LLT Journal, e-ISSN 2579-9533, p-ISSN 1410-7201, Vol. 28, No. 1, April 2025, pp. 1-19

LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching
http://e-journal.usd.ac.id/index.php/LLT
Sanata Dharma University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

RHETORICAL PROBLEMS OF INDONESIAN RESEARCH ARTICLE RESULTS AND DISCUSSION IN THE HISTORY AND LAW DISCIPLINES

Warsidi Warsidi[1*], Zifirdaus Adnan[2], and Vegneskumar Maniam[3]
[1]Universitas Islam Makassar, Indonesia
[2,3]University of New England, Australia
warsidi.dty@uim-makassar.ac.id[1], zadnan@une.edu.au[2],
and vmaniam@une.edu.au[3]
*correspondence: warsidi.dty@uim-makassar.ac.id
https://doi.org/10.24071/llt.v28i1.9095
received 8 July 2024; accepted 20 April 2025

Abstract
The number of rhetorical studies of research articles (RAs) using a genre approach has increased greatly. However, studies on this area in Indonesian research articles (RAs) published in accredited journals are still limited. None has investigated the rhetorical structures of Indonesian History and Law research article results and discussions (RARDs) published in Indonesian accredited journals. Thus, the present study aims to analyse them rhetorically using English rhetorical models, one is from Tessuto (2015) and the other one is from Hopkins and Dudley-Evans (1988). The reason for employing these models is to determine whether the models could represent the rhetorical structure of the present data sets. These models were alternately tested against both data sets. The results showed that the rhetorical structures of both Indonesian History and Law RARDs are different from those presented in the English-tested models, and the analysis results showed that the present data have their models. These differences indicate problems for Indonesian authors in these two selected disciplines when publishing RAs in reputable English journals. Thus, these findings may contribute to English for Academic Purposes (EAP) for teaching instruction for publishing RAs in reputable English journals for authors in the two disciplines.

Keywords: history and law disciplines, Indonesian RAs, results and discussion section, rhetorical model

Introduction
The Indonesian Government's research policy number 20/2017 encourages Indonesian scholars to publish academic works in nationally accredited journals or international public spheres. Professors and associate professors, in particular, are required to do so (Sandy & Shen, 2019; Warsidi, 2021). The purpose of publishing research in international journals is to contribute to global knowledge expansion and to participate in world academic conversations and discussions.

However, some linguists have found that the introduction sections of Indonesian RAs (henceforth: RAIs) have dissimilar rhetorical structures from

This work is licensed under CC BY-SA.
Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License

English RAs, which may create a problem for them when publishing their works in reputable international journals (Adnan, 2009, 2011; Arsyad, 2013c; Arsyad & Adila, 2018; Arsyad & Arono, 2016; Arsyad et al., 2018; Mirahayuni, 2002; Samanhudi, 2017; Samanhudi & O'Boyle, 2022; Warsidi et al., 2024; Warsidi et al., 2023; Warsidi & Adnan, 2024).

In English, the purpose of RAs is to expand knowledge; thus, they need to create innovation in their current research (Warsidi et al., 2024; Warsidi & Adnan, 2024). In contrast, in Indonesian RAIs, the purpose of the study is mainly to solve practical problems in the field (Adnan, 2009, 2010, 2011; Warsidi, 2024b; Warsidi et al., 2024). Besides, their citation types are also different between Indonesian and English RAs. In this regard, in many cases, the uses of non-integrated citations were found more in reputable English journals than in those published in Indonesian journals (Warsidi et al., 2023).

In the discussion section, Indonesian RAs also have a dissimilar rhetorical structure compared to those found in English RAs (Arsyad, 2013a, 2013c; Arsyad, Zaim, et al., 2020; Warsidi & Maniam, 2024; Yanita, 2016). Comparing current research findings with those in the literature is very important in English research article discussions (RADs) by employing academic conflict units. However, many Indonesian authors cited the literature not for comparison, but for supporting claims (Warsidi & Maniam, 2024). These differences could lead to difficulties for Indonesian academics when trying to publish their research internationally (Adnan, 2010, 2011; Arsyad, 2000; Mirahayuni, 2002) as their writings contain different rhetorical structures from those expected in internationally reputable journals. Then, a question remains whether Indonesian RAs from other disciplines published in Sinta 2-accredited journals also employ the same or different rhetorical structures as those published in English.

Addressing this question is important to expand knowledge in the literature. Thus, in response to this question, this study focused on analyzing research article results and discussions (RARDs) as a combined section from the disciplines of History and Law published in SINTA-accredited journals for the following reasons. Firstly, the review above shows that RARDs, as one combined section, are still the least investigated. Secondly, History and Law RAs in the Indonesian context have never been analyzed, particularly those published in accredited journals. Third, analysing this combined section may expand knowledge in the literature regarding the ways of publishing works in academic journals and contribute to providing research-based information for authors in these selected disciplines. Thus, investigating this combined section of History and Law RAs may contribute more insights into the literature and create some pedagogical implications for English for Academic Purposes (EAP) instruction practice. Therefore, because of these reasons, the researchers designed the following research questions:

1. Do Indonesian RARDs in the History and Law disciplines published in SINTA 2 accredited journals employ the same or different rhetorical structure compared to English RARDs?
2. If so, to what extent are their similarities? Otherwise, what are their rhetorical structures like?

Literature Review

Research on genre within research articles (RAs) has recently received growing attention from linguists worldwide. In the discussion section, for example, linguistic scholars have investigated rhetorical structures using a genre approach where the research article results (RARs) and research article discussions (RADs) can be combined in one section (Khalili et al., 2016; Suherdi et al., 2020). Besides, some others analysed the rhetorical structure in RADs as a separate section (Abbasi Montazeri et al., 2021; Alotaibi, 2021; Amnuai, 2017; Basturkmen, 2012; Cheng, 2020; Cheng, 2021; Cheng & Unsworth, 2016; Dobakhti, 2013; Dobakhti & Zohrabi, 2018; Jin, 2021; Joseph & Lim, 2018; Kim et al., 2016; Lubis, 2020; Moyano, 2019; Peacock, 2002; Sadeghi & Alinasab, 2020; Tessuto, 2015).

