The Argument Style in Research Article Discussions to Support Research Findings in Language Studies

Safnil Arsyad[*1]
Bambang Kaswanti Purwo[2]
Zifirdaus Adnan[3]

[1]English Education Postgraduate Program, Faculty of Education, University of Bengkulu, Bengkulu 38371, INDONESIA
[2]English Applied Linguistics Department, Faculty of Languages and Arts, Universitas Katholik Atma Jaya, Jakarta 12930, INDONESIA
[3]Indonesian Studies of School of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences, University of New England, Armidale NSW 2351, AUSTRALIA

Abstract
The argument quality in a research article discussion (henceforth RAD) determines the quality of the article as a whole, and therefore this section must be written as convincingly as possible. However, authors in different disciplines such as Language Studies (LS) may address this section in a different argument style. This study is aimed at investigating how Indonesian writers in LS support their findings in their RADs. There were 40 RADs taken from four different Indonesian journals in LS; the articles were chosen from the latest volumes of the nationally accredited journals. This study used a genre analysis method in which the major source of data is a collection of texts as a product of language activity. The results show that the majority of Indonesian writers use Style 1 (interpreting the research findings or suggesting what the research findings mean), Style 2 (explaining or elaborating the research findings), Style-3 (stating the possible cause/s of the research findings), and Style 4 (illustrating or exemplifying the research findings) to support their research findings. However, unlike international authors, Indonesian writers do not relate their research findings with those of previous related studies; if they do so, it is to confirm the interpretation or explanation of their research results. The results of this study may help Indonesian authors in LS improve the quality of their RADs especially when writing articles in English to be submitted to an international journal.

[*] Corresponding author, email: safnil@unib.ac.id

1.   INTRODUCTION

As an introduction, RAD is considered an important section because in this section authors are expected to address their research findings and argue for their importance and/or usefulness using an argumentative rhetorical style supported with related references (Dobakhti, 2013; Dujsik, 2013; Liu & Buckingham, 2018; Parkinson, 2011; Peacock, 2002; Salmani Nodoushan, 2016; Swales, 2004). Similarly, Dobakhti (2013) suggests that authors must argue convincingly for the importance of their research findings so that readers may accept and use them in their research. Besides, as Loan and Pramoolsook (2015) suggest, journal readers will not accept the findings if the authors' argument is weak and not convincing. Parkinson (2011, p. 164) also claims that authors are expected to "demonstrate to readers how the data is collected to prove the author's knowledge claim' in their RA discussions".

In the discussion section, authors are also expected to interpret and elaborate their findings in their RAD (Hagin, 2009; Hess, 2004), and this can be done by responding and commenting on every issue in the research questions (Branson, 2004; Thyer, 2008). Thus, RAD must be convincingly argumentative and for this purpose, authors must use the correct and appropriate rhetorical style and necessary linguistic means so that prospective journal readers may accept their new knowledge claims. According to Flowerdew (2001), if the discussion section of an article is not written correctly and appropriately using argumentative style, journal editors and/or reviewers may reject the manuscript. Authors should address and support their new knowledge claims by explanation, interpretation, illustration, and deduction, and these often need citations to other author's work (Dudley-Evan, 1994; Swales, 1990). However, according to Swales (2004), authors in a particular discipline and/or language may write their RAD in a different way or style. For example, authors in History rarely support their findings with references even when writing in English (Holmes, 1997). This is because, according to Holmes, there is no standard format of knowledge production and expression among authors in History since research in this discipline is not yet well developed. Another possible reason for the lack of knowledge claim justification in History research articles (RAs), as Holmes further suggests, is the limited improvement of collaborative research programs and the absence of a theoretical convention in that discipline.

In the Indonesian context, studies on RAD written in Indonesian or English by Indonesian authors, as far as we are concerned, are still rare. The only studies on this topic are those by Arsyad (2013b) and Irawati et al. (2018). However, the results of these studies did not provide detailed information on how Indonesian authors convince readers that their findings are interesting and important. This is the main motivation for this study; that is to investigate how Indonesian writers in a particular field of discipline argue for and support the importance of their findings in their Indonesian RADs so that readers may use the results or findings for their study. In particular, this present research attempted to answer the following questions:

1)   How do Indonesian writers in Language Studies justify new knowledge claims in their Indonesian RADs?

2) How do Indonesian writers in Language Studies use references to support new knowledge claims in their Indonesian RADs?

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Discourse studies on RADs of research articles have been conducted by Basturkmen (2012), Holmes (1997), Jalilifar (2011), Moyetta (2016), Parkinson (2011), and Salimi and Yazdami (2011). Holmes (1997) found that although there are many similarities in terms of the communicative moves in the three groups of RAs (i.e. history, political science, and sociology), there are differences in which, unlike the ones of political and sociology sciences, the moves in the History RADs are rarely cyclical. Moreover, different from the ones in Political and Sociology sciences, the RADs in History rarely have references to the previous research findings or Move 5. According to Holmes (1997, p. 333), this is because of "... limited development of cumulative research program and the absence of a theoretical consensus in that discipline".

Jalilifar (2011) compared the discourse structure of RADs in the disciplines of English Language Teaching (ELT) and Psychiatry written in two different languages (Persian and English) by three groups of writers (RADs in Persian by Iranian writers, RADs in English by Iranian writers and RADs in English by English writers). Jalilifar found differences either between the articles in two different disciplines (ELT and Psychiatry) or the same language (Persian) or between the articles in the same discipline but in two different languages. The most noticeable difference, according to Jalilifar, occurs in two groups of English articles: the one written by Iranian writers and the one by English writers in terms of the lexical choice to use. When the Iranian writers write RADs in English for a local publication, they do not get sufficient corrective advice from the journal reviewers, and therefore their choice of lexicons is often inappropriate. Similarly, Amnuai and Wannaruk (2013) found that the rhetorical structure of Thai RADs in the field of Applied Linguistics followed the model suggested by Yang and Allison (2003) consisting of seven moves with or without steps in each move. According to Amnuai and Wannaruk (2013), similar to international authors, the Thai authors are already aware of the main function of RAD which is to comment on the research results by 'interpreting', 'accounting for', and 'comparing them with those of previous works'.

