>).