Argument Strategies and Linguistic Realizations of the Discussion Sections in Local, National, and International Journal Articles in English Education by Indonesian Authors: How do they differ and/or Resemble?

Safnil Arsyad
University of Bengkulu in Bengkulu, Indonesia
safnil@unib.ac.id

Vira Widiarti
University of Bengkulu in Bengkulu, Indonesia
virawidiarti.95@gmail.com

Mega Fitri Wulandari
University of Bengkulu in Bengkulu, Indonesia
wulandarimegafirti@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The quality of argument in the discussion section determines the quality of a journal article because in this section authors must argue convincingly so that readers may accept and use their new knowledge claim. This study aims to determine the differences in argument strategies and linguistic realizations in the discussion sections of unaccredited local, accredited national, and reputable international journals in English by Indonesian writers in the field of Language Teaching. The research method used was descriptive qualitative and quantitative research methods (mixed-method) in analyzing differences in argument styles and linguistic features of the discussion sections of the journal articles. Sixty articles were analyzed using the genre-based text analysis method following Swales (1990) and Dudley Evan (1994). The results show that the argument strategies of articles in local, national, and international journals have important differences. The

main differences are the discussion sections in the international journals are much longer in word count and use much more references than the local and national journals do. Also, unlike international journal articles, the majority of local journals use an incomplete argument strategy while national journal articles use a semicomplete argument strategy. Yet another difference is that international journal authors tend to use non-integral citations more frequently while local and national journal authors prefer using integral citation types. The similarity among the three journal articles is that the majority of the authors tend to use present tense and past tense in their discussion section rather than present perfect tense and future tense.

INTRODUCTION

The Directorate-General for Higher Education of the Ministry of Education and Culture invites Indonesian scholars, graduate students, and lecturers to publish invalidated national journals and well-known foreign journals. in all fields of discipline. However, the data shows that Indonesian academic publications especially in international journals are mostly carried out by researchers in the fields of science, technology, health, and medicine (Kemristekdikti, 2016). This means that most articles from Indonesian academics in the field of Social Sciences and Humanities are also found deficient in terms of content requirements for international journal publications. The same condition is encountered by postgraduate students in Indonesia, particularly in the fields of social sciences and humanities; the majority of them are unable to produce quality scientific articles from their thesis and dissertation to be published in nationally accredited and international reputable journals, so they are forced to only publish their articles in local journals or journals organized by their study program or institution. Likewise, there are very few doctoral students who can publish in reputable international journals. This situation indicates the weakness of postgraduate students' ability to carry out research and write journal articles that are worthy of being published in Nationally accredited journals or authoritative international journals.

The journal paper is one of the analytical works published based on the findings of the study and the results of thoughts or literature review (Gufron, 2014). The choice of words or diction is the result of efforts to select certain words to be used in making sentences, paragraphs, or discourse. According to Oktavianti et al (2020), using a variety of vocabulary will make a piece of writing more entertaining to read and less repetitive. Thus, the choice of diction in writing articles is very important to express the intent of the researcher. Diction errors are often referred to as language errors (Mulyadi, 2017). Language errors in the process of acquisition and learning are processes that affect language learning. Journal articles have a structure of an abstract, introduction, methodology, Results and debates, and assumptions. The Results and Discussion section is one of the most critical sections because, in this section, the author must persuade readers that the conclusions of the study have added to the advancement of expertise in the literature. In addition, researchers need to summarise, discuss and interpret the findings of their studies and comment on any point raised in the research question or hypothesis (Thyer, 2008). For this purpose, the researcher must write the discussion section in an argumentative style that requires supporting references.

