



# LINGUISTIK TERAPAN

VOL.10 NO. 2 AGUSTUS 2013

JURNAL LINGUISTIK TERAPAN PASCASARJANA UNIMED



THE  
*Character Building*  
UNIVERSITY



## LINGUISTIK TERAPAN

*JURNAL LINGUISTIK TERAPAN PASCASARJANA UNIMED*  
TERBIT SEJAK MEI 2004 TIGA KALI SETAHUN ( APRIL, AGUSTUS DAN DESEMBER )

**PENASEHAT**  
REKTOR UNIVERSITAS NEGERI MEDAN

**PIMPINAN UMUM**  
DIREKTUR SEKOLAH PASCASARJANA UNIMED

**PIMPINAN REDAKSI**  
BUSMIN GURNING

**WAKIL PIMPINAN REDAKSI**  
MASA UNTUNG RITONGA

**SEKRETARIS REDAKSI**  
SRI MINDA MURNI

**PENYUNTING AHLI**  
BUSMIN GURNING ( UNIVERSITAS NEGERI MEDAN )  
LINCE SIHOMBING ( UNIVERSITAS NEGERI MEDAN )  
I MADE SWASTA ( UNIVERSITAS UDAYANA )  
ASRUDIN BARONI TAU ( YOGYA )  
JOKO NURKAMTO ( UNIVERSITAS SEBELAS MARET SOLO )  
HARYANTO ( UNIVERSITAS MAKASAR )  
AMRIN SARAGIH ( UNIVERSITAS NEGERI MEDAN )  
KINAYATI DJ ( UNIVERSITAS NEGERI JAKARTA )

**REDAKTUR PELAKSANA**  
RAKMAD HUSAIN

**SEKRETARIAT / DISTRIBUTOR**  
VIVI  
FARID MARUF HARAHAP

**DESAIN COVER**  
GAMAL KARTONO

**PROGRAM STUDI LINGUISTIK TERAPAN BAHASA INGGRIS**  
**SEKOLAH PASCASARJANA UNIVERSITAS NEGERI MEDAN**

Jl. Willem Iskander, Psr.V- Kotak pos No. 1589 Medan 20221

Telp (61) 6636730 Fax (061) 6636730

## PREPACE

The volume 10 of journal of applied linguistics issued by English applied linguistics study program (LTBI) is the peer-reviewed journal and is devoted to publishing research on language teaching and language and culture dominantly written by the students of LTBI who are going to graduate from the LTBI study program and other researchers or teachers or lecturers particularly in North Sumatera and other regions closed to North Sumatera.

This edition presents articles entitled: (1) The Implementation of Teaching English based on Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan (KTSP) At Vocational High School.

Gabriella Ruth Debora Tampulobon, (2) The Translation of Passive Voice in Harry Potter and The Prisoner of Azkaban into Bahasa Indonesia, Harry Sambayu, (3) Thematic Realization of Car Advertisement In Kompas Newspapers, Jasawitten Brando Purba, (4) The Effect Teaching Strategies and Cognitive Style Reading Comprehension, Merlin Helentinal Napitupulu, (5) Language Policy of Bilingual family Toward Children's word productin, Ira Maria Fran Lumbanbatu, (6) Lexical and Grammatical Metaphors In Newsweek, Sarah Nasution, (7) Experiential Function In Barack Obama's Speech on general Election Campaign of 2012, Ahmad Surur. (IMRaD and Navigating Students' Way Around Literature) Sri Minda Murni dan Mutsyuhito Solin  
English Applied Linguistics – Post Graduate School – State University of Medan

The articles are intended to be read by those who are interested in enhancing and uplifting the quality of human resources in the teaching of English, the use of language in cultural events or advertisements, the language shift and maintenance, etc in North Sumatera and other regions Indonesia.

It is realized that in this globalization era, one should be always on the move especially in broadening one horizon and awareness to the responsibility in a much more professional approach.