In the combined results and discussion section, Khalili et al. (2016) analysed rhetorical structures of the RARs and RADs in the dentistry discipline written by non-native speakers (NNSs) of English and native English speakers (NSS). The results show that NNS authors wrote their RARs and RADs differently from NS authors. They only found five functional moves frequently appearing in RARs and RADs written by NNSs. The functional moves include *presenting the findings*, *stating background information, making a statement of results, comparing the findings with previous research,* and *supporting the findings with previous research findings*.

Besides, Suherdi et al. (2020) analyzed 113 unpublished RARDs written by undergraduate English Foreign Language (EFL) students using a model of Ruiying and Allison (2003). They revealed that their data conformed to only four moves of the model: "providing background information, reporting results, summarizing results, and commenting on results" (see page 65). However, as noticed, Ruiying and Allison (2003) have more functional moves, which six moves in the result section: "preparatory information, reporting results, commenting on results, summarizing results, evaluating the study, deduction from the research" (see Ruiying & Allison 2003, p. 374) and seven in the discussion section: "background information, reporting results, summarizing results, commenting on results, summarizing the study, evaluating the study, and deductions from the research" (see Ruiying & Allison 2003, p. 376). Thus, Suherdi et al. (2020) might misinterpret the model of Ruiying and Allison (2003). The model's moves may only be partially employed in their corpus.

In a study of RADs presented as a separate section, Loi et al. (2016) investigated move structures in English and Malay RADs in the education discipline using Peacock's model (2002) for coding both data sets. They found differences in the movement structures between English and Malay RADs. The difference is that 100% of English RADS employed more cycle move orders for the model, while only 18 Malay RADS (90%) used cycle move orders. This finding means that English RADs tend to employ more of the model than Malay RADs. Then, English RADS employed more background information to connect their earlier sections with the discussion section than Malay RADs did. Besides, English RADs have 1.6 more extended discussions than those in Malay RADS, which may affect their employing more functional moves than those in Malay RADS.

In the case of high-impact-factor journals, Cheng (2020) analysed 60 empirical RADs from the management discipline published with impact factors higher than 4.2. The analysis focused on negotiating theoretical implications. This

move has three possible steps: stating theoretical implications (Step 1), showcasing the theoretical backgrounds (Step 2), and justifying theoretical values (Step 3). The analysis revealed that most RADs employed a pattern to state theoretical implications by stating Step 1, Step 2 and Step 3.

Furthermore, Lubis (2020) analysed how Indonesian undergraduate English language teaching (ELT) students commented on their results in 113 unpublished English empirical RAs (short versions of undergraduate thesis), focusing on results and discussion sections using top-down and bottom-up approaches. The findings indicated that *interpreting* (Step 1) is the predominantly manifested step to comment on results that appeared in 88% of the total corpus. Then, it was followed by *comparing* results with those found in the literature (Step 2), *accounting* for the results (Step 3), and *evaluating* results (Step 4), respectively. Then, there are seven manifesting comment errors: ambiguous placing steps, ineffective embedding steps, verbose steps, unclear steps, incoherent ideas, incorrect linguistic characteristics, and inappropriate placing steps. Finally, there are four patterns to comment on the results. However, the majority of them used a three-step pattern (Step 1, Step 2, Step 3) appearing in 28 RAs, a two-step pattern (Step 1, Step 2) occurring in 21 RAs, a four-step pattern (Step 1, Step 2, Step 3, Step 4) appearing in 21 RAs, and one-step pattern (Step 1) occurring in 12 RAs.

Rhetorical models in the results and discussion sections

This study employed two rhetorical models for the data analysis. The first model is Tessutto's model (2015). It was designed based on all research article sections in the law disciplines. However, the result section contains three communicative moves: *restating data collection and analysis procedures, stating key findings by tables, charts, or diagrams,* and *commenting on the findings reported in tables, charts, or diagrams.* While the first move is conventional, the last two communicative moves are obligatory in research article results.

The second rhetorical model of the discussion section was designed by Dudley and Evan (1988). It contains eleven moves, designed from the discussion chapter of the MSc dissertation in Biology and the discussion section of research articles from the Irrigation discipline. However, eight of these eleven moves appeared three times (cycling pattern). This model has been widely tested against the data in the discussion section in various disciplines, either in English or other language backgrounds. These two models were employed for analysing data because one model may not cover the two sections of the research articles.

The rationales of the present study

As reviewed above, RADs written in one separate section are more dominant than combined with RARs. Then, the reviews indicate that presenting *'background information, reporting results, summarising results,* and *commenting on results'* are significant functional moves in the discussion section. However, the review also suggests that research on rhetorical structure in a combined section (results and discussion) is minimal, particularly in the Indonesian context. Besides, considering that some journals have combined these two sections as one, it may provide authors with an understanding of how rhetorically these two sections are combined. Although Suherdi et al. (2020) and Lubis (2020) analysed RAs focusing on results and discussion as a combined section in the Indonesian context, their corpus is from

unpublished ELT RAs, which is different from the present study. The purpose of analysing unpublished RAs is to provide awareness for Indonesian students and their lecturers that their rhetorical structures are different from those published in reputable journals.

Method

Research design

This study used a mix of analytical approaches because one approach alone may not cover the analysis needed to answer the research questions. For example, to determine to what extent the data from both sites have similarities, a quantitative approach must be used. Besides, this question must be answered descriptively to ensure the claims are appropriately placed and convincing.

Data collection procedures

For the analysis, the present study used 30 RARDs as data sets: 15 Indonesian History RARDs and 15 Indonesian Law RARDs. As presented in the introduction section, the reason for choosing these data sets is that no earlier study of rhetorical structure in these two disciplinary RAs in the Indonesian context exists. Therefore, by filling this gap, this study's results may add more insights to the literature and contribute to pedagogical instructions for EAP teachers for teaching English for publication purposes.

