

**AN ANALYSIS OF STUDENTS' RESEARCH PROPOSAL
INTRODUCTION BASED ON CARS MODEL
AT STAIN SJECH M. DJAMIL DJAMBEK BUKITTINGGI**

*Nora Fudhla, Yenni Rozimela, Kurnia Ningsih
Language Education Program, State University of Padang
norafudhla@gmail.com*

Abstrak: Artikel ini ditulis berdasarkan penelitian yang bertujuan untuk mengetahui bagaimana retorika penulisan pendahuluan proposal penelitian mahasiswa Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris (PBI). Retorika penulisan yang digunakan sebagai pedoman penelitian adalah Swales' CARS model yang terdiri dari 3 langkah (move) yaitu: 1) *Establishing the Territory (Move 1)*, 2) *Establishing the Niche (Move 2)* dan 3) *Occupying the Niche (Move 3)*. Penelitian ini merupakan penelitian deskriptif dengan sumber data berupa pendahuluan proposal sejumlah 16 buah yang dipilih dengan teknik sampel acak stratifikasi. Data dikumpulkan melalui instrument berbentuk lembaran pengkodean dan catatan pengkodean. Selanjutnya data direduksi, ditampilkan dan diinterpretasi. Temuan penelitian ini menunjukkan bahwa secara garis besar: 1) area penelitian yang dituliskan dalam *Establishing the Territory (Move 1)* masih terlalu luas dan tidak sesuai dengan masalah penelitian bahkan ditulis berulang-ulang dan tumpang tindih dengan moves lainnya, 2) masalah penelitian yang seharusnya disebutkan dalam pendahuluan belum sesuai dengan kriteria *Establishing the Niche (Move 2)* sehingga apa yang akan diteliti tidak tertera dengan jelas dan 3) tujuan serta pertanyaan penelitian dalam *Occupying the Niche (Move 3)* juga masih belum dituliskan dengan tepat dan belum sesuai dengan permasalahan penelitian.

Keywords : *introduction, rhetorical structure, Swales' CARS model*

INTRODUCTION

Introduction section is a first part written in a research proposal. As the first part written, the introduction serves an important role for it sets the stage for the entire study. Besides, it draws the researcher's ideas and interest of the problems. Hence, introduction section would likely be the first part that needs to be carefully written and developed during the writing of a research proposal. .

Wilkinson (1991:96) states that the introduction is the part that provides the readers with the background information of the

research proposed and establishes a framework for the research so that the reader can understand how it is related to other research. Besides, Weissberg and Buker (1990: 20) say that introduction part serves as an orientation for the readers and gives them the perspective they need to understand the detailed information coming in the later sections. Clearly, the introduction draws the research topic as a lead-in to help the readers to follow the logic of the proposal for it states the statement of the problem, purpose and research questions, theoretical perspective, and limitation of the study.

Nevertheless, writing the introduction section is known to be troublesome for most candidate researchers. It is admitted by Swales (1990:137), Paltridge and Starfield (2007:82) and Swales and Feak (2012: 327) who say that writing the introduction is known to be burdensome for some writers. They also found that nearly all academic writers admit to having more difficulty with getting started on a piece of writing than they have with its continuation.

As a matter of fact, the difficulty in writing introduction of research proposal is also faced by the students of STAIN Sjech. M. Djamil Djambek Bukittinggi, especially English Education Department students. Based on the preliminary study result, it was found that the difficulties are related to how to begin writing this part and how to state a researchable and significant problem. It is not easy for them to accentuate the research topic or problem which is significant and important to be studied. Besides, the lecturers said that they often find some mistakes in the students' research proposal, especially in the introduction. More than 70% of students' research proposal introductions are considered unwell-structured. In addition, it was found from some proposal seminar observations that the introductions written have not been effective and efficient. The contributors assumed that the backgrounds have not described the importance of the topic researched and the strong arguments to choose the topic. As the result, most of introductions are suggested to be improved and repaired. Even,

some of them are suggested to be changed.

The difficulties in writing the introduction of a research proposal might be attributed to some factors. Swales and Feak argue that the length of a text may influence the writer's ability to compose such a well-written introduction. Besides, they believe that the requirement of the readership about the organization or the structure of an introduction might burden the writer to think about what comes first and what should be written next (Swales and Feak, 2012: 328). Thus, in order to be able to write a well-written introduction and to obtain the acceptance of the readership, the students should employ a widely used organizational pattern, which is called rhetorical structure (Swales and Feak, 2012:328).