Medan, Agustus 2013

The Editor,

Prof. Dr. Busmin Gurning, M.Pd

## IMRaD and Navigating Students' Way Around Literature

Sri Minda Murni dan Mutsyuhito Solin

English Applied Linguistics – Post Graduate School – State University of Medan

## Abstrak

*Tulisan ini mengkaji penerapan strategi IMRaD dalam membantu mahasiswa menulis laporan atas artikel ilmiah berbasis penelitian. Tujuannya adalah untuk menjelaskan: a) Apakah laporan mahasiswa merepresentasikan pemahaman yang baik atas informasi yang dibaca; dan b) Apakah laporan mahasiswa merepresentasikan pemahaman yang baik atas logika penelitian. Penelitian ini dilakukan secara kuantitatif dan kualitatif. data diambil dari 20 laporan tertulis mahasiswa atas artikel berjudul 'Which self? Pronominal choice, modernity, and self-categorizations' (Djenar, 2008). Temuan penelitian menunjukkan bahwa pemahaman yang baik atas informasi yang dibaca direalisasi melalui parafrase dan pemahaman yang lemah ditandai dengan laporan yang copy paste. Selanjutnya, pemahaman yang baik atas logika penelitian direpresentasikan melalui merujuk secara konsisten masalah penelitian dalam menulis setiap komponen laporan, dan pemahaman yang rendah ditandai dengan terombang-ambing antara informasi yang bersifat fakta, konsep, prosedur. Penelitian juga menunjukkan, pemahaman atas logika penelitian lebih buruk dari pemahaman atas informasi dan komponen yang paling lemah dalam logika penelitian adalah mengabstraksikan ringkasan reflektif penulis. Penelitian ini menyarankan agar dosen terlebih dahulu membimbing mahasiswa menulis laporan artikel berbasis riset sebelum menugasi mereka menulis critical book review yang sebenarnya. Hal ini dikarenakan kompleksnya teks akademik selain kompetensi berbahasa Inggris yang belum memadai.*

## 1. Introduction

My first encounter with students of the second semester of English Applied Linguistics Study Program struck me with questions dealing with academic advice they need on the best strategies to face the forthcoming second semester. This is due to their experience in the first semester concerning the challenge of critical book review assignment which they found to be beyond their academic readiness.

Critical book review is one of the programs promoted by the learning revolution policy designed by the university to enhance students active learning. In every semester and in every subject, critical book review is a compulsory activity beside mini-research and ideas engineering. The policy is in line with what most universities believe as crucial for master degree students. Wallace and Poulson (2004), for example, suggest that students' ability to take responsibility for their academic learning rest on becoming a critical consumer of literature. They argue that critical reading for postgraduate students is essential in promoting students' competence in self-critical writing.

However, being a critical reader is not an easy goal to achieve. Wallace and Poulson (2004) suggest one necessary step the students should do, i.e. to develop a mental map for navigating the way around the book or the article assigned for them. Having met different levels of reading competence and style of learning, I found the

need to guide them through series of activities prior to critical book review assignment. The very first step which I find necessary to do is navigating the way around the book as suggested by Wallace and Poulson (2004). I see that the stages of the competence comprises the competence in writing a book report, a book review, and a critical book review. In my class, I focus on articles rather than books, so what I do is assigning my students to critically review a research-based article. However, the study focuses on the first stage which is article report. To do so, I train them to analyze the work using IMRaD strategy.

As widely understood, report texts are the most common factual genres encountered by students across the curriculum. The purpose of a report is to provide accurate and relevant information. In addition, report is a text which presents information about something, as it is. It is as a result of systematic observation and analysis.

Academic text has some characteristics such as: a) It has one central theme and every part contributes to the main point; b) It is relatively formal and therefore uses language precisely and accurately; and c) It has several other features, such as: complex, formal, objective, explicit, hedged, and responsible. Academic written language is relatively more complex than academic spoken language. Jwang2 (2012) suggests that with longer and more formal words in written language, academic text usually has high lexical density with more varied vocabulary. It uses more noun-based phrases than verb-based phrases. In addition, it has relatively more grammatical complexity, including more subordinate clauses and more passives.

Writing an academic text such as report and review is also very challenging to students. Academic writing is explicit about the writing structure, making it clear to the reader how every part of the text related with each other (Jwang2, 2012). These connections, he suggests, can be made explicit by the use of different signaling words.