Moyetta (2016) also found an important difference between RADs in English and those in Spanish in the field of Psychology. She found that four Moves (providing background information, stating results, referring to previous research, and providing explanations) are considered obligatory in English RADs while only two Moves (stating results and referring to previous research) are found obligatory in Spanish RADs. According to Moyetta (2016), this suggests that, compared to Spanish authors, English authors are more willing to cooperate with readers since one of the Moves (providing an explanation) has a cooperative function. However, Salimi and Yazdami (2011) found no important difference between two groups of RADs (i.e. sociolinguistics and language testing) written in English by international authors in terms of their macro structure but there is a significant difference on the absence of important moves in the RADs. According to Salimi and Yazdami, the articles in

Language Testing are much better in terms of utilizing the important moves in their RADs compared to the ones in Sociolinguistics.

Studies on the discourse style of articles written in Indonesian or English by Indonesian writers have also been conducted such as those by Adnan (2009; 2014), Arsyad (2013a; 2013b), Arsyad and Adila (2017), Arsyad and Arono (2016), Arsyad and Wardhana (2014), Basthomi (2009), Mirahayuni (2002), and Safnil (2001). The common results from these studies are that the rhetorical style of Indonesian RA introductions is different from that of English RAs because of language/cultural and academic practice differences. For example, unlike in English RA introductions, the introduction section of Indonesian RAs in social sciences and humanities is longer and contains information about the government policy related to the research topic, the history of the research topic, and the description of the research location (Safnil, 2001). However, the majority of these studies focused on the rhetorical structure of RA introductions while studies on RADs seem to have been neglected.

One of the few studies on RAD in the Indonesian context was conducted by Irawati et al. (2018) when they examined the rhetorical style of 7 RADs in English and seven RADs in Indonesian written by Indonesian writers and published in Indonesian national accredited journals. Using Swales' (1990) framework for RADs, they found that the English and Indonesian RADs in the corpus of their study are similar to those RADs written by international authors as in Swales' model. The majority of them used the five important moves (i.e. statement of results, un/expected outcome, reference to previous research, explanation, and deduction, and hypothesis). However, the Indonesian writers in this study are those who have had experiences in writing RADs in English and published in reputable international journals. They may have been aware of the typical rhetorical style of English RADs and used it to write RADs either in English or Indonesian. Therefore, the Indonesian writers in the study of Irawati et al. (2018) cannot represent Indonesian writers who are not yet familiar with the ideal model of RAs as found in international journals written in English.

Arsyad (2013b) also investigated the rhetorical style of the discussion section of 47 RAs in Social Sciences and Humanities (i.e. religious study, education, economics and management, language studies, psychology, and social and political sciences) published in mostly university-based journals in Indonesia. Arsyad (2013b) found that, unlike English authors, Indonesian writers in Social Sciences and Humanities rarely use Move 4 (a reference to previous research) in their Indonesian RADs. According to Arsyad, this is because Indonesian writers think that they do not need to argue for their research findings; journal readers must accept whatever findings they claim. However, this study focused only on the macrostructure or the rhetorical pattern of the RADs; it did not search further on how authors argue for and convince readers that their research findings are important.

2.1 Theoretical Framework

The first important aspect of the argument styles of RAD is about how authors rhetorically convince journal readers and the research community at large on their new knowledge claim after presenting the research results or findings. Parkinson (2011) suggests that authors must explain their research findings in the light of accepted knowledge and extend this knowledge to a certain level of development. Therefore, according to Parkinson (2011, p. 165), authors may "hedge more because the

information is new and not yet endorsed by the community". In the analysis processes, authors' statements of research results became the starting point, and then what they state about the findings was identified and categorized based on its communicative purposes or styles. Liu and Buckingham (2018) suggest that after presenting the results, authors should comment on them, and this can be done in four possible ways: interpreting the results, comparing or contrasting the results with literature, and accounting for the results. In this study, following Liu and Buckingham, the possible communicative purposes of commenting on results are called styles, and the possible styles are the following: Style 1 (interpreting the research findings or suggesting what the research findings mean), Style 2 (explaining or elaborating the research findings), Style 3 (stating the possible cause/s of the research findings), Style 4 (illustrating or exemplifying the research findings), and Style 5 (relating the research findings with those in previous studies). Thus, this first analysis looks at the authors' rhetorical arguments or styles to gain readers' acceptance of their research findings or new knowledge claims, and the more appropriate styles are used the stronger the author's argument may become.

The second important aspect is how authors use references or citations of other people's work in their RADs. According to Swales (2004), in the discussion sections, RA authors use references or citations for confirming, comparing, or contradicting their research findings with the work of others. Snodgrass (2011, p. 17) suggests that authors often use phrases such as "consistent with", "in agreement with", "in line with", "confirm", or "corroborate" when relating their research findings with those in previous studies. Following Swales (2004), in this study, there are three possible purposes of authors in using references in their RAD. First, they may use references to confirm their interpretation or explanation or support the importance of their research findings and this is coded as Technique-1. Second, they may use references to compare their findings with those of previous relevant studies and this is coded as Technique-2. Third, they may use references to contrast their findings with those of previous relevant studies and this is coded as Technique-3. However, as Swales further claims, there may be inconsistency or variations in the rhetorical style of RADs in terms of using references or citations between different disciplines, within a particular discipline or even within a particular journal itself.