In the discussion, section authors must answer the research questions and show what the findings are, what they mean, what is the interpretation of the findings viewed from the established theory of knowledge in the field. The argument style in the discussion section, according to Swales (2004) can have Up to eight movements or a series of sentences with a simple communicative intent for readers. The eight Moves will support the strength of the arguments crafted by the author so that readers are willing to accept their research findings. Therefore, the quality of the discussion section greatly determines the quality of the article itself and whether or not the article can be accepted for publication by the journal. For this purpose, the writer must write this section carefully following the appropriate style and linguistic characteristics as Up to eight movements or a series of sentences with a simple communicative intent.

The Rationale for this Study

Research on The rhetorical structure and linguistic features of the topic section of the journal papers written by Indonesian writers is discussed by several researchers such as Arsyad and Arono (2014),

Mirahayuni (2014), Yanita (2016), and Muhtadin (2017). These studies focus on descriptions of rhetorical patterns and linguistic features of articles without comparing articles of different quality journals (local, national and international), whereas comparative research is needed as a comprehensive justification for rhetorical patterns and linguistic features (Connor et al., 2008). To the author's knowledge, there has been no comparative research on the style of argument and linguistic characteristics of the discussion section of articles published in journals with different levels of qualities. Also, previous studies focused only On the use of rhetorical gestures in the debate pages, and none of the studies examined what writers mention about their study results to reassure readers that their findings are significant and interesting. This is the main motivation for conducting this research; that is to see the differences and similarities in argument strategies and linguistic features of English-language journal articles in the field of English education or Applied Linguistics among articles published in the state, national, and foreign journals written by Indonesian writers. Therefore, this study was undertaken to address the following questions.

1. How is the argument strategy in the discussion section of three groups of journal articles in the field of English Education written by Indonesian authors?
2. How is the citation pattern in the discussion section of three groups of journal articles in the field of English Education written by Indonesian authors? and
3. How is the use of tenses in the discussion section of the three groups of journal articles in the field of English Education written by Indonesian authors? and

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Swales (1990) indicates that there are eight movements in the topic section of an article namely, context information, declaration of findings, (un)expected outcome, relation to previous studies, clarification, exemplification, deduction, and conclusion, and suggestion. Swales suggests that Move-1 contains research background; Move-2 contains research results; Move-3 contains research findings that match/do not match assumptions; Move-4 contains references to the literature; Move-5 contains descriptions of research findings; Move-6 contains illustrations of research findings; Move-7 contains conclusions,

and Move-8 contains recommendations. However, the quality of the discussion section is determined not only by the presence of the eight moves but also by the quality of the argument in the Moves. Also, Dudley-Evans (1994) proposes nine Moves in the article's discussion section; these are knowledge Transfer, declaration of findings, finding, (un)expected outcome, relation to previous study, clarification, argument, constraint, and suggestion. However, as Dudley Evans maintains, of the nine moves, only two moves are most important, namely statements about research Results or observations (Move-2) that are then related to previous applicable study results and linked to previous relevant research findings (Move-4).

While somewhat different, the two versions of the Move structure proposed by Swales (1990) and Dudley-Evans (1994) are identical in terms of essential Move sequences, namely the declaration of research findings (Move-2) which is then related to references or previous specific research findings (Move 4). These two moves are relevant since they are part of the conversation are a place for authors to use the relevant information available on a research topic to explain and convince readers how their research findings contribute to the available information or knowledge about a particular research topic (Branson, 2004). Thus, in this Results and Discussion section, the author seeks to convince readers that their research result has a meaningful and important contribution to other researchers or academics Involved in the same field of study.

In her analysis on the discussion section of the Indonesian student thesis written by Indonesian writers, Wardhana (2016) found that while there are eight moves in the discussion section of the research paper, about 67% of the writers in her study wrote their discussion section using just 3 moves. This is in line with that of Swales (1990) who proposed that the discussion section of research journal articles can have up to eight moves (Moves) or text segments that have clear communicative goals for readers. However, as Swales went on, out of the eight moves, only 3 moves are most often found in research articles in English. Similarly, Arsyad and Wardhana (2014) also say that the most dominant moves used in the discussion section of the Indonesian study papers are Move-1, Move-2, and Move-5.

