LLT Journal, e-ISSN 2579-9533, p-ISSN 1410-7201, Vol. 29, No. 2, October 2026, pp. 544-560

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

GENRE STUDIES ON INDONESIAN RESEARCH ARTICLES (2000-2025): A STRUCTURED REVIEW

Warsidi Warsidi[1*], Zifirdaus Adnan[2], and Safnil Arsyad[3]
[1]Universitas Islam Makassar, Indonesia
[2]University of New England, Australia
[3]Bengkulu University, Indonesia
warsidi.dty@uim-makassar.ac.id[1], zadnan@une.edu.au[2], and safnil@unib.ac.id[3]
*correspondence: warsidi.dty@uim-makassar.ac.id
https://doi.org/10.24071/llt.v29i2.466
received 29 January 2026; accepted 26 July 2026

Abstract
This study presents a structured qualitative review of genre studies on Indonesian research articles (RAs) published between 2000 and 2025. Although numerous studies have examined the rhetorical structures in Indonesian RAs, no study has synthesized their collective findings to provide a comprehensive overview of developments in the field. The review analysed 28 studies identified through a systematic search and selection process. The data were analysed using qualitative synthesis procedures, including data reduction, categorization, and interpretive analysis. The findings indicate that Indonesian RAs consistently exhibit rhetorical patterns that differ from those expected in English-language international journals, particularly in the introduction and discussion sections. In contrast, the abstract and method sections show partial alignment, although often with limited elaboration. These findings suggest that Indonesian authors may benefit from greater awareness of international rhetorical conventions, particularly when seeking publication in international journals. At the same time, the results highlight the situated nature of rhetorical practices, reflecting local academic traditions and communicative purposes.

Keywords: genre analysis, Indonesian academic writing, Indonesian research articles (RAs), rhetorical structures, structured reviews

Introduction
Genre studies of research articles (RAs) have attracted increasing scholarly attention across linguistic and disciplinary contexts. Studies have examined rhetorical structures in various languages and disciplines, demonstrating that academic writing conventions are not universal but shaped by disciplinary, linguistic, and cultural factors. As a result, studies in this area have been carried out on RAs written in a range of languages and linguistic contexts, for examples, Iranian RAs (Barghamadi & Siyyari, 2021; Mozaheb, 2015; Sabet & Kazempouri, 2015), Arabic RAs (Alzarieni et al., 2019), English RAs (Lim, 2012; Warsidi, 2023; Warsidi & Adnan, 2024; Warsidi et al., 2025b), and Indonesian RAs (Arsyad et al., 2020b; Warsidi, 2024; Warsidi et al., 2025a). Moreover, studies in this area have

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

also been conducted on various disciplinary RAs, for example, linguistics and applied linguistics (Abbasi et al., 2023; Afshar et al., 2018; Alkamillah et al., 2022; El-Dakhs, 2018), history and law (Warsidi et al., 2024; 2025a), engineering (Lin, 2014; Lin & Morrison, 2021), and other disciplines, suggesting that the genre approach plays a crucial role in contributing to linguistic research.

In the Indonesian context, genre studies on RAs have been conducted since the early 2000s, examining sections such as abstracts, introductions, methods, and discussions. These studies consistently suggest that Indonesian authors employ rhetorical strategies that differ from those commonly found in English-language international journals, particularly in areas such as gap establishment, citation practices, and argument development. However, although genre studies of RAs (Arsyad, 2000) on several sections, such as the abstract, introduction, method, and discussion, many Indonesian academics lack confidence in their writing skills and tend to avoid spending sufficient time preparing high-quality manuscripts (Arsyad et al., 2019). An issue for those authors seems to be that they have rhetorical differences from those found in English RAs. For example, earlier studies (Arianto et al., 2021; Arsyad et al., 2020b; Khairani et al., 2023) suggested that in the abstract section of Indonesian RAs is comparable to those in English counterparts. A specific example is that Indonesian research article abstracts contain fewer knowledge gap statements than English RA abstracts. However, Kurniawan and Sabila (2021) reported no significant differences between Indonesian and English research article abstracts.