Selection criteria were determined to select the two data sets, including journals and RAs. In selecting journals, the journals are from the history and law disciplines and published in Indonesia in Indonesian. Then, they received the highest accreditation status in 2017 and 2018 from the Indonesian Directorate of Higher Research and Education (DIKTI). However, the highest accreditation of Indonesian journals in these two selected disciplines receives SINTA two, because none received SINTA one. Thus, all the journals receiving this accreditation status in these two disciplines were chosen to select RAs from them. Based on the selection criteria above, there are three History journals accepted accreditation SINTA two; the journals are "*Jurnal Sejarah Citra Lekha, Patanjala : Jurnal Penelitian Sejarah dan Budaya*, and *Patra Widya: Seri Penerbitan Penelitian Sejarah dan Budaya"*. In the Law discipline, there are six Law journals received this accreditation status; they include "*Ijtihad: Jurnal Wacana Hukum Islam dan Kemanusiaan, Al Ahwal: Jurnal Hukum Keluarga Islam, Jurnal Legislasi Indonesia, Justicia Islamica: Jurnal Kajian Hukum dan Sosial, Mimbar Hukum,* and *Masalah-masalah Hukum"*. Thus, the researchers selected RAs from these journals for the analysis because all these journals have received accreditation SINTA two, meaning they have met the quality standard determined by DIKTI.

To meet 30 RARDs from the selected journals above, the researchers selected 15 RAs from Indonesian History journals and the other 15 RAs from Indonesian Law journals. This criterion was employed because this combined section has rarely been investigated, as shown in the literature review. Thus, focusing the analysis on this combined section may contribute to the literature about how rhetorical structure is employed in combined results and discussion under one section.

Data analysis procedures

To analyze this combined section, the researchers employed two models: Tessuto's (2015) model and a model proposed by Hopkins and Dudley-Evans (1988). The reason for using these two models is that one model was insufficient to analyze this combined section because each covered only one section. Employing these models also aimed to determine whether they can represent the rhetorical moves in the results and discussion section within Indonesian history and law RAs. However, these models did not apply to the two data sets because only a few moves from these two models appeared in the data. The reason was that more communicative moves of the models were not found in both data sets.

Therefore, to discover a model that could represent the rhetorical moves in this combined section, the researchers employed two approaches for analysing both History and Law RARDs. They are top-down and bottom-up approaches. The top-down approach means that we read the texts from the above passages to down passages by identifying communicative events within the texts, while the bottom-up approach means that we ensure each communicative event within the texts (Warsidi, 2021; Warsidi, 2024a, 2024b; Warsidi, Adnan, et al., 2024; Warsidi, Damayanti, et al., 2024).

Besides, we also considered strategies used by Swales (1990) and Arsyad (2014) that functional moves and communicative events appear in a sentence, clause, phrase, or group of sentences. To classify whether they contain functional moves and communicative events in the two data sets, the researchers use linguistic signals (Loi et al., 2016), indicating results and a comprehensive discussion to determine functional moves and communicative events in the two data sets. For example, "the **findings** revealed that …" This communicative event indicates that authors present their research findings because the language signal 'findings' indicates reporting the findings. However, the contexts, functions, and purposes behind the language signal must be ensured to avoid misinterpretation. Then, findings of communicative events were grouped according to their functions.

Validity of data analysis results

To ensure the data analysis results are accurate, the principal author reported his analysis results by providing evidence for every claim. Then, five Ph.D. linguistic scholars checked and reviewed the analysis results to ensure the study's accuracy (including translation accuracy). Three of the five linguists are experts in genre studies of research articles. Any disagreement regarding the analysis results was discussed in meetings (both offline and online) until we reached an agreement. Thus, at the end of the study, we met 100% agreement. According to Cohen's Kappa inter-coder reliability (Kirilenko & Stepchenkova, 2016), 80-100% agreements may indicate closed agreements. Thus, employing these steps may make the analysis results reliable and accountable.

Findings and Discussion

Findings

After employing two English models from Tessuto (2015) and Hopkins and Dudley-Evans (1988), the results showed that these two English models did not apply to both data sets. The summary analysis employing these two English models is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. The results of employing English models from Tessuto (2015) and Hopkins and Dudley-Evans (1988) to analyze IHLRARDs

Moves and Steps	Number of History RAs and percentages		Number of Law RAs and percentages	
	N=15	Percentage	N=15	Percentage
Move 1: Restating data collection and analysis procedure	0	0	2	13.33%
Step 1A: Reiterating purpose, question, hypothesis	0	0	0	0
Move 2: Stating key findings (by tables/figures)	6	40%	1	6.67%
Move 3: Commenting on findings (tables/figures)	3	20%	3	20%
Move 4: Background information	15	100%	15	100%
Move 5: Statement of results (SORs)	15	100%	15	100%
Move 6: (Un)expected outcome	0	0	2	13.33%
Move 7: Reference to previous research (comparison)	0	0	0	0
Move 8: Explanation of unsatisfactory result	0	0	0	0
Move 9: Exemplification	12	80%	6	40%
Move 10: Deduction	11	73.33%	11	73.33%
Move 11: Hypothesis	0	0	0	0
Move 12: Reference to previous research (support)	1	6.67%	2	13.33%
Move 13: Recommendation	0	0	2	13.33%
Move 14: Justification	0	0	0	0

As presented in Table 1 above, the analysis results show that only a few moves appear in both History and Law RARDs. In the History corpus, seven moves are absent from the data (Move 1, Move 6, Move 7, Move 8, Move 11, Move 13, and Move 14), and three moves had very few employments, which means only four moves fit the data. In the law corpus, only three moves have many employments, while the others are either not employed or employed only a few times. Besides, some moves of the models seem redundant to the others. For example, Move 2 and Move 5 are alike, and Moves 7 and 12 are identical. These findings indicate that these models are not appropriate for both data sets. Thus, Indonesian History and Law RARDs have different rhetorical structures from the English tested models because only a few moves of these English models can capture the rhetorical structure of both data sets.

Therefore, the analysis employed top-down and bottom-up approaches. It aims to find functional moves and communicative events appearing in a sentence, clause, phrase, or group of sentences in both data sets. As presented in the method section, linguistic signals were employed to ensure whether a sentence, clause, phrase or group of sentences contains functional moves and communicative events in the two data sets (Loi et al., 2016). The results are presented in the following section.

Results of employing top-down and bottom-up approaches

The analysis results of top-down and bottom-up approaches show two new finding models that can represent the rhetorical structures of Indonesian RARDs in History and Law disciplines. The Indonesian History Research Article Results and Discussion (IHRARD) model and the Indonesian Law Research Article Results and Discussion (ILRARD) model.

The IHRARD model

In the History discipline, the finding model is called the IHRARD model, presented in Figure 1.