Irawati (2017) and Irawati et al. (2018) looked at the rhetorical pattern of debate in the English and Indonesian research papers written

by Indonesian writers. in Language and English education. Irawati found that the rhetorical pattern of the discussion section written in English has 5 Moves and the discussion section in Indonesian has 6 Moves. So, between the two rhetorical patterns, there is one difference, namely Moves 6 (Exemplification). However, Irawati did not discuss what the difference means and why it happens.

Another important linguistic feature in an academic text is the use of verb tense and aspect (Chen, 2009). According to Swales and Feak (2009), tense is the chosen verb form based on the timing of an event or action, and aspect is the preference of sentence forms to signify whether or not an operation or event has been completed. Three possible verb tenses can be commonly used in an academic text namely: Past tense (referring to a particular study), present perfect tense (referring to the field of investigation), and present tense (a reference to generally accepted knowledge of the field). However, as Feak and Swales say, the tense option often depends on the use of verbs, particularly when it comes to the work of others; The verbs 'argue, propose, say, or retain' appear to be used for present tense; the verbs 'find, locate, show' tend to imply past tense.

When citing other people's works, two types of citations: integral and nonintegral types can be used(Feak& Swales,2012). Hyland (1999) It was observed that the use of non-integral citation was much more common than the use of integral citation in biology, physics, electronic engineering, and philosophy journal articles, except in philosophy in which the integral form of citation was more commonly used. Similarly, Yeh (2010) observed that the usage of non-integral citation was more prevalent than the use of non-integral citation than Integral quotation in the area of teaching English as a second language. According to Cronin, quoted in Swales & Feak (2012), this is possible because 'material counts more than interactions' (p. 340). Another explanation, according to Swales and Feak, is that the key aim of referencing the work of others is to show all information taken from references related to the current work to support the claims made by the authors.

In their study on Applied Chemistry articles, Nunn et al. (2012) also found that both quotes were made are in the form of non-integral citations. Nun et al., suggest that by using a nonintegral type of citation authors can show their neutral position towards the idea found in the cited works and if they want to show their distant position toward the

information, they use integral citations. In a study on multidiscipline research articles (Chemistry, Engineering and Technology, Tropical Biology and ICT Analysis and Implementation, Arsyad and Adila (2018) observed that the use of non-integral citations is far more dominant than the use of integral citations in all four different journals. According to Arsyad and Adila, this is because the scholars tend to keep their attention on the work that has been done in the field rather than on the authors.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study was carried out in conjunction with the Creswell (2009) model. The research methodology used to investigate the rhetorical structure and linguistic features of the discussion section was a checklist comprising the techniques, forms, and tenses of arguments that can be found in the discussion section (see Appendix). The rhetorical style, according to Swales (1990 & 2004), in a text is characterized by the use of keywords or interpreted from the understanding of the text.

Data for this research were taken from articles published in purposefully chosen research journals in English published in an unaccredited local journal (Edu-Ling), an accredited national journal (Joall), and a reputable international journal Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics (Ijal). Journal articles included in the corpus of This research was taken from the publication of the last five years to ensure the latest characteristics of the papers written in the three journals. Twenty papers have been taken randomly from each of the three journals with a total of 60 articles. The characteristics of the articles in the three different journals are presented in the following table.