Since our class deals with the complexity of academic text in English as a foreign language class, I assume that the sequential approach to critical book review competence is related to what Murray (2005) writes as instructional approach in adult education as summarized as: a) building the context; b) modelling and deconstructing the text; c) joint construction of the text; d) independent construction of the text; and e) linking related texts.

I got the inspiration for IMRaD strategy also from Poulson and Wallace (2004) who suggest top ten components critical readers look for. They are: a) A clearly-focused substantive topic; b) A critical review of literature; c) An appropriate methodological approach; d) A well-structured and explicit design for the study; e) Data that is analyzed thoroughly; f) Discussion of the analysis or findings; g) A reflective summary; h) Accurate referencing. I decide to simplify the ten elements into four by considering the level of my students' competence in reading literature in English.

**IMRaD strategy is a strategy I assume to benefit both students and me in the way that it minimizes students' copy paste of the work along with the development of their mapping competence around literature. For me, it minimizes the annoying situation**

for 'introduction'; 'M' for 'methods', 'R' for 'results', 'a' stands for 'and', and "D" stands for 'discussion'. Following Poulson and Wallace (2004), I ask my students to write a report on research-based articles I assign them to read. In the introduction part, the students should put information dealing with reasons for the writer to study the topic. This part should also consist the research problems; The method should be dealing with ways the researcher do to collect and analyze data; The results should inform the findings of the research and students should refer to research problems to do this part. Discussion is the part of the report where students should write information on how the findings related to previous research findings or the existing theories. I choose this strategy to help the students make sense of the information to solve problems in their academic lives as Barton and Hamilton (1998) suggest that sense making helps people solve problems in lives. In addition, learning is actually 'the process of making sense or creating meaning from experience' (Narey, 2009). Other reason is that 'acquiring explicit knowledge about the structuring of academic written discourse can be of positive value to (postgraduate) students' to tackle the reading of complex academic text (Mitchell and Riddle, 2004).

Tackling the complexity of academic text such as research-based article, according to Clandinin and Connelly (1994) relates to aspects such as: a) observing the intertwined experience of researcher and participant; b) feeling of several experiential features of the passage worth noting, etc.

The procedure of my teaching is as follows: upon giving explanation on what IMRaD is and how to write a report on research-based article using the strategy, I firstly guide my students to find information for the introduction part of their report. I ask them to read through the paragraphs and lines, show them the key words and the key phrases they need to quote, and direct their attention to the research problems. By doing so, I help my students to compose the first part ('introduction') of their report.

In the next step, having shown them the research problems, I guide them to find the answer to one of the problem by showing the paragraphs and the lines. By doing so, I jump to the third structure and teach them how to find and what to write in the 'results' part of the report. Since I just help them with one finding, the rest will be their responsibility.

In the third step, I lead them to the second structure by directing their attention to the 'methods' and show them the lines where they can find information on ways the researcher uses to collect data to get answers to research problems. Then I leave the responsibility of finding the ways to analyze the data to the students themselves. In the fourth step, I guide them to find information for 'the discussion' part of the report. I show them an example of how the researcher compares/contrasts his/her findings with previous research findings.

To help the readers to understand the content of the article being analyzed, I quote the research problems from the original copy of the article as follows,

*What are the possible motivations for the different choices of pronoun? Is it simply random stylistic variation? Is it a deliberate challenge to the norms? And considering that both *aku* and *saya* are self-referring terms, are there any*

*differences with regard to the notion of "self" that each term represents, and if so, what are these differences? (Djenar, 2008)*

## 2. Method

The object of the research is 20 IMRaD analysis written by post graduate students of English Applied Linguistics on an article titled 'Which self? Pronominal choice, modernity, and self-categorizations' by Djenar (2008). The problems of the study are:

Do the reports represent students' good sense of the information?

Do the reports represent students' good sense of the logic of research?

Students' good sense of the information were identified from two indicators, i.e.:

- a) including paraphrasing rather than copy pasting; and
- b) referring to mainstream information rather than supporting ones.

While students' good sense of research logic were identified from indicators:

- a) Referring to research problems in every steps of IMRaD; and
- b) Enhancing author's reflective summary to communicate author's vision.