Rhetorical structure is a way to "frame" or to "organize" the writing to communicate ideas which functions is to shape the ideas progression (Hult, 1987:19). It is supported by Swales (1990:138) who argues that the researchers need rhetorical structure to address and to arrange their goals, current capacities, problems and criteria of evaluation in writing introduction. He then proposed a rhetorical structure or movement as a model to write an introduction; that is Create A Research Space (CARS) model (Swales, 1990: 140, Swales and Feak, 2102: 331). This rhetorical movement consists of three move-steps structure. They are Establishing the Territory (Move 1), Establishing a Niche (Move 2) and Occupying a Niche (Move 3).

Establishing the Territory (Move 1) is a first move to indicate that the research topic area is in some way significant, important and relevant. This move is followed by Establishing a Niche (Move 2) to indicate the gap or problem that needs to be studied. It is done either by indicating a gap or extending the previous knowledge. The gap can be taken from the personal experience, deductions from the theories and the extension of the previous studies (Ary, et all, 1972: 40-45). The extension can be done through stating the insufficient result of preliminary study or the conclusion of previous related researches. Then, the gap or problem created in Move 2 is offered to be “filled” or solved in Occupying the Niche move (Move 3). In short, these three Moves structure the writing of introduction in research proposal.

Table 1. Swales’ CARS Model

Move	Steps
1. Establishing the Territory	1.a. Claiming centrality, by showing that the general research area is important, relevant, interesting and significant: (OBLIGATORY) 1.b. Introducing and reviewing items of research in the area (OBLIGATORY)
2. Establishing a Niche	2.a. Indicating a gap in the previous research (OBLIGATORY) 2.b. Extending previous knowledge in some way (OBLIGATORY)
3. Occupying a Niche	3.a. Outlining purposes or stating the nature of the present research (OBLIGATORY) 3.b. Listing research questions or hypothesis (PISF) 3.c. Announcing principal findings (PISF)

Every move is divided into several steps. Those steps are used to indicate the detail rhetorical structure of the introduction. The steps are such as claiming the centrality, reviewing the previous studies, indicating a gap, extending the previous knowledge, outlining purpose of the present research etc (Swales, 1990: 141; Swales and Feak, 2012: 331). The detail description of Swales’ CARS move-steps structure is listed as follow:

	3.d Stating the value of the present research (PISF)
	3.e Indicating structure of the research proposal (PISF)

Note: *PISF – Present in Some Fields, but rare in others

Table 1. Adapted from Swales and Feak (2012: 331)

Nevertheless, the rhetorical structure of introduction in a research proposal is assumed as topic which is less to be studied. Referring to some previous studies such as Bunton (2002), Cheung (2012), Briones (2012) etc, most of those studies gave consent on investigating the CARS structure of introduction sections in research articles (RA) or theses instead of the research proposal. Whereas, the problems related to the introduction in a research proposal are also important to be investigated as well as the introduction sections in research articles and theses. Hence, it seems that the problems in writing the introduction in research proposal were still limited to be discussed and emerge the need to conduct further research.

Considering the problems found and the facts stated above, the primary objective in the present research is to investigate the rhetorical structure of backgrounds of the problem written by the English Education Department students of STAIN Sjech M. Djamil Djambek Bukittinggi in their research proposals by using Swales' CARS rhetorical structure. Thus, the purposes of the research are to investigate:

1. How the Establishing Territory Move (Move 1) is written in the introduction.

2. How the Establishing Niche Move (Move 2) is written in the introduction.
3. How the Occupying Niche Move (Move 3) is written in the introduction.

METHOD OF THE RESEARCH

This study was descriptive research which investigated the rhetorical structure of research proposal introduction written by English Education Department students of STAIN Bukittinggi.

The source of the data was taken from 48 research proposal introductions written by the seventh semester students in 2014/2015 academic year. Each of these introductions was coded by D followed by number (D1 to D48). However, there were only 16 introductions chosen as the sample through stratified random sampling technique; they were D3, D11, D13, D15, D19, D20, D24, D25, D26, D29, D31, D34, D37, D38, D45, D46.