Move 1: Setting the background information (BI)
Move 2: Presenting the findings
Move 3: Describing the findings
Move 4: Commenting on the findings
Strategy 4A: Interpreting the findings
Strategy 4B: Relating the findings to previous literature (support)
Strategy 4C: Providing an example(s)
Move 5: Making a deduction

Figure 1. The IHRARD model

As presented in Figure 1, the IHRARD model has five functional moves. One move may appear in several subtitles or have repeated appearances (recycled). For example, in Move 1, *background information* appears in all 47 subtitles. In this study, this model was employed to analyse RARDs in the History discipline, and the results show that it is very applicable to History RARDs. The summary analysis results are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Results of employing the IHRARD model in analysing history RARDs

Moves	The appearance of moves and percentages N=15	
	Numbers	Percentages
Move 1: Setting the background information (BI)	15	100%
Move 2: Presenting the findings	15	100%
Move 3. Describing the findings	15	100%
Move 4: Commenting on the findings	15	100%
Strategy 4A: Interpreting the findings	14	93.33%
Strategy 4B: Relating the findings to previous literature (support)	6	40%
Strategy 4C: Providing an example(s)	12	80%
Move 5: Making a deduction	15	100%

Notes: N= Number of RARDs in the history discipline

As shown in Table 2, all moves of the IHRARD model are obligatory because they appear in all the history corpora. This finding means that this new model is the rhetorical structure of Indonesian RARDs in the History discipline. The authors employ these moves in the ways explained in the examples below.

Move 1: Setting the background information (BI)

This move is obligatory because all Indonesian RARDs in the History discipline employ it, which is mainly presented in their topic subtitle. Some examples of using this move are:

Example 01: "***Serial Patriot pertama kali tayang pada 30 Agustus 2015 dan berakhir pada 11 Oktober 2015 (terdiri atas 7 episode). Serial ini berkisah tentang misi yang dijalankan oleh 5 anggota komando pasukan khusus (Kopassus);*** *Komandan Tim Kolonel Bayu (Rizky Hanggono), Wakil Komandan Tim Letnan Kolonel Guntur (Verdy Bhawanta), Sersan Letnan Satu Jalu (Winky Wiryawan), Sersan Satu Charles (Maruli Tampubolon), dan Sersan Satu Samuel (Dallas Pratama)".* HIS07

[**The Patriot series first aired on August 30, 2015, and ended on October 11, 2015 (consisting of 7 episodes). The series presented the missions carried out by five members of the special forces command (Kopassus)**; "Team Commander Colonel Bayu (Rizky Hanggono), Deputy Team Commander Lieutenant Colonel Guntur (Verdy Bhawanta), Sergeant First Lieutenant Jalu (Winky Wiryawan), First Sergeant Charles (Maruli Tampubolon), and First Sergeant Samuel (Dallas Pratama)".]

Example 02: "***Secara geografi, Priangan Timur merupakan wilayah geografis paling timur dari sebuah wilayah yang bernama Priangan***.*[2] Munculnya Priangan seiring dengan keruntuhan Kerajaan Sunda pada 1579 (Djajadiningrat, 1913/1983:102-103) yang salah satu dampaknya adalah memunculkan pusat politik baru di Tatar Sunda, di antaranya Sumedanglarang di bawah pimpinan Prabu Geuan Ulun (Ekadjati (ed.), 1984:102; Lubis, 1998)".* HIS10

[**Geographically, East Priangan is the easternmost geographical area of a region called Priangan.**[2] The emergence of Priangan, along with the collapse of the Sunda Kingdom in 1579 (Djajadiningrat, 1913/1983: 102-103), brought up a new political centre in the Sunda Tatar, including Sumedanglarang under the leadership of Prabu Geuan Ulun (Ekadjati (ed.), 1984: 102; Lubis, 1998)]

The examples above indicate background information because they provide brief information about the topic before presenting the research findings, particularly the parts shown in bold. This move is widespread in all subtitles, and therefore it is obligatory.

Move 2: Presenting the findings

This move also appears in all RARDs in the History discipline and is therefore obligatory. In this context, research findings are presented to readers. Some examples of employing this move are:

Example 03: ***"Suasana industri perfilman pada masa penjajahan Jepang berbeda dengan masa penjajahan Belanda. Pada masa penjajahan Belanda, pembuatan film serba terbatas, produksi film sangat diperhitungkan secara komersial, yaitu bagaimana mendapatkan keuntungan*** *sebanyak-***banyaknya dengan biaya produksi yang kecil. Sementara pada masa penjajahan Jepang, pemerintah memberi kebebasan kepada sutradara untuk mengulang shooting atau pengambilan gambar demi mendapatkan hasil yang terbaik**." HIS05

[F**ilm industries during the Japanese period were different from the Dutch colonial era. During the Dutch colonial period, filmmaking was completely limited; film** production **was very commercially calculated, such as how to get as much profit as possible with a small cost. However, during the Japanese colonial era, the government gave authority to the director to repeat shooting to get the best results**.]

Example 04: *"Di bawah kepemimpinan R.A.A. Wiratanuningrat,* ***Kabupaten Sukapura mengalami kemajuan yang sangat pesat. Pembangunan di segala bidang telah berhasil dengan baik, sehingga mendapat tanggapan yang positif dari pemerintah kolonial. Oleh karena itu, bupati ini*** *mendapatkan* ***banyak penghargaan dari pemerintah kolonial, dan dicintai masyarakat Sukapura*** *yang merasakan langsung kemajuan pada berbagai bidang selama bupati tersebut memerintah".* HIS08
[Under the leadership of R.A.A. Wiratanuningrat, **Sukapura Regency developed rapidly. The development in all fields was successful, so it received a positive response from the colonial government. Therefore, the regent received many awards from the colonial government and was loved by the people of Sukapura,** who felt firsthand progress in various fields during the regency's reign.]

The bold statements above indicate how the authors present the findings of their studies. As shown in Example 03, the author compares the film industries between the Dutch and Japanese colonial eras, indicating they are answering the study's research question. Here, the author presents the findings related to the subtitles. In Example 04, the authors also answer their research questions. In this regard, the findings must be closely related to the topics of subtitles.