The study uses quantitative and qualitative research as Larazon (2005) suggests highlights reality in different way; so they are complimentary in the way that qualitative analysis is a bottom-up approach to identifying the main ideas within people's discourse and quantitative content analysis attempts to provide a numerical measure of mention (Wilson and Moudraia (2006). Qualitative research is a set of interpretative practices which in this study is done on the preliminary quantification of students' article report seen as the representation of their competence in tackling the complexity of academic text.

## 3. Results

The results of the study show how students make sense of the information in the article and of the logic of research. The competence in making good sense of the information is presented as follows:

3.1 Students' sense of the information as represented by:

- paraphrasing : 3 (15%)
- copy pasting : 17 (85%)
- referring to mainstream information : 6 (30%)
- referring to supporting information : (14) 70%

Students' good sense of information is shown by paraphrasing the information she/he finds in the text. An example of good paraphrasing is characterized by picking up only key words and key phrases from the article and use them in their own paragraph. The underlined words/phrases are the ones picked up by a students to show his sense of the information, as follows:

*The writer in her research examines a recent shift in the choice between two singular forms of first person pronoun in Indonesia, namely, aku dan saya. Aku is conventionally associated with intimacy and informality and it will be considered*

*unacceptable when people use it in the formal situation. But there are some people do it, the celebrities for example. The writer sees this phenomenon and wants to explain motivating factors behind the recent tendency to use aku and saya. The writer wants to describe what makes them different.*

By looking at the paragraph, we can see that only words and phrases which are key to the main idea are adopted by the students. They are 'intimacy', 'informality', and 'motivating factors behind the recent tendency to use aku and saya.'

On the other hand, poor sense of the information is shown by copy pasting the information they found in the book rather than paraphrasing. In copy pasting, students picked up words/phrases/sentences from different paragraphs and put them as one paragraph of their own. I present here two paragraphs from which a student compose his own. The underlined sentences are the one she picked to compose her paragraph:

Paragraph 1:

*The interconnection between person-referring terms and social relations has captured the attention of linguists for decades. Numerous studies have been devoted to the description of how uses of such terms are reflective of the ways in which members of a speech community (p. 31).*

Paragraph 2:

*This article calls into question the adequacy of such notions as "intimate" versus "formal"—which are often employed contrastively in sociolinguistics to describe pronoun choice — for describing the distinction between aku and saya, respectively. Particularly problematic is when these notions are viewed as two opposing concepts. The assumption that what is intimate cannot also be formal fails to accommodate a pronoun that is characterized as one but is used within the context of the other (p.33).*

The students' first paragraph in the 'introduction' part of the IMRaD becomes as the following:

***In this article the writer tells the interconnection between person-referring terms and social relations on a speech community.***

*This article calls into question the adequacy of such notions as "intimate" versus "formal"—which are often employed contrastively in sociolinguistics to describe pronoun choice — for describing the distinction between aku and saya, respectively. Particularly problematic is when these notions are viewed as two opposing concepts. The assumption that what is intimate cannot also be formal fails to accommodate a pronoun that is characterized as one but is used within the context of the other.*



From the paragraph, we can see that only the bold type is the words produced by the students which is the phrase 'in this article the writer tells' and the word 'on'. The rest is copy paste.

In addition, students' sense of literature is shown by referring to mainstream information rather than to supporting/minor information. The data shows that there are 30% of the students referred to the mainstream information and only 70% who referred to supporting/minor information.

Mainstream information is the one related to research problems. In 'method' student should pick up information concerning the ways the researcher collects and analyzes the data to answer research problems. In 'results', students must present the result of each research problems as found in the article.

A good sense of information as presented by referring to mainstream information is presented by referring to the data as found in the text followed by description of the data as follows:

*The distribution of aku and saya in the interviews*

<i>Choice of pronoun</i>	<i>Number of speakers</i>
<i>Aku</i>	<i>14 (35%)</i>
<i>Saya</i>	<i>17 (42.5%)</i>
<i>Aku and saya</i>	<i>3 (7.5%)</i>
<i>Other</i>	<i>6 (15%)</i>
<i>Total</i>	<i>40 (100%)</i>