Furthermore, there were two instruments used in this research, namely: Coding Sheet I and Coding Sheet I note. The Coding Sheet I was made in terms of checklist followed by the explanation or information of how the rhetorical structure was written (Suharsimi Arikunto, 2006: 159, Eriyanto, 2011: 221). It was developed and adapted from theories of CARS model and used to identify the rhetorical structure of introduction. The second

one was Coding Sheet I Note which was used to write down any findings, comments, or problem found during data reading. This note was used to remind the researcher not to miss any findings to be discussed later.

The data were analyzed following Miles and Huberman's techniques of data analysis (1984: 21-23). Firstly, the data were reduced and tabulated in a table containing all of identified data collected from the documents. Besides, the identified data were summarized in a table by using tally procedure to ease the process of data analysis. Secondly, the data were display to describe the rhetorical structure written in the documents. Lastly, the data were interpreted to draw the conclusion.

FINDINGS

Based on the data analysis, it was found that:

1. Establishing the Territory move (Move 1) was stated by all 16 documents' writers. All of the writers used centrality claiming of the research topic (Step 1.a) to establish this move and only 1 of them who cited some related previous researches (Step 1.b). Nevertheless, the study revealed that more than half of Move 1 identified in the documents was not established appropriately. Most of Move 1 identified was written in too general or too broad area. Besides, the research area and the centrality claiming stated by the writers were considered far from the actual research problem proposed in the research. In contrast, the only one Step 1.b identified was considered fairly written. Based on the data analysis, the identified step strongly supported the centrality

claiming established earlier and had detail information about the previous researches reviewed such as the name of the researcher, the years and the result of the study.

In addition, it was found that Move 1 had been written repeatedly in all of the documents. The repetition was stated either in the series of paragraph or was written overlapped with other moves or steps. Even, it was found that there were 8 documents containing centrality claiming paragraphs for two or three pages long. Most significantly, Move 1 was established again after Move 2 or Move 3 had been established.

2. Establishing The Niche Move (Move 2)

It was found that Move 2 was not established in all of the documents. The data show that only 1 out of the 16 documents' writers stated Step 2.a (indicating the gap found in the previous studies) and only 2 of them stated Step 2.b (extending the previous knowledge in some ways).

Based on the data analysis, the only one Step 2.a identified was considered fairly written (found in Document 26). This identified step had already indicated the gap found in the previous studies. Besides, the writer of Document 26 had cited the information of the previous researches.

Furthermore, the study revealed that one of Step 2.b identified was considered well and fairly written while another one was considered poorly written. The

sample of well-written Step 2.b can be seen in the Document 15. The writer of this document had mentioned what strategy to be extended in her present research which was successfully applied by previous researcher. Besides, the writer had mention who had applied this strategy. In contrast, the Step 2.b identified in Document 20 was considered poorly written since the extension of the model chosen was not clearly explained and the detail description of who had used it previously was not cited. Eventually, it was found that nearly all of the documents' writers had indicated a gap or problem to be solved. They had begun to use several key signals such as quasi-negatives to show the *mini-critique* like *but*, *nevertheless*, and *however*. Nonetheless, the gaps or problems indicated in those documents could not be identified as the gap or problem as demanded by CARS model. The gaps or the problems written in those documents could be classified as practical research problem instead of research-based research problem as proposed by Swales. Based on Swales' CARS model, the research problem should be found in the previous studies (Step 2.a and Step 2.a) while most of the documents' writers found the problem in the practice of educational setting such as in schools, colleges, courses, etc. Thus, instead of mentioning any kind of related previous studies to show the gap or to extend the tradition, most of the documents' writers tended

to justify the research problem by showing the evidence taken from the fields, such as personal experience, others experience (such as teachers, students, school principles, etc) and preliminary study result.

Based on the data analysis, 2 out of the 16 documents' writers cited the practical research problem found in their personal experience (Document 11 and Document 45) and half of them (8 out of 16 writers) provided information about the problem found in the field through interview, documentation study or observation (D3, D11, D15, D20, D24, D25, D37, and D45).

3. Occupying the Niche Move (Move 3) was already stated by most of documents' writers. There were 13 documents stated Step 3.a (outlining or stating the purpose of the present research), 16 documents stated Step 3.b (listing research questions or hypotheses), 16 documents stated Step 3.c (announcing principal findings), 16 documents stated Step 3.d (stating the value of the present research) and none of the documents stated Step 3.e (indicating the structure of the research proposal).