Move 3: Describing the findings

Describing the research findings usually appears after the authors have presented their findings. The analyses found that this move appears in all RARDs in the History discipline (100%), and therefore it is also obligatory. How the authors describe their research findings is seen in the following examples:

Example 05: *"Namun demikian,* ***Perfini dalam mencapai tujuannya tersebut sudah barang tentu tidak mudah. Dalam perkembangannya, sebagai perusahaan film pribumi yang berusaha membuat film yang bermutu, Perfini seringkali dihadapkan pada masalah keterbatasan finansial dan fasilitas dalam memproduksi film".*** HIS05
[However, **the ways Perfini (an Indonesian film company) achieved its goals are not easy. During its growth as an indigenous film company that tried to make high-quality films, it faced various problems, such as financial limitations and facilities for producing its films**.]

Example 06: ***"Dalam konteks ini, penulis sepakat dengan pandangan Sudirman Saad bahwa perlu ada pemberian*** **fishing rights** ***dalam wilayah perairan teritorial*** *karena hal ini sejalan dengan tuntutan pengusaha budidaya laut. Hak tersebut dapat diwariskan dan diperjualbelikan sebagaimana layaknya hak-hak atas tanah".* HIS12
[**In this context, the author agreed with Sudirman Saad's view that there is a need for granting fishing rights in the territory** because this is in line with the demands of marine aquaculture entrepreneurs. These rights can be inherited and traded as people have rights to land.]

All the examples above, particularly the bold sections, indicate how authors describe their findings. In Example 06, the author directly shows their position to elaborate on the findings. They demonstrate the move of *describing the findings*.

The ILRARD model

The top-down and bottom-up analysis found five moves frequently appearing in Law RARDs. These moves are used to design a new model called the Indonesian Law Research Article Results and Discussion Model, abbreviated as the ILRARD model. The model is presented in Figure 2.

Move 1: Setting the background information (BI) of the subtitle
Move 2: Presenting the research findings
Move 3: Describing the research findings
Move 4: Commenting on the research findings
Strategy 4A: Interpreting the research findings
Strategy 4B: Relating the findings to the literature
Strategy 4C: Providing example(s)
Strategy 4D: Relating the findings to a government regulation
Move 5: Ending the discussion
Strategy 5A: Deducting the findings
Strategy 5B: Making a recommendation

Figure 2. The ILRARD model

The ILRARD model has only five functional moves, which is much more applicable to Indonesian RARDs in the Law discipline than the earlier tested models. All the moves of this new model were found to be obligatory. The analysis summary that employed this new model is shown in Table 3.

Table 3. The summary findings: Employing the ILRARD model in analysing RARDs in the Law discipline

Moves and strategies in the ILRARD model	Appearances of a move in the results and discussions N=15	
	Numbers	Percentages
Move 1: Setting the background information (BI) of the subtitle	15	100%
Move 2: Presenting the research findings	15	100%
Move 3: Describing the research findings	15	100%
Move 4: Commenting on the research findings	15	100%
Strategy 4A: Interpreting the research findings	12	80%
Strategy 4B: Relating the findings with the literature (support)	9	60%
Strategy 4C: Providing example(s)	6	40%
Strategy 4D: Relating the findings with government regulation	7	46.67%
Move 5: Ending the discussion	15	100%
Strategy 5A: Deducting the findings	14	93.33%
Strategy 5B: Making a recommendation	2	13.33%

N = Number of RAs

Table 3 shows that all moves appear in all the law RARDs, so they are all obligatory. Below are more details about the move employment and the evidence found in the law RARDS. However, only Moves 4 and 5 are presented to shorten and minimise spaces because the earlier three moves have been exemplified and described in the earlier section.

Move 4: Commenting on the research findings

This communicative move appears pivotal in the data as all Law RARDs employ it (100%). The authors apply four possible strategies to comment on their

findings. However, as the journal requires this article to limit its space, only one is exemplified here.

Strategy 4B: Relating the findings to the literature

This strategy means the author may compare, contrast, support, or relate their analysis results to previous literature. As found in the analysis, it appears in nine (60%) Law RARDs, which means that this strategy is conventional. The ways the authors employ this strategy are:

Example 07: *"Perjanjian perkawinan yang juga harus diperhatikan oleh pasangan calon suami istri agar terbentuk keluarga yang bahagia yaitu perjanjian terhadap kebutuhan biologis (seks).* ***Dalam literature lain disebutkan kebutuhan rohani. Untuk memenuhi kebutuhan biologis baik suami maupun istri sangat penting. Dalam Surat Ali Imran ayat 14 Allah berfirman bahwa:"*** LW03
[Marriage agreements must also be considered by prospective husband and wife to make a happy family that is an agreement on biological needs (sex). **In other literature, it mentions spiritual needs. Meeting the biological needs of both husband and wife is vital. In Surah Ali Imran verse 14, Allah says that**:]

Example 08: ***"Satjipto Rahardjo juga menekankan*** *bahwa fungsi hukum sebagai sarana* social *engineering lebih bersifat dinamis, yaitu hukum digunakan sebagai sarana untuk melakukan perubahan-perubahan didalam masyarakat".* LW05
[**Satjipto Rahardjo also said that** the legal function as a means of social engineering is more dynamic, in which the law is used as a means to make changes in society.]

In the examples above, more specifically in the bold forms, the authors connect their research findings to the literature. However, the literature is mainly employed to support their research findings. The authors rarely contrast or compare their research findings with the literature. Thus, the literature is mainly employed to support research findings.

Move 5: Ending the discussion

There are two strategies to end the discussion: *deducting the findings* and *making a recommendation*. This communicative move occurs in all the Law RARDs (100%). Thus, it is obligatory in the data. Further details of how the discussion is finalised, as found in the data analyses, one strategy is exemplified as follows:

Strategy 5A: Deducting the findings

Deducting the findings is one of the strategies used to end the discussion. It means to summarize the research. Some examples of making a deduction are:

Example 09: ***"Dengan demikian, mengenai isi perjanjian kawin diserahkan kepada pejabat umum*** *yang mempunyai wewenang untuk memberikan penafsirannya".* LW03
[**Therefore, the contents of the marriage agreement must be authorized to the general officer** who has the authority to provide the interpretation.]