3.   METHODS

3.1   The Corpus of the Study

For this study, 40 RAs were chosen from four different Indonesian research journals in LS: 10 from Salingka (Sal), 10 from Aksara (Aks), 10 from Linguistik Indonesia (LI), and 10 from Linguistika (Ling). The articles selected from the four different journals were taken from the latest volumes of the journals to represent the current features of the research papers published in the journals and the discipline. These journals were chosen to represent journals in Linguistics that belong to the Humanities (MacCulloch, 2018). These four journals were chosen based on the reasons that 1) the journals publish research articles in Indonesian by Indonesian writers for Indonesian readers, 2) the journals publish RAs in Language Studies, 3) the journals are open-access journals in which the articles can be easily accessed and

downloaded, 4) the journals are mainstream journals in Indonesia indicated by their national accreditation values of 2 or 3 ('Sinta' value 2 or 3 out of 1 the highest to 6 the lowest value range), and 5) the RAs published in the journals use a common format of an RA i.e. introduction, methods, results, and discussion or IMRD.

Furthermore, the 40 articles were chosen from four different journals based on the following criteria: a) the articles were written from a piece of research, b) the articles used a standard research article format of introduction, method, results and discussion, and conclusion, c) the articles were written in Indonesian and by Indonesian authors, d) the articles were about Language Studies such as Linguistics, Applied Linguistics, and Literature, and e) the articles were taken from recent versions of the journals (i.e. from the last five-year volumes). Moreover, 40 articles were included in the corpus of this study because the minimum requirement for the number of texts to be included in quantitative analysis is 30 texts (Corder & Foreman, 2009). A study on the language used to prove knowledge claims in high-impact Physics journals by Parkinson (2011), for example, included only 30 texts. However, a number of 40 research articles in this study was to ensure a more comprehensive coverage of the discourse style of Indonesian RAs in the discipline in terms of both content and language choices.

3.2 Categorizing the Styles and Techniques of the Argument

The appearance of styles and techniques in the Indonesian RADs were categorized into obligatory, conventional, or optional based on their frequency of occurrence. Following Kanoksilapatham (2005), if a style or technique appears in all RAs (100%), it was categorized as obligatory, if it appears between 60-99% of the RAs, it was categorized as conventional, and if it appears in less than 60% of the RAs, it was categorized as optional. The main purpose of categorizing the styles and techniques into three categories, according to Kanoksilapatham (2005), is to establish which rhetorical styles and techniques out of the possible styles and techniques are more conventional than the others.

3.3 Methods and Procedures of Data Analysis

The processes of identifying the communicative chunks of style and technique in the discussion section of RAs, following Dudley-Evans (1994), went through the following steps. First, the titles, the abstracts, and the key terms in each of the articles were read to get a general understanding of the research activities reported in the RAs. Second, the entire article was read to identify the main sections (i.e. abstract, introduction, methods, results and discussion, and conclusion). Third, the discussion sections of the RAs were read again to identify the linguistic and discourse features which may signal the possible communicative segments in the discussion sections referring to the five possible styles and three possible techniques as a guideline. Fourth, the possible styles and techniques in the discussion of the RAs were identified and coded with the help of linguistic and discourse features such as subheadings, paragraphs as a unit of ideas, specific lexicon, discourse markers, and/or inferred from the text. Fifth, the author's argument effectiveness in the RADs was evaluated and rated by Indonesian native speaker postgraduate students based on the occurrence of the five styles and three techniques. Finally, an independent rater was asked to identify

the styles and techniques found in samples of RADs to ensure the inter-rater reliability of text analysis results. The checklist to identify the argument styles is attached in Appendix A, while the one to identify the techniques of using reference is given in Appendix B.

3.4 Inter-rater Reliability Analysis

To achieve a standard process of identifying and coding styles and techniques in the text, inter-rater reliability was conducted so that different persons can identify the boundary of communicative segments at a sufficiently high level of agreement. An independent rater involved in this study was a lecturer at the English Postgraduate Education program at the Education Faculty of Bengkulu University with a Ph.D. qualification in linguistics. The co-rater was trained on how to identify the possible communicative units of style and technique using a research instrument as attached in Appendices A and B, to ensure that the co-rater clearly understood how to identify and code the style and technique in the RADs. If any misidentification and miscoding act occurred on the RA sample in the training then a discussion, negotiation, and clarification were held to reach an agreement between the researcher and the co-rater. Then, the co-rater was asked to identify the possible style and technique in a sample of 8 or 20% RADs (two RADs were taken randomly from each of the four groups of RAs in the corpus of the study). Finally, the co-rater worked independently to identify and code the communicative chunks of style and technique in the sample texts.

In this study, Cohen's *Kappa* coefficient analysis was used to evaluate the inter-rater reliability of the style and technique in the discussion section of RA samples. The maximum score in Cohen's *Kappa* statistical analysis is 1.00 and the lowest is 0.00 (Brown, 1996). Also, if Cohen's *Kappa* score is less than 0.40 it was considered 'poor', between 0.40–0.59 'fair', between 0.60–0.74 'good', and 0.75 or above 'excellent' (Kanoksilapatham, 2005). After comparing the style and technique identification results from the researcher and the co-rater on a sample of ten RADs, the *Kappa* coefficient value was calculated. The Cohen's *Kappa* value obtained was 0.85, an excellent overall inter-rater reliability implying that the processes of coding the styles and techniques in the RADs were already reliable.

4.   RESULTS

4.1   The Indonesian Writers' Style in Justifying Their Research Findin*gs*

The first research question addressed in this study is how Indonesian writers in Language Studies justify research findings in their RADs. The data analysis result is summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. The argument style in the Indonesian RADs.

No	Styles	Frequency	%	Category
1	Style 1: Interpreting the research findings or stating what the findings may mean	33	82.5	Conventional
2	Style 2: Explaining or elaborating the research findings to make it clear for readers	35	87.5	Conventional

Table 1 continued…

3	Style 3: Stating the possible cause/s of the research findings	26	65	Conventional
4	Style 4: Illustrating or exemplifying the research findings	29	72.5	Conventional
5	Style 5: Relating the research findings with those in previous related studies	23	57.5	Optional

As indicated in Table 1, none of the styles can be categorized as obligatory; four of them (Styles 1, 2, 3, and 4) are categorized as conventional and one style (Style 5) is optional. Below are discourse samples taken from the data of the study to illustrate the conventional and optional style.