Based on the data analysis, it was found that most of Step 3.a (outlining research overall purpose) was considered poorly written which falls into two category. First, it was noted that some of Step 3.a written was considered too general. It was because this step was stated with no description about what, where and who will be studied. Second, it was found that half of

Step 3.a written was considered inappropriate. It was because the purpose was inappropriate with the research problem, research questions and principal findings. In other words, what was stated as the research overall purpose had nothing to do with the research problem described earlier. Besides, it was considered inappropriate due to the choice of word or the type of the research.

In contrast, only 2 out of 13 identified Step 3.a which were considered fairly written. It was because the documents' writers had already stated appropriate research purposes which were related to the research problem and had already mentioned what, where, and who will be studied.

Like Step 3.a, it was found that more than half of the identified Step 3.b (listing research questions or hypothesis) was considered inappropriate. There were three category of inappropriateness indicated in the documents. First, the Step 3.b was categorized inappropriate because the research questions were not suitable to the research problem (Move 2). For example, the research questions were about the history of language learning and the definition of method whereas the research problem was about the grammatical errors (Document 46). Second, it was inappropriate because the research questions were not in line with the research overall purpose (Step 3.a). A sample taken from Document 34 showed that the research questions were to answer

whether cognitive and compensation strategy influence the students' vocabulary mastery whereas the research overall purpose mentioned earlier was to test the students' ability on mastering vocabulary through games.

Third, the inappropriateness was due to the inappropriate choice of question words or type of the research. For example, it can be seen on Document 11 in which the candidate researcher would like to apply a strategy named class action research whereas the class action research is a kind of research type or design.

Like Step 3.b, most of Step 3.c (announcing principal findings) was considered inappropriate. The inappropriateness was occurred due to the principal findings stated were not in line with research overall purpose or research questions. Most of the Step 3.c was briefly and clearly stated but the result of data analysis shows that more than half of the documents' writers did not relate the specific purpose of the research with the research overall purpose or research questions. For example, the principal findings stated in Document 29 was to find out the students' strategies in learning English while the research purpose was to know the application of metacognitive strategies and the research questions were about how able the students applied the strategy. In short, what was stated in Step 3.a, 3.b and 3.c were different and were not related each other. Furthermore, it was found that more than half of the Step 3.d

(stating the value of the present research) in all of the documents was categorized poorly written. It was because most of significance of the research written was too general and was not directly related to the research problem or research purpose. In some cases, the significance of the research was written too short which cause the research seemed not valuable. Besides, almost all of the documents' writers did not state theoretical contribution.

DISCUSSION

The results of findings above are discussed as follow:

1. Establishing the Territory (Move 1)

Referring to the findings above, it can be seen that the students had difficulties to choose the research area, to begin writing the initial section of introduction with appropriate scope of research territory and to narrow down or to organize ideas.

These problems probably happened because of some factors, such as the low of students' ability and the lack of students' ideas or practice about research area territory. Referred to the syllabus of Research Method subject which provides the students about research proposal writing, it can be seen that the discussion related to introduction is only given once and is designed to be taught with several materials.

Besides, it seems that most of the students tried to make sure that their research area or research

topic is important and significant for they repeated Move 1 enormously. It is supported by Paltridge and Starfield (2007: 91) who say that the use of the three moves is often in cyclical manner since the writer tries to justify the relevant of his/her research.

Furthermore, the generality and the repetition of Move 1 in introductions analyzed in this research is in line with the findings of Bunton's study (2002) who found that all but one of the 45 Introductions he analyzed had Move 1 been recycled several times over the course of introduction. Bunton's study also proved that the generality and the repetition of Move 1 also occurred in other range of fields. In the matter of this fact, the generality and the repetition of Move 1 in the introductions investigated seems to "disobey" the basic structure of CARS model due to the length of the introduction and the numeral aspects to be explained. It is supported by Paltridge and Starfield who state that there is a possibility to recycle several moves due the length of the text allowed and the various aspects examined (2007: 91).

Thus, several factors mentioned above are probably why the students tended to state Move 1 in too general research area and to repeat this move enormously just to establish the actual research area territory.