Table 1: The Distribution of Articles Included in this Study

No.	Journal	Category	Number of articles	The average length of discussion in words	The average number of references cited in the discussion
1.	Edu-Ling	Local journal	20	1736	5

| 2. | Joall | National journal | 20 | 1145 | 3 |
| 3. | Ijal | International journal | 20 | 3109 | 18 |

Table 1 shows that Ijal articles have the longest discussion section in terms of the number of words and Joall articles have the shortest one. Ijal authors also cited the most references in their discussion and Joalland Edu-Ling authors cited much fewer references. This may indicate that the discussion in Ijal articles is much better than those in Joall and Edu-Ling articles; this is because, in the discussion section, authors must convince readers how their research findings contribute to the available information or knowledge in the literature and this needs sufficient rhetorical works. Also, the most effective way to be convincing in academic writing is by using relevant references to support the author's claims (Parkinson, 2011). Similarly, authors must argue convincingly Because of the significance of their research conclusions, so that readers can consider and include them in their research (Dobakhti, 2013). Loan and Pramoolsook (2015) suggest that journal readers will not accept the findings of a piece of research if the authors' argument is weak and not convincing.

Data analysis was carried out using a genre-based text analysis approach; a genre-based analysis technique focused on analyzing the communicative objectives of the text or parts of the text. In this text analysis, we looked at which Communicative units or gestures occur in the topic of the paper. Following Safnil (2001), the communicative unit or movement in the discussion is described as a clause or a set of clauses that show a strong indication of having a particular communicative intent that can be established and characterized by linguistic characteristics or can be inferred from the information contained in the document. Communicative units or Moves together in a given text construct a communicative target important to the rhetoric of the text. The data review protocols followed the following steps: 1) reading the results and discussion parts to define the latest moves following the Swales 8 Moves model (1990 & 2004); 2) reading each existing Move to see the Steps that may exist in each Move following the Swales model; 3) Reading the discussion section of each article on the description of linguistic characteristics, such as integral and non-integral quotation

patterns, tense in the citation; 4) observing the data that has been collected about the style of argument and linguistic features of the three groups of articles to see the differences and similarities between the three groups of articles.

The first analysis was on the argument strategy found in the discussion sections of the articles. For this study the possible strategies were classified into 5 following Arsyad (2020): Strategy 1 (interpreting the research Findings/results), Strategy 2 (explaining/developing study findings/results), Strategy 3 (suggesting potential explanations of research findings/results), Strategy 4 (giving an example of research findings/results) and Strategy 5 (relating research findings/results to those in previous related studies). The second analysis was on the citation styles (integral or nonintegral) found in the discussion of the articles following Swales (1990). The final analysis was on the use of tenses (present tense, past tense, present perfect tense, and future tense) of sentences or clauses in the discussion section.

The final stage of the data analysis procedure was validating the analysis results of the argument strategy and linguistic features of the articles included in the corpus of this study. The results of the researcher and validator analysis were compared and the difference was calculated using Cohen's Kappa coefficient analysis following Brown (1996). Then, following Kanoksilapathan (2005), if Cohen's Kappa score is less than 0.40 then it was deemed to be bad or 'weak,' between 0.40–0.59 appropriate or 'average,' between 0.60–0.74 decent or 'good,' and 0.75 or better or 'excellent.' The independent assessor interested in this research was a professor with a graduate degree in English Education Postgraduate Program of Education Faculty of Bengkulu University. Next, the Independent Rater was added and educated on how to recognize potential claim tactics, patterns, and styles of quotes in the papers' discussion pages. Two weeks were then given to the process of defining and coding reasoning techniques, tenses, and forms of citations in 12 (20 percent) of randomly selected discussions in the corpus of this report. The inter-rater correlation relationship was then measured and the results indicate an agreement of 87% or an outstanding inter-rater agreement (Orwin, 1994). There was just a disparity in the recognition and coding of the claim methods in the study papers although almost there was little variation in the description and coding of the tenses and

citation forms. After a few meetings between the researcher and the independent assessor, a full consensus was eventually reached.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

FINDINGS

From the research results, it is known that Indonesian writers in the field of English Education generally use different argument strategies between local, national, and international journals. The complete data on argument strategies in the three groups of articles can be seen in the table below.