Extract 1 (conventional styles):

(P-1)   **Temuan yang diringkas pada Tabel 4, 6, 7 dan 8 menunjukkan bahwa untuk empat jenis kesalahan yang diteliti (kalimat tanpa subjek, kalimat tanpa jeda, kalimat tidak tuntas, dan klausa menggantung), ternyata tidak ada perbedaan yang signifikan antara proporsi setiap jenis kesalahan kalimat sebelum diajar dengan teknik Pembangkitan Penyadaran dan sesudah diajar dengan teknik tersebut**. *Perbedaan signifikan hanya terlihat pada jenis kesalahan kalimat terlalu panjang, yang hasil perhitungannya disajikan di Tabel 5. Kendati pada pengamatan sekilas terutama di Tabel 3 di atas tampak kecenderungan menurun dalam proporsi setiap jenis kesalahan, perhitungan statistik ternyata menunjukkan bahwa perbedaan antara proporsi kesalahan sebelum perlakuan tidak berbeda secara signifikan dengan sesudah perlakuan (LI-1).*

[(P-1)   **The findings summarized in Tables 4, 6, 7 and 8 show that, for the four types of errors investigated (sentences without subjects, sentences without pauses, incomplete sentences, and hanging clauses), it turns out that there is no significant difference between the proportion of each type of sentence error before and after being taught with awareness awakening technique**. *A significant difference is only seen in the types of too-long sentence errors as presented in Table 5. Although at a glance observation, especially in Table 3 above, there is a tendency to decrease in the proportion of each type of error, statistical analyses show that the type of error difference between before and after treatment is not significant. (LI-1)]*

(P-2)   *Selanjutnya, pada bagian ini dibahas hasil analisis di atas dari sudut pandang pengalaman penulis dan studi lain. Yang pertama adalah tentang kecenderungan membuat kalimat tanpa jeda. Pengamatan informal penulis pun menunjukkan bahwa kesalahan ini makin sering nampak di berbagai media komunikasi kantor, terutama surat elektronik.* **Contoh kalimat tanpa jeda (7a) ini diambil dari sebuah surat elektronik dari sebuah bank domestik; padahal, hanya dengan memberikan jeda berupa tanda titik yang menggantikan tanda koma, maka kalimat tersebut menjadi lebih efektif, seperti pada (7b).**
(7a). Gunakan terus Kartu Kredit Anda dan nikmati fasilitas dan penawaran di berbagai merchant pilihan, kunjungi situs kami dan klik di sini untuk men-download cardlink versi cetak edisi terbaru.
(7b). Gunakan terus Kartu Kredit Anda dan nikmati fasilitas dan penawaran di berbagai merchant pilihan. Kunjungi situs kami dan klik di sini untuk men-download cardlink versi cetak edisi terbaru.

*[(P-2) In addition, in this section we discuss the research results from the perspective of authors' experience and relevant studies. The first is about the tendency to make sentences without pauses. Informal observations with the authors show that this error is increasingly apparent in various office communication media, especially through electronic mails. **An example of pause (7a) is taken from an electronic letter from a domestic bank in which the sentence uses a comma rather than a full stop. Therefore, by changing a comma into a full stop, the sentence becomes more effective, as in (7b).***
(7a). Use your Credit Card continuously and enjoy the facilities and offers at various selected merchants, visit our website and click here to download the latest edition of printed card link.
(7b). Use your Credit Card continuously and enjoy the facilities and offers at various selected merchants. Visit our website and click here to download the latest edition of the printed card link. (LI-1)]

*(P-3) **Penulis menduga bahwa kecenderungan membuat kalimat tanpa jeda ini disebabkan oleh pengaruh dari ragam tutur lisan.** Ketika bertutur secara lisan dalam situasi informal, penutur memang secara alamiah merangkai ujaran-ujarannya dengan jeda sangat pendek. Ragam tutur lisan penuh dengan penderetan gagasan demi gagasan yang diuntai oleh konjungsi dan, atau jeda sepersekian detik. Dengan kata lain, ketika bertutur pengguna bahasa cenderung melakukan fragmentasi satuan-satuan pikirannya, sementara ketika menulis mereka harus melakukan integrasi gagasan-gagasannya dengan menggunakan kata sambung subordinatif (Chafe, cited by Renkema, 2004). (L-1)*

*[(P-3) **The author suspects that the tendency to make sentences without stops is due to the influence of various spoken speeches.** When speaking verbally in informal situations, speakers naturally arrange their utterances with very short pauses. Verbal speech is full of ideas strung together by conjunction or split-second pauses. In other words, when speaking, language users tend to fragment their idea units, while when writing they must integrate their ideas using subordinate conjunctions (Chafe, cited by Renkema, 2004) (L-1)]*

The title of the article from which Extract 1 was taken is '*Dampak Teknik Pembangkitan Penyadaran dan Pencermatan Terhadap Keefektifan Kalimat Bahasa Indonesia dalam Tulisan Ilmiah Mahasiswa*' (The Impact of Awareness and Consciousness Awakening Technique on Effective Sentences in Indonesian Academic Texts by University Students). The results and discussion sections in this article are separated and the discussion section alone is 1,741 words long. In the first paragraph, the author discusses his research findings by interpreting and elaborating them (Style 1 and Style 2) to help readers understand the findings better. In the second paragraph, the author illustrates the types of errors made by his respondents in writing (Style 4). In the third paragraph, the author addresses the possible cause of the research results (Style 3) and supports his argument with a reference (Chafe, cited in Renkema, 2004). Thus, in this example, the author uses four styles (Style 1, 2, 3 & 4) in discussing his research finding, while the use of reference is to support his argument on the possible cause of the finding rather than to compare or contrast them with those of other authors.