Example 10: ***"Sehingga jelas dari pembahasan ini*** *para ulama mengakui bahwa pada dasarnya poligami boleh hukumnya. Poligami yang diberbolehkan dalam Islam dengan jumlah maksimal empat. Syarat yang diperlakukan adalah adil yang hanya secar fisik semata, karena dinyatakan mustahil seorang suami dapat adil pada hal-hal yang berhubungan dengan batin".* LW04

> [**Thus, it is clear from this discussion** that the scholars recognise that polygamy is legal. Polygamy is allowed in Islam with a maximum of four. The condition to be treated is fair, which is only physical because it is stated that a husband cannot be fair on matters of the soul.]

The examples above signal how the authors make a deduction in their discussion section. This strategy usually appears in the last paragraph of each subtitle and sounds like a summary. However, it only summarizes the subtitle for the results and discussion section, not the whole RA.

In short, the above findings indicated that the rhetorical structure of Indonesian History and Law RARDs differed from the English models from Tessutto (2015) and Hopkins and Dudley-Evans (1988) because the functional moves of the present data sets are mostly different from the functional moves of the models, the top-down and bottom-up analytical approaches found two new models that could represent both data sets appropriately. One new model is called the IHRARD model, which is appropriate for the History RARDs, and the other one is called the ILRARD model, which represents the rhetorical structure of Law RARDs. These two finding models imply that the rhetorical structures of Indonesian History and Law RARDS are different from those found in English-tested models, and these differences may become problems for Indonesian authors in these two disciplines to publish their works in English journals.

Discussion

This section mainly discusses the findings of Indonesian History and Law RARDs and compares them to those found in the literature. Two new models have proven that both data sets have different rhetorical structures from the English-tested models proposed by Tessutto (2015) and Hopkins and Dudley-Evans (1988). Both new finding models have fewer functional moves than those in the English RADs presented in Hopkins and Dudley-Evans (1988) and the discussion model proposed in Swales (1990). In this regard, four functional moves of the tested model are absent from the present research data.

However, the most noticeable difference between the present research findings and the findings for English RADs is the purpose of referring to the previous literature reported by Hopkins and Dudley-Evans (1988). In the present data, authors relate findings to the literature to get ideas and provide evidence to back up their arguments rather than to compare their results with other results reported in the literature. On the other hand, comparing the research findings with the literature is essential in the English RADs (Amnuai, 2017; Arsyad, 2013b; Basturkmen, 2012; Dobakhti & Zohrabi, 2018; Hopkins & Dudley-Evans, 1988; Peacock, 2002; Swales, 1990), including in the Law discipline (Tessuto, 2015). Employing this strategy in English RADs aims to evaluate the research findings, identify their weaknesses, and compare the current findings with those in the literature. This evidence proves that referring to previous literature has different functions in the present research findings and English RADs.

Indonesian authors in the present analysis also use literature in their RADs differently from the authors of English RADs. The reason for the difference may begin with the purpose of the research. As found in the current data analysis, the Indonesian authors aim to overcome real-world problems or unexpected phenomena in the field (Adnan, 2010, 2011; Arsyad, 2000; Arsyad, Purwo, et al.,

2020; Warsidi, 2021), which they present in their introduction section. By identifying the problems or unexpected phenomena, Indonesian authors expect that their study can contribute to addressing them. Therefore, the authors tend to use the literature to support and provide evidence for their discussion, but they did not employ it to compare and evaluate their research findings. Doing this may convince their audiences that their research outcomes benefit them. As a result, the research contribution tends to be more practical than theoretical, which means that the research contributes to real-world problems, such as solving issues in the field, rather than filling the knowledge gaps in the literature.

On the other hand, the purpose of the English writing tradition is to address knowledge gaps found in the literature (Swales, 1990), including in the Law RAs (Tessuto, 2015). By addressing the knowledge gaps, English authors expect their study to contribute to knowledge development. For this purpose, therefore, they tend to compare their research findings with the literature (Amnuai, 2017; Arsyad, 2013b; Ruiying & Allison, 2003; Swales, 1990) to evaluate their research findings to determine whether their research results have contributed to the literature. Besides, the English RAs use three steps to assess their findings, but only the step "indicating the significance of the research" appears predominantly in English economics RAs (Liu & Lim, 2014). As a result, the research contribution in English RAs tends to be more theoretical rather than practical, which is different from the Indonesian writing tradition (Adnan, 2010, 2011; Warsidi, 2021; Warsidi et al., 2024). Therefore, these differences affect how the authors employ literature in the discussion section.

Furthermore, the present study's functional move of describing or explaining the findings is obligatory because all corpora employed this move. This move is also obligatory in Iranian RADs in applied linguistics and chemistry (Afshar et al., 2018) and in English and Saudi-local journals in dentistry (Alharbi, 2016). In contrast, this functional move is the least employed in the RADS written by native English and English foreign-language speakers (Peacock, 2002). Also, the two moves of "reporting the results" and "commenting on the results" are the most important functions in the English RADS, and the most important step to comment on the results is "comparing the results with the literature" (Amnuai, 2017). More importantly, most English NS use, discuss, and evaluate their research results by using previous literature (Basturkmen, 2012). These comparisons indicate that the strategies employed by the authors in the present study for referencing previous literature differ in function from the English RADs. The reason is that Indonesian authors rarely employed academic conflict for their discussion, as likely those of Malay authors (Warsidi & Maniam, 2024), because this tradition may be considered impolite in the Indonesian context (Adnan, 2010; Warsidi, 2021).

The different rhetorical structure also appears in a study that compared English and Spanish psychology RADs, as the English authors employ four obligatory moves "stating background information, stating results, referring to previous research, and providing explanations" (p.93) while the Spanish authors only have two obligatory moves "stating the results and referring to previous research" (Moyetta, 2016, p. 94). Besides, Arabic authors have different options from English writers when commenting on their research results. Arabic authors tend to comment on their findings by interpreting their research results, comparing their research results to the literature, and accounting for their results, while English

authors tend to comment on their results by explaining and interpreting them, comparing their results to the literature, and evaluating their results (Alotaibi, 2021). Different rhetorical structures also occur between disciplinary RAs within the same culture, as found between Iranian applied linguistics and chemistry RAs (Afshar et al., 2018) and between two Malaysian disciplinary RAs, applied linguistics and medical science RADs (Al-Shujairi et al., 2019). Therefore, this evidence seems to support the notion that the rhetorical structures of RAs may vary between national language cultures and between disciplines. These two factors may also be the reasons why the Indonesian RA authors in the present study wrote their RAs rhetorically in the ways they did (Adnan, 2010, 2011).