In the introduction section, the majority of genre studies in the Indonesian context have shown that Indonesian authors employ different rhetorical structures that differ from those found in the English research articles (RAs). For example, some studies have identified several Indonesian models, such as the Problem Justifying Project (PJP) model (Arsyad, 2000), the Isocpol model (Adnan, 2010), the Ideal problem solution (IPS) model (Adnan, 2011), and the models in Indonesian History and Law Research Article Introductions (RAIs) (Warsidi, 2021), suggesting that Indonesian authors have different rhetorical structures from the well-known English model, the Create a Research Space (CARS). Moreover, other studies confirmed that their rhetorical patterns also differ from those of English RAIs (Warsidi, 2021; 2024; 2025; Warsidi et al., 2024; Warsidi et al., 2023). These research findings suggest that Indonesian RAIs follow different rhetorical conventions from those of English RAIs published in reputable international journals. Such differences may also pose challenges for Indonesian authors seeking to prepare manuscript for publication in international journal, especially in reputable English journals.

In the method section, the studies that explore this important section are still limited. The findings so far revealed that the rhetorical structures of Indonesian research article methods (RAMs) showed only a few differences from those of English RAMs, particularly in employing steps (Arsyad, 2013a). Another study discovered that Indonesian RAMs lacked details (Warsidi, 2021). These two different findings imply that although Indonesian authors used similar rhetorical structures to those in English, they described this fundamental section with insufficient details.

In the discussion section, several studies also found that Indonesian authors identified challenges faced Indonesian authors when writing in English for

publishing in reputable journals. These challenges include limited access to relevant sources; hence, they rarely compare their findings to the literature (Warsidi et al., 2025a; Warsidi & Maniam, 2024), cite irrelevant literature (Arsyad et al., 2020a), and some other issues. In contrast, comparing current research findings is common in their English counterparts (Cheng & Unsworth, 2016; Sadeghi & Alinasab, 2020; Warsidi & Maniam, 2024). These issues may also imply that the Indonesian authors may have difficulties when intending to publish in English reputable journals because their rhetorical conventions are not in line with those required in English reputable journals.

In summary, the literature reviewed above suggest that genre studies on Indonesian RAs published in local Indonesian journals have focused on the abstract, introduction, method, and discussion sections of RAs since 2000, and the results suggest that Indonesian authors may face challenges when writing RAs for international publication, especially in reputable English journals. However, despite the growing number of studies, research in this area remains fragmented. Existing studies typically focus on specific sections of RAs or individual disciplinary contexts, and there has been no systematic attempt to synthesize their findings across time. As a result, a comprehensive understanding of how Indonesian RA rhetoric has developed over the past two-and-a-half decades remains limited.

To address this gap, this study presents a structured review of genre studies on Indonesian RAs published between 2000 and 2025. The study aims to answer the following questions:

1. What can be synthesized from genre analyses in Indonesian RAs during these two-and-a-half decades?
2. What do these genres studies imply for Indonesian authors seeking to contribute knowledge discussion internationally?

Addressing these research questions may provide a more comprehensive theoretical insight into genre studies in Indonesian RAs. Then, the results may also practically contribute to expanding authors' rhetorical repertoire and awareness of journal-specific expectations. Thus, they can meet these expectations when writing for reputable English journals and participate in the knowledge conversation globally. The findings may also inform the development of teaching materials for English for Research Publication Purposes (ERPP).

Method

Research design

This study employed a structured qualitative literature review to examine the focus, methods, and findings reported in genre studies on Indonesian RAs published over the past two-and-a-half decades. The review followed explicit procedures for literature searching, study selection, data extraction, and qualitative coding, as detailed below. It is described as structured because these procedures and the same analytical categories were applied consistently across all the included studies. This design enabled a systematic synthesis of patterns and developments in genre research on Indonesian research articles.