Extract 2 (an optional style):

(P-5) *Bentuk tuturan imperatif yang digunakan pada situasi pembelajaran di SMA Negeri 3 dan SMA Negeri 5 Malang memang berstatus formal. Akan tetapi, jalinan interaksi antara guru dan siswa pada kegiatan tersebut selain bersifat formal juga dibangun situasi keakraban sehingga jarak sosial antara guru dan siswa menjadi samar-samar. Pada situasi ini muncul bentuk tuturan imperatif aktif transitif yang dituturkan guru kepada siswa dengan ditandai penggunaan verba dasar pada tuturan imperatifnya. Penggunaan verba dasar pada tuturan imperatif merupakan ciri dari tuturan imperatif aktif transitif.* **Ini sesuai dengan pendapat Rahardi (2005:90) yang mengatakan tuturan imperatif aktif transitif verbanya harus dibentuk tanpa berawalan meN-. (Ling-6)**

[(P-5) *The form of imperative speech used in the learning situation in SMA 3 and SMA 5 Malang is a formal status. However, the interplay between the teacher and students in the activity is not only formal but also a situation of familiarity so that the social distance between the teacher and students becomes vague. In this situation arises the form of transitive active imperative speech that is spoken by the teacher to students with a marked use of basic verbs in his imperative speech. The use of basic verbs in imperative speech is a feature of active transitive imperative speech.* **This is in line with Rahardi (2005: 90) who said that transitively active imperative speech must be formed without prefix meN-. (Ling-6)]**

Extract 2 was taken from an article entitled '*Strategi Imperatif Verbal Guru Dalam Penanaman Nilai Karakter pada Siswa SMA Unggulan di Malang*' (Teacher's Verbal Imperative Style in Developing Character Value in Excellent SMA Students in Malang). In this article, the results and discussion sections are combined and these sections consist of 2,480 words. In paragraph 5, the authors state that their findings are similar to those of another author in a reference as cited in the literature (i.e. Rahardi, 2005). Thus, unlike in Extract 1, the author's use of reference in this example is to compare their research results with the finding of other people (Style 5).

4.2   The Argument Techniques in the Indonesian RADs

The second research question in this study is how Indonesian writers in LS use references in their discussion to confirm, compare, or contrast their research findings with those of other people's works. The data analysis result is shown in Table 2 below.

Table 2. The frequency of techniques in the Indonesian RADs.

No	Techniques	Frequency	%	Category
1	Technique 1: Confirming the interpretation or explanation of the results or supporting the importance of the research findings.	23	57.5	Optional
2	Technique 2: Comparing the research findings with those of previous relevant studies.	4	10	Optional
3	Technique 3: Contrasting the research findings with those in previous relevant studies.	1	2.5	Optional

As can be seen in Table 2, there is no technique which can be categorized as obligatory and conventional, and all three techniques (i.e. Techniques 1, 2 and 3) are categorized as optional, but when comparing the frequency of Techniques 1, 2 and 3,

the use of Technique 1 is far significantly more frequent. Table 3 also indicates that there are only 4 authors (10%) in the corpus of this study comparing and only one author (2.5%) contrasting their research findings to those of other people's findings found in the literature. Below are illustrations of the techniques found in the data of this study.

Extract 3 (Technique 1: confirming research findings):

(P-1)   *Pada percakapan hal-hal yang diungkapkan oleh pelaku dan lawan bicara terkadang diumpamakan dalam wujud bahasa kiasan.* **Eriyanto (2009, hlm. 259) mengungkapkan bahwa pemakaian kiasan dimaksudkan sebagai ornamen atau bumbu sebuah berita.** *Metafora dapat disajikan berdasarkan peribahasa, petuah, atau bahkan ujaran agama. Akan tetapi, pemakaian metafora tertentu bisa menjadi petunjuk utama untuk mengerti makna suatu teks. (Aks-5)*

[(P-1)   *In a conversation, the things expressed by the speaker and his/her interlocutor are sometimes compared in the form of figurative language.* **Eriyanto (2009, p. 259) reveals that the use of figures of speech is intended as an ornament or spice of news**. *Metaphors can be presented based on proverbs, admonitions, or even religious utterances. However, the use of certain metaphors can be the main clue to understanding the meaning of a text. (Aks-5)]*

(P-2)   **Menurut Fairclough (2001, hlm. 292) bahwa metafora merupakan kunci bagaimana realitas ditampilkan dan dibedakan dengan orang lain.** *Metafora bukan hanya persoalan keindahan literer karena bisa menentukan apakah realitas itu dimaknai dan dikategorikan sebagai positif atau negatif. Militer dapat ditampilkan dengan memberi metafor anak kandung rakyat, anak kandung revolusi, atau pembawa sengsara rakyat. Metafora ini bukan sekadar pemberi identitas atas diri militer. Dengan memberi metafora anak kandung revolusi, diabstraksikan kepada khalayak bahwa militer baik, mewarisi semangat pejuangan, dan apa pun yang dilakukan adalah demi kepentingan rakyat. Sebaliknya, dengan memberikan metafor pembawa sengsara rakyat, militer diabstraksikan sebagai sosok yang oportunis dan tindakannya merugikan rakyat.* (Aks-5)

[(P-2)   **According to Fairclough (2001, p. 292), metaphor is the key to how reality is displayed and distinguished from others.** *Metaphor is not only a matter of literary beauty because it can determine whether reality is interpreted and categorized as positive or negative. The military can be displayed by giving the metaphor of the children of the people, biological children of the revolution, or bearers of miserable people. This metaphor is not just a military identity giver. By giving the metaphor of the biological child the revolution, abstracted to the public that the military is good, inherits the spirit of struggle, and whatever is done is in the interests of the people. On the contrary, by providing a metaphor for the miserable bearer of the people, the military is abstracted as an opportunist and his actions harm the people. (Aks-5)]*

The title of the article from which Extract 3 was taken is '*Analisis Percakapan Bahasa Sasak dalam Perspektif Gender: Sebuah Kajian Wacana Kritis*' (Conversation Analysis in Sasak Language from Gender Perspectives: A Critical Discourse Analysis Study). In this article, the results and discussion sections are combined and these sections are 3,557 words long. Extract 3 illustrates how Indonesian writers in LS use references in their RAD to confirm or support his interpretation,

explanation/elaboration, or the suggestion of the cause of their research findings. In paragraph 1, the author uses a reference (i.e. Eriyanto, 2009) to support his interpretation of his findings. In paragraph 2, the author continues his explanation about his research finding, and to convince readers that his interpretation is right and acceptable, the author uses another citation (i.e. Fairclough, 2001).