- 1. Of the 40 celebrities being examined, 'aku' and 'saya' are the most frequently chosen terms. Etc.*
- 2. There is a variation between speakers in using 'aku' and 'saya'. Etc.*
- 3. Speakers shift between the pronouns in the same interview. Etc.*

Poor sense of information is shown by referring/copy pasting supporting information rather than mainstream information as follows:

*This article has demonstrated the untenability of the assumption that aku and saya map neatly onto two discrete sets of social variables. Viewing the pronouns in terms of flexible and context-dependent selfcategorizations has enabled the contradiction between formality, neutrality, and intimacy to be reconciled and for different-speaker and samespeaker variation to be explicated. I have considered the use of aku as a strategy of asserting personal identity, but not as an autonomous self, for when celebrities speak and refer to themselves. Saya is an expression of the social self-concept, the self that is part of a collective identity and idealized as the one preferred in public contexts*

This paragraph does not present the main issue as stated in the research problems. They are actually supporting rather than mainstream information. Worse than that, all the sentences picked up by the student is from the original copy of the article.

However, she adds some lines to shorten the paragraph due to the limitation of the page

required. The original paragraph is presented below. The underlined sentences are the sentences taken while the rest are skipped.

This article has demonstrated the untenability of the assumption that aku and saya map neatly onto two discrete sets of social variables. Viewing the pronouns in terms of flexible and context-dependent selfcategorizations has enabled the contradiction between formality, neutrality, and intimacy to be reconciled and for different-speaker and samespeaker variation to be explicated. I have considered the use of aku as a strategy of asserting personal identity, but not as an autonomous self, for when celebrities speak and refer to themselves, they always have in mind the audience who, though not always co-present, are taken into consideration. Their use of aku, though divergent from the norm, is strategic: by choosing this term they are able to establish a public persona perceivable as friendly and accessible but at the same time assert their individuality. Saya is an expression of the social self-concept, the self that is part of a collective identity and idealized as the one preferred in public contexts (p51).

### 3.2 Students' sense of research logic:

Students' sense of the logic of research is another competence the students need to write an IMRaD-based report. The study obtains the following data dealing with the students' sense of logic of research, as follows:

- referring to research problems : 6 (30%)
- referring to other detail : 14 (70%)
- enhancing author's reflective summary : 7 (35%)
- ignoring author's reflective summary : 13 (65%)

The data shows that only 30% of the students referred to research problems in the structure of the IMRaD report. As the result, the content of each IMRaD structure is not coherent to one another. The majority (70%) referred to other detail which resulted in the non-coherence report details.

The example of good sense of logic of research can be seen from the linearity between the problems as quoted by the student and the way he reports the result as shown in the following report,

*Research problems:*

- 1). *What are the possible motivations for the different choices of pronoun?*
- 2). *Is it simply random stylistic variation?*
- 3). *Is it a deliberate challenge to the norms?*
- 4). *What are the differences between 'aku' and 'saya' as self-referring terms?*

And the content he writes for 'result' is as follows:

*Result*

1. *The possible motivation for different choice of pronoun 'aku' and 'saya' are the interpretation of 'aku' as, etc.*

2. *The variation use of 'aku' and 'saya' is not only random stylistic variation. Etc.*
3. *The use of 'aku' which is divergent from norm is strategic to establish public persona, etc.*

Poor sense of the logic of research can be seen from the non-linearity between the problems of the study and the result as follows,

*Problem*

*The recent use of 'aku' by celebrities in television interviews suggests that a pronoun conventionally associated with intimacy and informality can also be strategically to assert individuality; etc*

And the 'result' is reported as follows:

*The use of 'aku' as a strategy of asserting personal identity, but not as an autonomous self, for when celebrities speak and refer to themselves, they always have in mind the audience who, though not always co-present, are taken into consideration, etc.*

Other data show the non-linearity between the problems and the discussion part as follows,

*Problems*

- 1) *What are the differences between 'aku' and 'saya' as self-referring terms?*
- 2) *What are the possible motivation for the different choice of pronoun?*
- 3) *Is it simply random stylistic variation?*

And the discussion part contains report as follows<

*Approach in which each pronoun is mapped onto a set of variables. 'Aku' is mapped onto 'informal and intimate', and 'saya' onto 'formal (non-intimate) and neutral. Etc.*