Data collection procedures

The dataset comprised 28 publications on genre studies of Indonesian RAs over the past two-and-a-half decades beginning from the year 2000. These data

were collected through Google Scholar, Scopus, and the Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ), using combinations of keywords such as *Indonesian research articles*, *genre studies of Indonesian research articles*, and *rhetorical structures of Indonesian research articles*. The publication types that we included were journal articles, books, dissertations, and other relevant scholarly publications. Studies were included if they focused on Indonesian research articles, analysed their rhetorical organisation or other genre features, and were available in full text. Studies that did not focus on Indonesian research articles or did not examine rhetorical or genre features were excluded. The year 2000 was selected as the starting point because we found that the earliest eligible study identified through the search was published in that year. After the search results had been screened against the inclusion and exclusion criteria, we retained 28 publications to form the study dataset, and arranged them chronologically by publication year.

Data analysis procedures

The data were analysed through four iterative stages: data reduction, data display, thematic synthesis, and interpretation, adapted from Mezmir (2020). A structured data-extraction form was used to record each publication's bibliographic information, the research-article section examined, the analytical framework employed, and the principal rhetorical findings reported. Each publication constituted a unit of analysis, while each distinct finding concerning rhetorical organisation was treated as a unit of coding. During data reduction, findings unrelated to rhetorical or genre features were excluded. The remaining findings were coded according to the research-article section examined—such as the abstract, introduction, method, results and discussion, or conclusion—and according to rhetorical features such as moves and steps, their sequencing, and their frequency or optionality. The coded findings were displayed in tables and compared across studies. Recurring similarities, differences, and developments were then grouped into themes and interpreted in relation to Indonesian academic writing. Publication year was retained as a secondary analytical variable to identify possible developments between 2000 and 2025, rather than as the principal basis for organising the findings.

Reliabilities of data analysis results

To ensure the reliabilities of data analysis, the first author conducted the initial coding, synthesized the results, and interpreted the findings. The second and third authors subsequently reviewed the coded data, analytical claims, and supporting evidence and reanalysed the relevant material where necessary. Any differences in coding or interpretation on the claims were resolved through WhatsApp, email correspondence and during zoom meetings until consensus was reached. This process helped ensure the analysis of this study reliable and valid.

Findings and Discussion

Findings

The results of the review of the studies indicate that Indonesian research articles differ rhetorically from English-language RAs across the abstract, introduction, method, results, and discussion sections. The most substantial differences were reported in the introduction and discussion sections, whereas those

identified in the abstract, method, and results sections were less pronounced. The following subsections synthesise the findings for each research-article section.

The abstract section

Genre analysis of the Indonesian RA abstracts indicates several rhetorical differences from the English counterparts, but these differences seemed to be relatively limited. The Findings of the analysis are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Genre analysis in Indonesian RA abstracts

Genre Studies in the abstract section	Findings
Arsyad et al. (2020b)	The findings indicate no major rhetorical differences Indonesian and English abstracts.
Kurniawan and Sabila (2021)	The findings indicate similarities between Indonesian and English research article abstracts.
Arianto et al. (2021)	Indonesian authors have fewer gap strategies than those of English international authors.
Khairani et al. (2023)	The findings indicate different rhetorical structures in the abstract.

Table 1 shows that, although Indonesian research-article abstracts differ from English-language abstracts in their rhetorical moves, the differences are generally limited. The principal difference is the less frequent inclusion of research-gap statements in Indonesian abstracts. More recent genre studies have examined a broader range of research-article sections. Regarding abstracts specifically, recent evidence suggests that Indonesian abstracts have become increasingly similar to their English-language counterparts (Kurniawan & Sabila, 2021), although Indonesian authors continue to include fewer research-gap statements (Arianto et al., 2021).

The introduction section

In the introduction section, genre analysis results consistently showed that Indonesian RAs exibit rhetorical structures that differ from the English RAIs represented in the CARS model. Table 2 summarizes the findings of the analysis.