2. Establishing a Niche (Move 2)

Referring to the findings above, it shows that the gaps or the

problems stated in almost all of the introductions were not in line with what is demanded in CARS model. The findings show that only a small number of the students who follow the niche establishment based on CARS model which tends to find a gap in the previous studies rather than in the educational practices.

This probably happened because of some factors. First, it probably happened because the students have not conducted documentation study in terms of reviewing literature or related previous researches to prove that the research topic is worthy, observable and acceptable in epistemic world of research or by research communities. Possibly, the students have not or have not been encouraged to read a lot before starting to write.

Second, it might be related to the students' course of program in which they were trained to be an English teacher so that they tended to find a problem in the educational practices rather than in previous studies. It is supported by Creswell who stated that most of educational researchers would likely to choose the problem they found in the educational settings (2009a: 76).

Third, it could be because there is a tendency or assumption to write introduction mostly in terms of self-citation or opinion rather than citing others and put any kind of citations in the next chapter. This tendency had ever been revealed by a study conducted by Cheung (2012) in Singapore who also found that only few of the

documents' writers she observed wrote review of the related previous researches in the introduction section. She argues that a possible reason to account for the less frequent use of literature in the introduction could be because Singaporean students think that review of literature should be presented as a separate chapter in chapter two. Another reason might be attributed to the fact that students in Singapore are not aware of the need to include relevant literature in the introduction to contextualize the study. Otherwise, Swales and Feak state that citations of any literature review can occur anywhere in introduction section to support opinion (2012:340). It is done to acknowledge the intellectual property rights of earlier authors and to show respect for previous scholars.

In brief, the inappropriate counter claim (Move 2) based on CARS model in the students' introduction may probably due to the lack of students' reading or knowledge about the related previous studies, the students' training or course program, and the students' assumption that the review of related previous studies should be written in the chapter two.

3. Occupying the Niche (Move 3)

The findings show that most of the students' had already established Move 3 by stating the research overall purposes and only few of them had not established this move at all. Nevertheless, the identified steps of Move 3 in the documents were

considered poorly written and inappropriate. The inappropriate of Move 3 in almost all of the documents might be related to the findings which show that most of the documents' writers did not establish Move 2 (establishing the niche). Possibly, the students had not understood about their research problem which made them confuse to state the appropriate research overall purpose, research questions, principal findings and significance of the research. This assumption is supported by Swales and Feak who stress that there is a connection between Move 2 and Move 3. They said that, by the end of Move 2, both writer and reader would have a good idea of what is coming in Move 3 (2012: 348). Thus, the inexistence of Move 2 might have contributed to the poorly written and the inappropriate Move 3.

Besides, the possible reason of why the documents' writers established inappropriate Move 3, especially in stating Step 3.b and 3.c, was due to the students' lack of knowledge about the type of the research they would have conducted and the choice of questions words which belongs to certain type of the research. It is shown in the findings and data analysis that some of the writers had established the niche (Move 2) and research purpose (Step 3.a) appropriately and clearly but when they came to the research questions, most of them used inappropriate research questions.

Furthermore, the poorly written and the inappropriate Move 3 might also be attributed to the fact

that the writing of Introduction in some institutions used several subheadings. As stated in STAIN's Guidance Book of Research Proposal and Thesis Writing, the Introduction section has several subheadings. They are background of the problem, identification of the problem, focus or limitation of the problem, formulation of the problem, research questions, purpose of the research, and significance of the research (2009: 22). Referring to this guidance and rule, it was assumed that the students probably found difficulties to differentiate or to identify the problem to be stated in the background of the problem and in the identification of the problem. The same goes on differentiating the statement of research overall purpose in term of thesis statement at the end of the background of the problem part and the statement of research purpose which written in certain subheadings. Hence, the similarity of the content to be stated in one section consisting of several subheadings might be other possible factor that causes the students stated inappropriate Move 3. This is probably why Swales categorized Step 3.b to 3.e as PISF (Present in Some Fields but rare in others) (Swales and Feak, 2012: 359).

In short, the poorly written Move 3 might be because of the students' lack of knowledge about the research problem and the type of the research. Besides, it might be attributed to the fact that the institution where they study obligates them to have several

subheadings written in the introduction section.