Conclusion

Shedding light on the gaps in the present study has fostered the researchers to analyse the rhetorical structures of Indonesian History and Law RARDs. The analysis revealed that Indonesian authors in these two data sets have different rhetorical structures from the English models. Two new findings models prove the rhetorical differences between the present two data sets and those found in English models. These results indicate that Indonesian authors in these two data sets may face difficulties publishing their RAs in English journals, particularly those in the Law discipline (Tessuto, 2015), as evidence. This study has found two contributions: theoretical and practical. Theoretically, it puts some more inside the literature that culture and discipline possibly influence the rhetorical structures of RAs. It means that the different language and disciplinary backgrounds of RAs may have their own rhetorical convention. Practically, this finding also contributes to English teachers considering teaching instruction for ESP and EAP classes. However, this analysis was limited to two disciplines in the Indonesian language, and thus, further research on other disciplinary RARDS is recommended. Besides, comparing Indonesian and English RARDs seems important to provide more understanding for teaching ESP and EAP, particularly comparing RADS written in Indonesian and English in the History and Law to contribute to this study in more detail.

Funding acknowledgement

We thank the University of New England for providing us with an *International Postgraduate Research Award* (IPRA) grant to conduct this study.

References

Abbasi Montazeri, E., Jalilifar, A., & Hita, J. A. (2021). Evaluative language in applied linguistics research article discussions: Exploring the functions and patterns of that-structures in argumentative texts. *Language Awareness, 32*(1), 1-24. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2021.1990938

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. (2010). *Rhetorical patterns of Indonesian research articles: A genre of Indonesian academic writing*. Saarbrücken: VDM Verlag Dr Müller.

Adnan, Z. (2011). 'Ideal-problem-solution'(IPS) model: A discourse model of research article introductions (RAIS) in education. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics, 34*(1), 75-103. https://doi.org/10.1075/aral.34.1.05adn

Afshar, H. S., Doosti, M., & Movassagh, H. (2018). A comparative study of generic structure of applied linguistics and chemistry research articles: The case of discussions. *Research in Applied Linguistics, 9*(1), 28-56. https://doi.org/10.22055/rals.2018.13404

Alharbi, S. (2016). Schematic structure of discussion of results sections in the field of dentistry: A comparison of international and local English-medium journals. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ), 7*(2), 61-76. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2814814

Alotaibi, H. S. (2021). Taking an authorial stance in English and Arabic research article discussions. *Pragmatics and Society*, *12*(3), 461-487. https://doi.org/10.1075/ps.18044.alo

Al-Shujairi, Y. B. J., Tan, H., Abdullah, A. N., Nimehchisalem, V., & Imm, L. G. (2019). Moving in the right direction in the discussion section of research articles. *Journal of Language and Communication (JLC), 6*(2), 143-158.

Amnuai, W. (2017). The textual organization of the discussion sections of accounting research articles. *Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences, 40*(2), 389-394. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.kjss.2017.10.007

Arsyad, S. (2000). *Rhetorical structure analysis of the Indonesian research articles* [Doctor of Philosopy thesis, Australian National University of Canberra, Australia].

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. https://doi.org/10.1080/17447143.2013.849711

Arsyad, S. (2013b). A genre-based analysis of the discussion section of research articles in Indonesian written by Indonesian speakers. *International Journal of Linguistics, 5*(4), 50-70. https://doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v5i4.3773

Arsyad, S. (2013c). A genre-based analysis of the introductions of research articles written by Indonesian academics. *TEFLIN Journal, 24*(2), 180-200. https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v24i2/180-200

Arsyad, S. (2014). The discourse structure and linguistic features of research article abstracts in English by Indonesian academics. *Online Submission, 10*(2), 191-223.

Arsyad, S., & Adila, D. (2018). Using local style when writing in English: The citing behaviour of Indonesian authors in English research article introductions. *Asian Englishes, 20*(2), 170-185. https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2017.1327835

Arsyad, S., & Arono, A. (2016). Potential problematic rhetorical style transfer from first language to foreign language: A case of Indonesian authors writing research article introductions in English. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses, 11*(3), 315-330. https://doi.org/10.1080/17447143.2016.1153642

Arsyad, S., Purwo, B. K., & Adnan, Z. (2020). The argument style in research article discussions to support research findings in language studies. *Studies in English Language and Education, 7*(2), 290-307. https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v7i2.16626

Arsyad, S., Zaim, M., & Susyla, D. (2018). Review and citation style in research article introductions: A comparative study between national and international English-medium journals in medical sciences. *Discourse and Interaction, 11*(1), 28-51. https://doi.org/10.5817/DI2018-1-28

Arsyad, S., Zaim, M., Ramadhan, S., & Lubis, A. A. (2020). The argument style of research article discussions by non-native authors of English published in international journals. *Journal of Applied Linguistics & Literature (JOALL), 5*(2), 193-212. https://doi.org/10.33369/joall.v5i2.11268

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. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2016.09.001

Cheng, F. W. (2021). Crafting theoretical value in management research article discussion sections. *Ibérica: Revista de la Asociación Europea de Lenguas para Fines Específicos (AELFE)*, (41), 61-82. https://doi.org/10.17398/2340-2784.41.61

Cheng, F.-W. (2020). Negotiating theoretical implication in management research article discussions. *ESP Today, 8*(1), 90-113. https://doi.org/10.18485/esptoday.2020.8.1.5

Cheng, F.-W., & Unsworth, L. (2016). Stance-taking as negotiating academic conflict in applied linguistics research article discussion sections. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 24*, 43-57. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2016.09.001

Dobakhti, L. (2013). Commenting on findings in qualitative and quantitative research articles' discussion sections in applied linguistics. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature, 2*(5), 145-154. https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.2n.5p.145

Dobakhti, L., & Zohrabi, M. (2018). Citation behaviours of applied linguists in discussion sections of research articles. *Applied Research on English Language, 7*(2), 215-236. https://doi.org/10.22108/are.2018.108465.1209