Extract 4 (Technique 2: comparing research findings with that of other people):

> *Dengan demikian, apa pun situasi tuturnya dan siapa pun peserta tuturnya, pola strategi kesantunan yang umumnya diaplikasi oleh keempat budaya etnik Sulawesi Selatan, termasuk Indonesia pada umumnya adalah strategi kesantunan negatif, yang lebih menekankan pada aspek "hormat" (deference) dibandingkan dengan pola strategi kesantunan positif, yang lebih menekankan pada aspek "keakraban" (solidarity) yang umum dipakai dalam masyarakat dengan budaya Amerika. **Hal ini sejalan dengan** Lakoff (1990) yang mengatakan bahwa budaya Asia umumnya menggunakan strategi hormat. Beberapa data di atas membuktikan bahwa meskipun bentuk interaksi adalah akrab, kadang-kadang bentuk sapaan yang dipilih oleh peserta tutur adalah strategi kesantunan negatif, yakni penggunaan ragam tutur yang lebih hormat, dan bukan yang bersifat kasual, atau kesantunan positif yang menekankan keakraban* (LI-10)

> *[Thus, whatever the speech situation is and whoever the participants are, the pattern of politeness strategy generally applied by the four ethnic cultures of South Sulawesi, including Indonesia in general, is a negative politeness strategy emphasizing deference compared to positive strategy pattern of politeness emphasizing more on the aspects of familiarity (solidarity) commonly used in American culture. **This is in line with** Lakoff (1990) who said that Asian cultures generally use respect strategies. The above data prove that even though the form of interaction is familiar, the form of greeting chosen by the participants is sometimes a negative politeness strategy, namely the use of a more respectful, and not casual, speech type or positive politeness that emphasizes familiarity (LI-10)]*

Extract 4 was taken from the article entitled '*Ancangan Model Kerangka Teori Kesantunan yang Efektif Mengkaji Budaya Bahasa-Bahasa Warisan di Asia: Review Terhadap Keuniversalan Kerangka Teori Kesantunan Brown & Levinson*' (A Design Model of Effective Theoretical Framework to Study Indigenous Cultures and Languages in Asia: Review on the Universality of Brown and Levinson's Politeness Theoretical Framework). The discussion section in this article is separated from the results, and this section consists of 1,297 words. Extract 4 is to illustrate how Indonesian writers in LS use references to compare their research findings with those of other people. As indicated in Extract 4, the author claims that his finding is similar to that of Lakoff (1990), suggesting that people from Asia tend to use negative politeness strategy to show their respect to other people who are already familiar to them.

Extract 5 (Technique 3: contrasting research findings with that of other people):

> *Fakta di atas mengimplikasikan bahwa bagi penulis Indonesia fungsi kutipan yang paling utama dalam pendahuluan artikel adalah untuk mendukung pentingnya topik penelitian dan untuk mendukung masalah penelitian. **Sebaliknya**, dalam praktik penulisan karya ilmiah di jurnal internasional, mengritik literatur dimaksudkan untuk*

menemukan rumpang (gap) atau kelemahan informasi yang ada untuk dapat dilengkapi atau diperbaiki sehingga pengetahuan pembaca tentang topik tertentu dapat bertambah (knowledge advancement). (LI-3)

*[The data imply that for Indonesian writers, the main function of citation in the introduction section of a research article is to support the importance of the research topic and to justify the research problem. **Conversely**, in the practice of writing scientific papers in international journals, criticizing the literature is intended to find existing gaps or weaknesses of information to be equipped or improved so that readers' knowledge of a particular topic can be increased (knowledge advancement). (LI-3)]*

The title of the article from which Extract 5 was taken is '*Tipe dan Fungsi Pengutipan di Bagian Pendahuluan Artikel Jurnal Berbahasa Indonesia*' (Type and Function of Citation in the Introduction Section of Indonesian Research Articles). In this article, the discussion section is combined with the results, and these sections are 2,387 words long. Extract 5 illustrates how Indonesian writers in LS contrast their research results with other author's work in the literature. In the above paragraph, the authors contrast their results with that of Kwan et al. (2012) in which, unlike Indonesian writers in their research data, international authors often evaluate the findings of other researchers.

5.   DISCUSSION

The first finding of this study is that the majority of Indonesian writers in the corpus of this study use Style 1 (interpreting the research findings or stating what the findings may mean), Style 2 (explaining or elaborating the research findings to make it clear for readers), Style 3 (stating the possible cause/s of the research findings) and Style 4 (illustrating or exemplifying the research findings) in commenting on and arguing for their research findings in their Indonesian RADs. However, only a few of them relate their research findings with those in previous studies found in the literature (Style 5). This finding is in line with Holmes (1997) who found that the discussion section of RAs in History rarely has reference to the previous research findings. According to Holmes (1997, p. 333), this is probably because authors in the field of History do not have a "theoretical consensus" in writing research articles for journals. Moreover, this finding supports the one by Arsyad (2013b) but different from that of Swales (2004) who suggests that in the discussion section, the rhetorical emphasis is on the finding of the present study, while references to relevant works are used to affirm or to see whether the present results resemble, differ from or contradict the previous ones. According to Swales, since an important purpose of conducting research is to review the findings of previous similar or related studies, reference to related studies in the discussion section becomes compulsory.