Table 2: Argument Strategies in the Discussion of Three Groups of Articles

Argument Strategies	Local Journal (Edu-Ling)	National Journal (Joall)	International Journal (Ijal)
Strategy 1: interpreting the research findings/results	18 (90%)	20 (100%)	20 (100%)
Strategy 2: explaining/ elaborating research findings/results	2 (10%)	2 (10%)	20 (100%)
Strategy 3: suggesting the possible causes of the research findings/results	2 (10%)	16 (80%)	20 (100%)
Strategy 4: giving an illustration on the research findings/results	2 (10%)	0 (0%)	12 (60%)
Strategy 5: relating the research to the findings/results with those in	6 (30%)	14 (70%)	20 (100%)

previous relevant studies

As can be seen in Table 2, Strategy 1 (interpreting the research finding is used by almost all Indonesian authors from the three groups of articles. Below is an example of Strategy 1 taken from the data for this study.

Extract 1: Strategy 1
Based on both views, it can be concluded that a gender-based approach can improve student writing skills, engage students in language awareness and background knowledge. (Edu-Ling-3)

Table 2 also shows that Strategy 2 (explaining/elaborating research findings/results) And Strategy 4 (giving an example of study findings/results) is used only by the majority of Ijal writers and not by Joall and Edu-ling authors. Examples of Strategies 2 and 4 taken from the data in this study are given below.

Extract 2: Strategy 2
Technical perspectives involve the students' learning activities and learning strategies which make them autonomous learners. Regarding the technical perspectives, the finding confirmed that the students did not indicate that they were autonomous learners technically. It means from all the learning activities and strategies which categorized them as autonomous learners, most of the students just did those activities sometimes. It was found that not more than 10% of the respondents indicated doing those activities frequently to improve their English learning. (Ijal-2)

Extract 3: Strategy 4
However, when it comes to the learning activities which are integrated to the technology such as listening to English songs, watching English movies, and watching English TV programs and YouTube channel, there were more than 50% of the students who often did those learning strategies. It indicates that the students tended to have the learning strategies which allowed them to observe the authentic materials and it was also integrated with the

technology. It is in line with Lamb's (2013) research result that In Indonesia, which the teaching and learning process depends on the textbooks, assessments and the professionalism of their class teacher, globalization and its technologies are having the effect of increasing the desire for English among young people and providing the innovative means of accessing it. (Ijal-2)

It can also be seen in Table 2 that Strategy 3 (suggesting the possible causes of the research findings/results) and Strategy 5 (relating the research to the findings/results with those in previous relevant studies) are used by the majority of Joall and Ijal authors but not by Edu-Ling authors. Below are given examples of Strategy 3 and Strategy 5 taken from the data of this study.

Extract 4: Strategy 3
Based on the result of this study, the use of listening logs through WA succeeds to improve significantly students' listening comprehension. This is since it lets the students effectively get more information from listening materials since it could be practiced outside the classroom. (Joall-1)

Extract 5: Strategy 5
This result was similar to the research finding of Wang (2013) who investigated the genre-based approach in writing and the results of the study indicated that learners did writing better when they were made aware of the structure and providing models seem to increase the salience of the communicative moves considered by the learners for inclusion in their texts. The results are also similar to the research finding of Belmekki&Sekkal (2018) who found that there was an effect of the process-genre approach on the language choice of ESP students' writing achievement. (Joall-9)

DISCUSSIONS

In general, almost all Ijal authors use the five strategies while very few Edu-Ling authors use Strategies 2, 3, 4, and 5. It implies that all strategies are obligatory for Ijal authors while only one strategy (Strategy 1) is obligatory for Edu-Ling authors while Strategy 3 and 5 are considered conventional for Joall authors. This is probably because, unlike international journal authors, local and national journal authors in Indonesia in the data of this study are not aware of the importance of the five argument Strategies in the topic section of the article in the journal. According to Hagin(2009) and Hess(2004), the authors are expected to interpret and expand on their observations in their discussions and this section must be convincingly argumentative and one way to achieve this is via using references to support the author's claim on their findings (Arsyad, 2020). Similarly, Dudley-Evans (1994 and Swales, 1990) suggest that authors should Address and endorse their current knowledge statements through description, analysis, illustration, and inference, which also include quotes from other authors.