In general, the poorly written introductions in most of students' research proposal might be because the CARS model have not been taught or explained to the students. Whereas, the CARS model is important to be known and to be understood by the student before and during writing introduction and it has been widely used by the college students, supervisors and educational researchers as the guidance to organize, to assess and to analyze introduction section such as introduction in research proposal (Partridge and Starfield, 2007: 91). Accordingly, it is probably why this study revealed that most of the students have not been able to establish the three moves properly.

CONCLUSION

Based on the research findings and discussion, it can be concluded that the students do have difficulties in writing research proposal introduction. It can be said that they have not been able enough to compose such a well-structured writing based on the demanded Swales' CARS rhetorical structure. It is proved by the findings which show that all of the students had already stated Move 1 (Establishing the Research Territory) but the writing is considered too general and is repeated enormously in most of the introduction. Furthermore, almost all of the students had not been able to establish the niche (Move 2) based on CARS model which indicate the gap or problem found in the previous researches Besides, the Move 3 (Occupying the Niche) written were considered poorly written since most of Move 3 stated in the introduction

were not appropriate with the research problem.

SUGGESTIONS

Based on the findings and conclusions above, it is recommended to:

1. The lecturers of STAIN Bukittinggi to teach or to explain the CARS rhetorical structure to the students since this structure will help the students to develop a well-written research proposal introduction.
2. To STAIN Bukittinggi to provide special class which serves the students with the concept of proposal/thesis writing. Besides, it is recommended to STAIN Bukittinggi to provide a workshop for the lecturers and advisors about Swales' CARS model.
3. To other researchers who will conduct further research about Swales' CARS rhetorical structure to dig more about proposal writing problems with more techniques of data collection

Note: This article was written based on the writer's thesis at Graduate Program of State University of Padang supervised by Dra. Yenni Rozimela, M.Ed, Ph.D and Dr. Kurnia Ningsih, MA.

REFERENCES

- Ary, D., Jacobs, L.C., and Razavieh, A. 1972. *Introduction to Research in Education, 3rd edition*. New York: CBS College Publishing
- Briones, Roy Randy Y. 2012. Move Analysis of Philosophy Research Article Introductions Published in the University of Santo Tomas. *Philippine ESL Journal, Vol.*

- 9, July 2012, p. 56-75.
Retrieved on January 27th 2014.
- Bunton, D. 2002. Generic Moves in Ph.D thesis Introductions in J. Flowerdew (ed.), *Academic Discourse*. London: Pearson Education.
- Cheung, Yin Ling. 2012. Understanding the Writing of Thesis Introductions: An Exploratory Study. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 46 (2012) 744 – 74. Elsevier Journal. www.sciencedirect.com. Retrieved on January 27th 2014.
- Creswell, J.W. 2009a. *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. New Jersey: Pearson Merrill Prentice Hall
- Eriyanto. 2011. *Analisis Isi: Pengantar Metodologi untuk Penelitian Ilmu Komunikasi dan Ilmu-Ilmu Sosial Lainnya*. Jakarta: Kencana
- Hult, Christine A. 1987. "Assessment Topics: The Importance of the Rhetorical Frame." *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, Vol. 10, Number 3, Spring, 1987. p.19-28. Council of Writing Program Administrators. Retrieved on October 23rd 2014.
- Miles, Matthew B. and A. Michael Huberman. 1984. *Qualitative Data Analysis. A sourcebook of New Methods*. London: Sage Publication
- Paltridge, Brian and Sue Starfield. 2007. *Thesis and Dissertation Writing in a Second Language: A handbook for Supervisors*. USA: Routledge.
- Sekolah Tinggi Agama Islam Negeri (STAIN) Sjech M. Djamil Djambek Bukittinggi, 2009. *Buku Pedoman Penulisan Skripsi dan Tugas Akhir*, Kementrian Agama RI.
- Swales, J.M. (1990). *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Swales, J.M. and Christine B. Feak. 2012. *Academic Writing for Graduate Students. Essential Task and Skills, 3rd edition*. USA: University of Michigan Press
- Suharsimi Arikunto. 2006. *Prosedur Penelitian. Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*. 4th Edition. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Weissberg, Robert and Suzanne Baker. 1990. *Writing Up Research, Experimental Research Report Writing for Students of English*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Wilkinson, A. M. 1991. *The Scientist's Handbook for Writing Papers and Dissertation*. Englewood Cliffs, Nj: Prentice Hall.