This result shows that Indonesian writers in LS write RADs in Indonesian differently from international authors as suggested by Swales (1990; 2004). This is probably because, as Sabet and Kazempouri (2015) suggest, there are no universal trends or conventions in writing the discussion section in RAs; there are a variety of conventions in writing the discussion section of RAs between different disciplines. The convention of RADs in LS in Indonesia seems only to contain a statement of results, interpretation of the results, elaborating the results, stating the possible cause,

and illustrating the results with or without references. In other words, the use of reference to support interpretation or explanation of research results is not considered important for Indonesian writers in LS when writing in Indonesian. However, according to Loi et al. (2015), personal contribution to the current knowledge addressed in the discussion section must be consistently motivated on the grounds of previous studies conducted by other specialists in the field.

The second finding in this study is that a few Indonesian writers in LS use references in their RADs to confirm the interpretation or explanation of the results or to support the importance of the research findings, but very few of them compare or contrast their findings with those in previous relevant studies. This implies that, for Indonesian writers, comparing or contrasting their research findings with those of previous relevant studies is not necessary; a more important rhetorical work is to state, interpret, explain or elaborate, state the possible cause of the findings and/or illustrate them. This is probably because, as suggested by Arsyad (2013b), Indonesian writers believe that they do not need to compare or contrast their research findings with those found in previous studies. According to Arsyad (2013b), Indonesian writers view that they do not have to justify their findings and even readers must accept whatever findings they have in their studies.

This finding is different from that of Amnuai and Wannaruk (2013) who found that the rhetorical structure of Thai RAD followed the model suggested by Yang and Allison (2003) which consists of seven moves with or without steps in each move. This is because, Thai authors are already aware of the main function of RAD which is to comment on the research results by 'interpreting', 'accounting for', and 'comparing them with those of previous works'. Thus, the Indonesian writers in LS in this study may not be aware of the rhetorical style in RAD commonly found in English RADs since they rarely read articles in English. However, Swales (1990) suggests that the different rhetorical styles in the RADs can be because of the disciplinary convention at the international or national context. Martin (2003) and Tahririan and Jalilifar (2004, p. 39) also suggest that authors are "highly dependent on their sociocultural factors in their academic writing". Thus, the Indonesian writers in LS may have followed the article writing convention available in Indonesia rather than the one used by international authors.

The results of this study indicate some implications for Indonesian authors in Language Studies when writing an article in English to be submitted to a reputable international journal in English. It is important to argue convincingly that their research results or findings are important and necessary, and therefore the use of relevant references is obligatory in their RADs. This is because the argument quality of a RAD also determines the quality of a research article as a whole, and it will be an important indicator for journal editors and/or reviewers to decide whether or not to accept an article draft for publication.

6.   CONCLUSION

The main finding of this study is that the Indonesian writers in Language Studies (LS) write research article discussion in Indonesian differently from international authors who write in English as suggested by previous studies (Swales, 1990, 2004). The main difference is in the way Indonesian writers justify their new knowledge claim

in which, unlike in RAs published in English, the majority of Indonesian RA authors do not relate the research findings with those in previous studies in their RADs, especially to compare and/or contrast the research findings. If they use references in their RAD, it is to confirm the interpretation or explanation of the results or to support the importance of the research findings not to compare or contrast their findings with those of other authors. This is because the convention of writing RADs in Indonesian seems to be different from that of English RAs as published in international journals.

When Indonesian writers in LS write articles in English for international journal publication, they should conform to the rhetorical style acceptable by international readers to make the articles more acceptable by the journal readers. They should follow the common rhetorical style of RADs as expected by international journal readers published in English. The most important rhetorical change for the Indonesian writers is to confirm, compare, or contrast their research findings with those in the relevant studies found in the literature. This is aimed at convincing readers on the new knowledge claims they address in their RADs.

The corpus of this study included only 40 articles from four different journals in Language Studies out of the many journals in this field published in Indonesia. These articles may not well represent all articles published in all journals in LS in Indonesia. Therefore, future studies should include more articles taken from more representative journals in LS. In addition, this study investigated only the argument techniques and use of references of Indonesian authors in justifying their research results in their Indonesian RADs. Other factors may contribute to the quality of the argument such as the quality of references used, the logical flow of the authors, the cohesion and coherence quality of the RADs, and so on. These factors merit further investigation to know a complete picture of the argument quality of RADs by Indonesian authors in Language Studies. These studies can be conducted in a descriptive-analytic or cross-cultural comparative method. This information will be very useful to teach and mentor Indonesian writers particularly in LS to write RAs in English for international journal publication more successfully.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

REFERENCES

Adnan, Z. (2009). Some potential problems for research articles written by Indonesian academics when submitted to international English language journals. *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly, 11*(1), 107–125.

Adnan, Z. (2014). Prospects of Indonesian Research Articles (RAs) being considered for publication in center journals: A comparative study of rhetorical patterns of RAs in selected humanities and hard science disciplines. In A. Lyda & K.

Warchal (Eds.), *Occupying Niches: Interculturality, cross-culturality and aculturality in academic research* (pp. 66-79). Springer.

Amnuai, W., & Wannaruk, A. (2013). Investigating move structure of English applied linguistics research article discussions published in international and Thai journals. *English Language Teaching*, *6*(2), 1-13.

Arsyad, S. (2013a). A genre-based analysis of Indonesian research articles in the social sciences and humanities written by Indonesian speakers. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, *8*(3), 234-254.

Arsyad, S. (2013b). A Genre-based analysis on discussion section of research articles in Indonesian written by Indonesian speakers. *International Journal of Linguistics*, *5*(4), 50-70.

Arsyad, S., & Adila, D. (2017). Using local style when writing in English: The citing behaviour of Indonesian writers in English research article introductions. *Asian Englishes*, *20*(2), 170-185.

Arsyad, S., & Arono. (2016). Potential problematic rhetorical style transfer from first language to foreign language: A case of Indonesian writers writing research article introductions in English. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, *11*(33), 315-350.

Arsyad, S., & Wardhana, D. E. (2014). Introduction in Indonesian social sciences and humanities research articles: How Indonesians justify their research project. *Linguistik Indonesia*, *32*(2), 149-163.