Some students confused to recognize the 'method' and the 'discussion' part of the article. In the following, the method – which is about procedures in collecting and analyzing data- is used for the content of the 'discussion' as follows,

*The researcher first indicates that the use of 'aku' in Indonesian culture is for non formal conversation and the use of 'saya' is for formal conversation. But then after the collecting data she finds that some of the interviewee use 'saya' in answering question. The the researcher does something to analyze the data by grouping and categorizing the data from the celebrities that is interviewed.*

Other failed to recognize data from theoretical framework. Khairil Anwar 'Aku' for example is referred by the researcher to develop the theoretical framework concerning the use of 'aku' in Indonesian language. However, some students failed to

recognize this and put them in her 'method' structure. The other content of the 'method' does not also present the procedure of collecting data, as the following,

*In collecting the data, the writer made the analogy from the use of 'aku and 'me' in English. Not only from English, she also explained the study of Japanese in the use of pronoun 'boku' ... She took the date from the most famous form 'aku', written by Chairil Anwar. Etc.*

In addition, there are only 35% of the students promoted the author's reflective summary as the key concept resulted from the article. The majority of the students ignore the reflective summary without realizing the contribution of the element as the arrival point as well as starting point for future researcher.

A good sense of the logic of research is presented by students' writing the reflective summary in the 'discussion' part as done by the following student,

*Theoretical constructs such as intimacy and formality are inadequate for explaining the choice between pronouns. The recent shift to 'aku' and the variation between 'aku' and 'saya' be sufficiently explicated by considering them as linguistic representation of personal and social self-categorizations.*

On the other hand, the poor logic of research is shown by ignoring the reflective summary of the author as presented in the following example of 'discussion' part in IMRaD report,

*The same studies were done by Brown and Gilman's (1972) but it just focus on the speaker's backgrounds, such as age, sex, and social status.*

Students' sense of the logic of research as shown in the data represent the level of competence in referring to research problems. The majority of the students did not keep on the track of the article when doing the IMRaD-based report and ignore the reflective summary (65%).

### 3.3 Other findings

#### 3.3.1 Students sense of the logic of research is better than students' sense of the information.

The data shows that students' logic of research is better than students' sense of the information. There are 65% of the students show good sense of the logic of research and only 45% shows good sense of the information. Good sense of the logic of research is shown as follows:

- referring to research problems : 6 (30%)
- enhancing author's reflective summary : 7 (35%)
- with the total is : 13 (65%)

which means that there are 65% of the students who show good logic of research and only 35% of the students show poor sense of the logic of research.

While those who show good sense of the information are those who are:

- paraphrasing : 3 (15%)

- referring to mainstream information : 6 (30%)  
with the total is : 9 (45%)

which means that there are 45% of the students who show good sense of the information and 55% show poor sense of the information. Another ways to prove this is that there are 35% of students show poor logic of research and 55% show poor sense of the information. It implies that students' logic of research can be developed through IMRaD, however, students' reading competence of academic text need to consider. Other strategy might be needed to improve students' competence in reading academic text.

### 3.3.2 The rank of difficulties concerning the four criteria.

The rank of difficulties concerning the four criteria is seen in as follows:

- copy pasting : 17 (85%)
- referring to supporting information : 14 (70%)
- referring to other detail : 14 (70%)
- ignoring author's reflective summary : 13 (65%)

In terms of the rank of difficulties show greater number lies on copy pasting (85%), followed by referring to supporting information (70%), referring to other detail (70%), and ignoring author's reflective summary (65%). It shows students' low competence in writing due to their poor performance in reading. They are not independent learners who are competent to produce ideas in their own words.

### 3.3.3 Students copy paste from each other

Data also shows that student copy pasted not only from the original article but also from each other.