The second analysis is on the citation style (integral and non-integral) used in the discussion section of the three groups of articles (local, national, and international journals). The analysis results are given in the following table.

Table 3.
The Citation Style in the Three Groups of Articles

Journal	Integral Citation	Non-integral Citation	Total
Local Journal (Edu-Ling)	42 (88%)	6 (12%)	48 (100%)
National Journal (Joall)	24 (96%)	1 (4%)	25 (100%)
International Journal (Ijal)	70 (38%)	113 (62%)	183 (100%)

Table 3 shows that Ijal authors use citations far more frequently than Edu-Ling and Joall authors in the discussion section of their journal article and the majority of their citations use an integral format. Below is given an example of an integral citation taken from the data of this study.

> **Extract 6:** Integral Citation
> Similar to Aykac, Jain (2015) also describes mind mapping is as a diagram visualizing the information using various colors, pictures, or words. (Edu-Ling-10)

Table 3 also shows that the majority of citations in Edu-Ling and Joall articles use a nonintegral format. Below is given an example of a nonintegral citation.

> **Extract 7**: Nonintegral Citation
> This perhaps indicates that the students, irrespective of linguistic proficiency, are not interested in getting too familiar with the readers by using personal asides which may cause serious consequences to them (Shahriari&Shadloo, 2019). (Ijal-1)

The data of this study show that international journal authors (Ijal authors) are much more superior compared to national and local journal (Joall and Edu-Ling) authors in terms of the number and types of citations used in their discussion. This may imply that for international journal authors citations have effective power in an argument. According to Arsyad et al. (2018), Writers ought to reassure readers that their paper is an essential piece of scholarly work that can be read and that can be achieved successfully by quoting the related literature.

It is also interesting to notice in Table 3 that Ijalauthors use non-integral citation more frequently than integral citation (113 or 62% versus 70 or 38%) while authors of Joall and Edu-Ling dominantly use integral citation style. The integral type of quote is used when the authors believe that the author is more important than the information contained in the reference, while the non-integral quotation is used when the authors consider that the information contained in the reference is more important than the authors of the reference (Hyland 1999, Swales &Feak 2012). The dominant use of nonintegral citation in Ijal articles is in line with the finding of Hyland (1999) and Yeh (2010) who also found that international authors prefer using nonintegral citation type than the integral one Since the key purpose of quoting a citation is to present to readers the conclusions of other scholars that have already been written, rather than to show respect to the authors. In

other words, Ijal authors have already reflected the common practice of the tendency to use nonintegral citation format in their journal articles.

The final analysis in this study is on the use of tenses (present tense, past tense, present perfect tense, and future tense) in the discussion section of the three groups of journal articles and the results are displayed in the following table.

Table 4.

The Use of Tenses in the Discussion Section of the Journal Articles

No	Journals	Tenses				Total
		Present Tense	Past Tense	Present Perfect Tense	Future Tense	
1	Local journal	302 (61.38%)	177 (35.97%)	8 (1.62%)	5 (1.02%)	492 (100%)
2	National journal	77 (27.5%)	194(62.28%)	6 (2.14%)	3 (1.07%)	280 (100%)
3	International journal	595 (57.21%)	417 (40.09%)	15 (1.44%)	13 (1.24%)	1040 100%)

Table 4 shows that the majority of authors in the three groups of articles use present tense and past tense in their discussions while only a small number of them use present perfect tense and future tense. Below are examples of the four tenses taken from the data of this study.

Extract 8: Present Tense

The teachers **give** an example of a text to students and the text will discuss together components of a text. This activity can **help** students to know the social purpose, the target audience, text structure, and language features. (Edu-ling 03).