Basthomi, Y. (2009). Examining research spaces in doctoral prospectuses. *TEFLIN Journal*, *20*(2), 140-158.

Basturkmen, H. (2012). A genre-based investigation of discussion sections of research articles in dentistry and disciplinary variation. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *11*(2), 134-144.

Branson, R. D. (2004). Anatomy of a research paper. *Respiratory Care*, *49*(10), 1222-1228.

Brown, J. D. (1996). *Testing in language programs*. Prentice-Hall Regents.

Corder, G. W., & Foreman, D. I. (2009). *Nonparametric statistics for non-statistician: A step-by-step approach*. John Willey and Sons.

Dobakhti, L. (2013). Commenting on findings in qualitative and quantitative research articles' discussions in applied linguistics. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature, 2*(5), 2200-3452.

Dudley-Evans, T. (Ed.). (1994). *Genre Analysis: Approach to text analysis for ESP in Malcolm Coulthard in advances in written text analysis*. Routledge.

Dujsik, D. (2013). A genre analysis of research article discussion in applied linguistics. *Language Research*, *42*(9), 453-477.

Flowerdew, J. (2001). Attitudes of journal editors to non-native speaker contributions. *TESOL Quarterly*, *35*(1), 127-150.

Hagin, S. (2009). How to write the results and discussion sections. *English 1102/66 of Kennesaw State University,* Spring.

Hess, D. R. (2004). How to write an effective discussion. *Respiratory Care*, *49*(10), 1238-1241.

Holmes, R. (1997). Genre analysis and the social sciences: An investigation of the structure of RA discussion sections in three disciplines. *English for Specific Purposes, 16*(4), 321-327.

Irawati, L., Saukah, A., & Suharmanto. (2018). Indonesian writers writing their

discussion section both in English and Indonesian research articles. *Cakrawala Pendidikan, 27*(3), 447-456.

Jalilifar, A. R. (2011). World of attitudes in research article discussion section: Cross-linguistic perspective. *Journal of Technology and Education*, *5*(3), 177-186.

Kanoksilapatham, B. (2005). Rhetorical structure of biochemistry research articles. *English for Specific Purpose*, *24*(3), 269-292.

Kwan, B. S. C., Chan, H., & Lam, C. (2012). Evaluating prior scholarship in literature reviews of research articles: A comparative study of practices in two research paradigms. *English for Specific Purposes, 31*, 188-201.

Liu, Y., & Buckingham, L. (2018). The schematic structure of discussion sections in applied linguistics and the distribution of meta-discourse markers. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *34*(July), 97-109.

Loan, N. T. T., & Pramoolsook, I. (2015). Move analysis of results-discussion chapters in TESOL master's theses written by Vietnamese students. *3L: The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies, 21*(2), 1-15.

Loi, C. K., Evans, M. S., Akkakoson, S., Ahmed, S. & Ahmed, S. (2015). Rhetorical patterns in the discussion sections of Malay research articles. *International Journal of Languages, Literature and Linguistics*, *1*(2), 118-121.

MacCulloch, D. (2018, November 15). *What are the humanities?*. The British Academy. https://www.thebritishacademy.ac.uk/blog/what-are-humanities/

Martin, P. M. (2003). A genre analysis of English and Spanish research paper abstracts in experimental social sciences. *English for Specific Purposes, 22*(1), 25-43.

Mirahayuni, N. K. (2002). *Investigating textual structure in native and non-native English research articles: strategy differences between Indonesian and English Writers* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of New South Wales.

Moyetta, D. (2016). The discussion section of English and Spanish research articles in psychology: A contrastive study. *ESP Today*, *4*(1), 87-106.

Parkinson, J. (2011). The discussion section as argument: The language used to prove knowledge claims. *English for Specific Purposes*, *30*(3), 164-175.

Peacock, M. (2002). Communicative moves in the discussion section of research articles. *System*, *30*, 479-497.

Sabet, M. K., & Kazempouri, M. (2015). Generic structure of discussion sections in ESP research articles across international and Iranian journals. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, *6*(2), 87-95.

Safnil. (2001). *Genre structure analyses of the Indonesian research articles* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. The Australian National University.

Salimi, S. & Yazdami, M. (2011). Move analysis of the discussion section of sociolinguistics and testing articles: Are standard met?. *International Conference on Language, Literature and Linguistics, 6,* 354-358.

Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2016). Working on the 'write' path: Improving EFL students' argumentative-writing performance through L1-mediated structural cognitive modification. *International Journal of Language Studies, 10*(4), 131-152.

Snodgrass, E. A. (2011). *Referencing sources in discussion and conclusion sections of academic research papers* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Iowa State University.

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

Swales, J. M. (2004). *Research genres: Explorations and applications*. Cambridge University Press.

Tahririan, M. H., & Jalilifar, A. R. (2004). Genre analysis of thesis and dissertation abstracts: Variation across cultures. *Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *7*(2), 121-143.

Thyer, B. A. (2008). *Preparing research articles*. Oxford University Press.

Yang, R., & Allison, D. (2003). Research articles in applied linguistics: Moving from results to conclusions. *English for Specific Purposes*, *22*, 365-385.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Identification of Argument Styles in the Indonesian RADs

Article Code   :
Article number :

Argument styles	Communicative purposes	Useful discourse features found in the text	Notes
Style-1	Interpreting the research findings or stating what the findings may mean		
Style-2	Explaining or elaborating the research findings to make it clear for readers		
Style-3	Stating the possible cause/s of the research findings		
Style-4	Illustrating or exemplifying the research findings		
Style-5	Connecting the research findings with those in previous related studies		

Appendix B

Identification of Techniques in the Indonesian RADs

Article Code   :
Article number :

Using Reference Techniques	Communicative purposes	Useful discourse features found in the text	Notes
Technique 1	Confirming the interpretation, the results or explanation or supporting the importance of the research findings.		
Technique 2	Comparing the research findings with those of previous relevant studies.		
Technique 3	Contrasting the research findings with those in previous relevant studies.		