Copy pasting among the students can be seen in the introduction part of the IMRaD report. Three students have exactly the same sentences in the introduction part, not only the content but also the technique of presenting the information, such as using the same bullets as follows,

#### *Reason*

- *To singular forms of first-person pronoun in Indonesian, namely 'aku' and 'saya.*
- *Commonly, 'aku' is described as an intimate, informal and interpersonal domains.*
- *'Saya' is described as a neutral, formal for public contexts but in fact 'aku' is used in public domains; - By selecting 'aku' in public it blurs the distinction between the domains.*
  - *Variation in the choice of form is not consistent*
  - *The acceptable norms for public*

Other example of copy pasting to the work of one's to another can be seen in the 'method' part, as follows,

*The data collected from interviews with forty celebrities in nine television broadcasts about infotainment, totalling six hours of airtime, collected between December 2005 and January 2006.*

It is not surprising to find exactly the same sentences in the ending part of four report texts written by four different students such as,

*The result of Dwi Noverini Djenar (2008) stated that the recent shift use of 'aku' by celebrities as modern construction is individuality and 'saya' is considering as linguistic representation of personal and social categorization.*

#### **4. Conclusion and Discussion**

Assigning the students to write a critical book review requires a step-by-step guidance from the lecturers. Without sufficient guidance, students' ability to take responsibility for their academic learning by being a critical consumer of literature suggested by Wallace and Poulson (2004) will never happen.

The study supports Wallace and Poulson (2004) in the way that students need help in developing a mental map for navigating the way around the book or the article assigned for them. As IMRaD strategy involves the activities to develop the mental map and to navigate the students around the text, it is found to be helpful in promoting the quality of the students' report writing of research-based article. This step-by-step approach also supports what Murray (2005) suggests as relevant to adult learners in: a) building the context; b) modelling and deconstructing the text; c) joint construction of the text; d) independent construction of the text; and e) linking related texts.

Although the complexity of what Poulson and Wallace (2004) suggest as the top ten components critical readers is simplified in IMRaD, it is done without the substantive components such as: a) A clearly- of focused substantive topic; b) A critical review of literature; c) An appropriate methodological approach; d) A well-structured and explicit design for the study; e) Data that is analyzed thoroughly; f) Discussion of the analysis or findings; g) A reflective summary; h) Accurate referencing are well-developed.

However, the result of the study shows that it is not easy to use IMRaD where competence in tackling academic problems as suggested by Barton and Hamilton (1998) is still a big issue. The process of making sense as suggested by Narey's (2009) or creating meaning through IMRaD strategy can help develop the logic of research but it takes longer for those who have poor competence in reading and writing to make them become independent reporters instead of intelligent copy-pasters.

In doing IMRaD strategy, students' way to acquire explicit knowledge about the structuring of academic written discourse proved to be helpful. However, the competence in tackling the complex language of academic text as suggested by Mitchell and Riddle (2004) and Clandinin and Connelly (1994) need to be considered.

Last but not least, IMRaD inspires learners to consider personal change they need to gain control of the academic environment as suggested by Barton and Hamilton (1998) at least as a future researcher. Hopefully, it can also help as a transformative tool

to promote or to cope with students' personal change and a means of gaining their control over the academic environment.

### Bibliography

- Barton, David dan Mary Hamilton. 1998. *Becoming Expert*. Local Literacies. London: Routledge.
- Clandinin, D. Jean and F. Michael Connelly. 1994. *Personal Experience Methods*. Handbook of Qualitative Research. Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln (ed.). USA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Jwang2. 2012. <http://www.kent.ac.uk/scarr/events/beijingpapers/WenxiaYandong.pdf>
- Lazaraton, Anne. 2005. *Qualitative Research Methods*. Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning. Eli Hinkel (ed.). London: Lawrence Erlbaum associates.
- Murray, Denise E. 2005. *ESL in Adult Education*. Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning. Eli Hinkel (ed.). London: Lawrence Erlbaum associates.
- Narey, Marilyn J. 2009. *Introduction. Making Meaning*. Pittsburg: Springer
- Wallace, Mike and Louise Poulson. 2004. *Critical reading for Self-critical Writing*. Language and Literacy. Andrew Goodwyn and Andrew Stables (ed.). London: Sage Publications.
- Wilson, Andrew and Olga Moudraia. 2006. Quantitative or qualitative content analysis? Experiences from a cross-cultural comparison of female students' attitudes to shoe fashions in Germany, Poland, and Russia. *Corpus Linguistics around the World*. Andrew Wilson, Dawn archer, and Paul Rayson (ed.). Amsterdam: Rodopi.