Extract 9: Past Tense

They **reported** high scores on the external regulation which belongs to a more controlled type of motivation in addition to the autonomous types of motivation. (Ijal-05).

Extract 10: Present Perfect Tense

In addition, mentors' explanation on good ways of communicating **has helped** student-teachers to develop reinforcement skills, such as the ability to praise students' work during the internship program. Reinforcement skills are indeed important in the instructional process. (Ijal-08).

Extract 11: Future Tense

Moreover, having activities in their groups **will** allow learners to have cooperation and interaction between the students. (Ijal-02).

Wang and Tu (2014) claim that there are different tendencies of tense usage in the different sections of an academic article due to their specific functions. For example, according to Swales and Feak (2012), the Present tense is frequently found in the presentation and topic areas, while the past tense is usually used in the process section. However, according to Feak and Swales (2009), the distinction between these times is not too obvious; writers can move from one type to another for a specific reason. The transition from past tense to present perfect tense, and then present tense, or imply that the research results they quote are closer to the authors' research in different ways, such as closer to the author's view, closer to the subject or research findings of the author, or closer to the hypothesis or information that has been widely agreed. The findings of this study seem to reflect this view where the authors prefer using present tense and past tense in their discussion section where they state, elaborate, and illustrate their findings and cite references to convince readers that their findings are important.

CONCLUSION

From the results and discussion, it can be concluded that in general, the discussion section of Ijal articles is far superior to Edu-Ling and Joall articles in terms of the number of words, references, the use of argument strategies, and the type of citation. It shows that Ijal article authors have complied with the academic writing conventions for the discussion section of international journal articles. On the other hand, Edu-Ling and Joall articles may have represented the writing style

convention used in the Indonesian academic writing context especially in writing the discussion section of a journal article.

REFERENCES

Arsyad, S. & D.C.E.Wardhana (2014). Introduction in Indonesian Social Science and Humanities Research Article: How Indonesian Justify Their Research Project, *Linguistik Indonesia*, 32 (2),149-163.http://ojs.linguistik-indonesia.org/ index.php/linguistik_indonesia/ article/view/23/22

Arsyad and Arono (2014) Memahami dan Menulis Abstrak Artikel Jurnal: Pedoman Praktis Bagi Mahasiswa dan Dosen, Jakarta: Halaman Moeka

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

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

Branson, R. D. (2004). Anatomy of a Research Paper, *Respiratory Care*, 49 (10):1222- 1228. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/15447807/

Brown, J. D. (1996). Testing in language programs. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall Regents.

Chen, M. (2009). Tense of reporting in dissertation literature reviews, *Journal of Cambridge Studies*, 4, 139–150. https://www.repository.cam.ac.uk/handle/1810/255691

Creswell, John W. (2009) Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed? Method Approaches, Los Angeles: Sage.

Connor, U., E.Nagelhoutand W.V. Rozicky (2008) Contrastive Rhetoric: Reaching to Intercultural Rhetoric, Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing CO.

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.URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.2n.5p.145

Dudley-Evans, T. (1995) Common-core and Specific Approaches to the Teaching of Academic Writing, in D. Belcher & G. Braine (eds.) (1995). Academic Writing in Second Language: Essays on Research on Pedagogy, Washington: Praeger.

Feak, C. B., & Swales, J. M. (2009). Telling a research story: Writing a literature review. Michigan: The University of Michigan Press.

Gufron, S. (2014) ArtikelIlmiah: Anatomi, Bahasa, danKesalahannya. *EDU-KATA*. 1(1):c110.

Hyland, K. (1999). Academic attribution: Citation and the construction of disciplinary knowledge. *Applied Linguistics*, 20, 341–367.https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/20.3.341

Irawati (2017). Pola Retorika pada Sub bagian Pembahasan dari Artikel Penelitian Berbahasa Inggris dan Berbahasa Indonesia yang Ditulis olehPenulis Indonesia,' dalam Prosiding Seminar Hasil Penelitian di Lembaga Penelitian dan Pengabdian pada Masyarakat UniversitaPGRI Madiun dengan alamat web: http://prosiding.unipma.ac.id/index.php/SNHP/article/view/67/67.