Hopkins, A., & Dudley-Evans, T. (1988). A genre-based investigation of the discussion sections in articles and dissertations. *English for Specific Purposes, 7*(2), 113-121. https://doi.org/10.1016/0889-4906(88)90029-4

Jin, B. (2021). A multi-dimensional analysis of research article discussion sections in an engineering discipline: Corpus explorations and scientists' perceptions. *SAGE Open, 11*(4), 21582440211050401. https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211050401

Joseph, R., & Lim, J. M.-H. (2018). Background information in the discussion sections of forestry journals: A case study. *GEMA Online® Journal of Language Studies, 18*(1), 198-216. https://doi.org/10.17576/gema-2018-1801-12

Khalili, A., Farrokhi, F., & Aslanabadi, M. (2016). Application of native speaker models for identifying deviations in rhetorical moves in non-native speaker manuscripts. *Research and Development in Medical Education, 5*(1), 18-26. https://doi.org/10.15171/rdme.2016.005

Kim, L. C., Evans, M. S., Lim, J. M.-H., & Akkakoson, S. (2016). A comparison between Malay and English research article discussions: A move analysis. *SAGE Open, 6*(2), 1-11. https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244016652925

Kirilenko, A. P., & Stepchenkova, S. (2016). Inter-coder agreement in one-to-many classification: Fuzzy kappa. *PloS One, 11*(3), e0149787. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0149787

Liu, M. S.-M., & Lim, J. M.-H. (2014). How do writers evaluate their own empirical research? A genre-based inquiry into economics journal papers. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 134*, 13-22. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.04.219

Loi, C. K., Lim, J. M. H., & Wharton, S. (2016). Expressing an evaluative stance in English and Malay research article conclusions: International publications versus local publications. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 21*, 1-16. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2015.08.004

Lubis, A. H. (2020). The argumentation structure of research article 'findings and discussion' sections written by non-native English speaker novice writers: A case of Indonesian undergraduate students. *Asian Englishes, 22*(2), 143-162. https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2019.1669300

Mirahayuni, N. K. (2002). Investigating generic structure of English research articles: Writing strategy differences between English and Indonesian writers. *TEFLIN Journal, 13*(1), 22-57. https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v13i1/22-57

Moyano, E. I. (2019). Knowledge construction in discussions of research articles in two disciplines in Spanish: The role of resources of appraisal. *Journal of Pragmatics, 139*, 231-246. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2018.09.011

Moyetta, D. (2016). The discussion section of English and Spanish research articles in psychology: A contrastive study. *Esp Today–Journal of English for Specific Purposes at Tertiary Level, 4*(1), 87-106.

Peacock, M. (2002). Communicative moves in the discussion section of research articles. *System, 30*(4), 479-497. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(02)00050-7

Ruiying, Y., & Allison, D. (2003). Research articles in applied linguistics: Moving from results to conclusions. *English for Specific Purposes, 22*(4), 365-385. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(02)00026-1

Sadeghi, K., & Alinasab, M. (2020). Academic conflict in applied linguistics research article discussions: The case of native and non-native writers. *English for Specific Purposes, 59*, 17-28. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2020.03.001

Samanhudi, U. (2017). Introduction of research articles in applied linguistics by Indonesian and English academics. *IRJE| Indonesian Research Journal in Education, 1*(1)58-71. https://doi.org/10.22437/irje.v1i1.4339

Samanhudi, U., & O'Boyle, A. (2022). Citation practice in research articles in Indonesia-based journals and international journals. *Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes, 9*(4), 741-751. https://doi.org/10.22190/JTESAP2104741S

Sandy, W., & Shen, H. (2019). Publish to earn incentives: How do Indonesian professors respond to the new policy? *Higher Education, 77*(2), 247-263. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-018-0271-0

Suherdi, D., Kurniawan, E., & Lubis, A. H. (2020). A genre analysis of the research article 'findings and discussion' sections written by Indonesian undergraduate EFL students. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 10*(1), 59-72. https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v10i1.24989

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

Tessuto, G. (2015). Generic structure and rhetorical moves in English-language empirical law research articles: Sites of interdisciplinary and interdiscursive cross-over. *English for Specific Purposes, 37*, 13-26. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2014.06.002

Warsidi, W. (2021). *Rhetorical patterns of indonesian research articles in law and history disciplines: A genre-based analysis* [Dissertation, University of New England, Australia].

Warsidi, W. (2024a). The rhetorical model of English sales copies posted on Instagram. *LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching, 27*(1), 305-319. https://doi.org/10.24071/joll.v24i2.6455

Warsidi, W. (2024b). The rhetorical model of Indonesian research article introductions (RAIs) in the law discipline: Problems and opportunities. *Journal of Language and Literature, 24*(2), 315-327. https://doi.org/10.24071/joll.v24i2.6455

Warsidi, W., & Adnan, Z. (2024). The rhetorical strategies to create incremental innovation in applied linguistics research articles. *JOALL (Journal of Applied Linguistics and Literature), 9*(1), 1-19. https://doi.org/10.33369/joall.v9i1.29780

Warsidi, W., & Maniam, V. (2024). Academic conflicts in research articles discussion: The case of Indonesian and Malaysian authors. *Issues in Language Studies, 13*(2), 1-16. https://doi.org/10.33736/ils.5865.2024

Warsidi, W., Adnan, Z., & Maniam, V. (2024). A contrastive genre-based study of English and Indonesian RAIs in the history discipline. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network, 17*(1), 467-488.

Warsidi, W., Damayanti, N., & Syurganda, A. (2024). The rhetorical model of IELTS speaking test band 7 or above. *Premise: Journal of English Education and Applied Linguistics, 13*(2), 429-445. https://doi.org/10.24127/pj.v13i2.9256

Warsidi, W., Irawan, A. M., Adnan, Z., & Samad, I. A. (2023). Citation studies in English vs. Indonesian research article introductions (RAIs) in the history discipline. *Studies in English Language and Education, 10*(2), 598-613. https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v10i2.28343

Yanita, H. (2016). Analisis struktur retorika dan penanda kebahasaan bagian hasil dan pembahasan artikel jurnal penelitian bisa FKIP UNIB untuk bidang pengajaran bahasa. *Diksa: Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia, 2*(2), 165-170. https://doi.org/10.33369/diksa.v2i2.3457