Irawati, L., Saukah, A., &Suharmanto. (2018). Indonesian writers writing their discussion section both in English and Indonesian research articles, *CakrawalaPendidikan*, 27(3), 447-456.

Kanoksilapatham, Butsaba (2005). Rhetorical Structure of Biochemistry Research Articles, *English for Specific Purposes,*24(3), 269-292. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2004.08.003

Kemristekdikti. (2016). *Kekuatan 50 institusiilmiah Indonesia: Profilpublikasi ilmiah terindeks Scopus (The strengths of 50 Indonesian scientific institutions: Scopus indexed scientific publication profiles)*. Jakarta: Direktorat Pengelolaan Kekayaan Intelektual, Direktorat Jenderal Penguatan Riset dan Pengembangan Kemenristek dikti Indonesia.

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. DOI: 10.17576/3L-2015-2102-01

Mirahyuni, N.K. (2014).StrukturBagianPembahasan (Discussion Section) pada Artikel Penelitian Berbahasa Inggris, *Parafrase*, Vol. 14, No. 02.

Muhtadin. (2014) Analisis struktur retorika dan fitur linguistic bagian pendahuluan artikel jurnal penelitian berbahasa Indonesia dalam bidang ilmu hukum, Tesis Universitas Bengkulu.

Mulyadi, Y. (2017) EBI + (EjaanBahasa Indonesia Plus). Bandung: YramaWidya.

Nunn, R., Y. Guefrachi, & E. Mansour. (2012). In search of the voice and identify: An analysis of a competent applied chemistry paper (Part 1). In J. Adamson & R. Nunn (Eds.), Editorial and authorial voices in EFL academic journal publishing (pp. 44-57). Asian EFL Journal Press.

Oktavianti, D., Gusmuliana, P., & Apriani, E. (2021). The Students' Strategies in Developing Their Ideas in Writing Essay. Jadila: Journal of Development and Innovation in Language and Literature Education, 1(4), 389-406.

Orwin, R. G. (1994). Evaluating coding decisions. In H. Cooper & L. Hedges (Eds.), The handbook of research synthesis (pp. 139–162). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

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

Safnil (2001). Rhetorical Structure Analyses of the Indonesian Research Articles, unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, the Australian National University, Canberra, Australia.

Swales, J.M. (1990). Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research SettingsCambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Swales, J.M. (2004). Research Genres: Exploration and Applications, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Swales, J.M., &Feak, C. B. (2012). Academic writing for graduate students (3rd. Ed.) Michigan: The University of Michigan Press.

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

Yanita, H. (2016). Analisis Struktur Retorika dan Penanda Kebahasaan Bagian Hasil dan Pembahasan Artikel Jurnal Penelitian Bisa FKIP UNIB untuk Bidang Pengajara nBahasa, *JurnalPendidikanBahasadanSastra Indonesia*, 2(2), 165-170. http://repository.unib.ac.id/id/eprint/17376

Yeh, C.C. (2010). Citation practices in TESL research articles: A comparative study, *Asian ESP Journal*, 6, 40–62.

Wardhana, D.E.C. (2016).Kontruksi Retorika yang Terefleksi dalam Proses Kreatif Penulisan BAB Temuan Penelitian dan

Pembahasan AJP Berbahasa Indonesia di Jurnal Terakreditasi Bidang Penelitian Bahasa, *KOLITA* 14,162.

Wang, S. and Tu, P. (2014) Tenses Use and Move Analysis in Journal Article Abstracts, *Taiwan Journal of TESO*L, 11(1), 3-29. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1078991.pdf