Table 2. The findings of genre analyses in Indonesian RAIs

Genre Studies in the introduction section	Findings
Arsyad (2000)	The communicative purposes and persuasions in Indonesian RAIs are relatively different from English RAIs.
Mirahayuni (2002)	Indonesian RAIs and RADs have significant differences from English models in both forms and functions of organizing strategies.
Adnan (2009)	The results indicate a need to teach rhetorical structures expected in international research journals.
Adnan (2010)	Indonesian authors have the *Isocpol* model, which means that their rhetorical structures are different from the English model. Besides, their citing practices are mostly neutral, and this behavior is also different from English RAIs.

Genre Studies in the introduction section	Findings
Adnan (2011)	The findings of IPS model imply that Indonesian RAIs rhetorical structures differ from those found in English reputable journals.
Arsyad (2013c)	The findings confirmed earlier studies that Indonesian authors have different rhetorical structures from those of English native authors.
Arsyad and Arono (2016)	The findings suggested that Indonesian authors' rhetorical style can cause rejection from international journals
Miasari et al. (2018)	Positive and neutral stances were common, whereas critical stances or negative evaluations were absent.
Adila (2016)	Positive stance is commonly found, while negative stance is hardly identified.
Arsyad et al. (2018)	The findings suggested that Indonesian authors should do evaluative review when citing literature because negative stance has not been employed by Indonesian authors.
Arsyad et al. (2020b)	Indonesian RAs have rhetorical problems in writing the introduction.
Adnan (2014)	Education discipline has greater rhetorical differences from English-language RAIs, compared with RAs in social and political sciences and health disciplines.
Arianto et al. (2021)	Indonesian authors have fewer gap strategies than those of English international authors.
Arsyad et al. (2021)	The findings revealed that although Indonesian RAs have used the moves identified in English RAs, their argument quality is still weak and needs improvement.
Nabilla et al. (2021)	At the move level, the rhetorical structures of RAIs written by experienced Indonesian authors are similar to those written by novice authors, but at the step level, they differ in detail.
Warsidi (2021)	The findings revealed that Indonesian authors employed different rhetorical structures from the English RAs.
Warsidi et al. (2023)	The results imply that Indonesian authors use different rhetorical structures from those in English.
Warsidi (2024)	English authors employed non-integral citations and adjusted their citations into their contexts more frequently than Indonesian authors.
Warsidi et al. (2024)	The rhetorical structures of Indonesian RAIs are different from the CARS model.
Khairani et al. (2023)	The findings indicate different rhetorical structures from those published in reputable English-language journals, from the abstract to the conclusion.

Genre studies of research-article introductions identified several recurring rhetorical differences. Indonesian authors tended to use citations to support their claims rather than to critique or evaluate previous research (Adila, 2016; Miasari et al., 2018). Consequently, explicit critical stance-taking was less frequent than in the English-language corpora examined in the reviewed studies. Particularly notable differences concerned the less frequent establishment of a research niche (Warsidi, 2024) and research territory (Warsidi, 2021; Warsidi et al., 2024). Although Indonesian authors cited previous studies, they less frequently used those citations to evaluate or contrast earlier findings and employed fewer explicit gap-establishing strategies than authors represented in the international comparison corpora (Arianto

et al., 2021). All three moves of the CARS model were identified, but their realisation and the associated argumentation did not always correspond to the conventional patterns represented in the model (Arsyad et al., 2021). Indonesian authors also used non-integral citations less frequently than authors in the English-language comparison corpus (Warsidi et al., 2023). These patterns should be understood as rhetorical differences shaped by particular scholarly and publication contexts rather than as inherent deficiencies. Nevertheless, Indonesian authors seeking to publish in English-medium international journals may benefit from greater awareness of target-journal expectations, particularly concerning critical evaluation, niche establishment, and explicit gap statements. Such awareness can expand their rhetorical repertoire and enable them to make informed choices when participating in global scholarly conversations.

Moreover, although the research articles were written in English, the authors' citation practices were predominantly supportive, with sources used mainly to reinforce their claims. Several studies reported limited use of citations to evaluate or critique previous research and establish research gaps (Adila, 2016; Arsyad & Adila, 2018; Arsyad et al., 2018), while Miasari et al. (2018) identified little or no explicit critical stance-taking. One study also found instances in which cited sources were not directly relevant to the research topics being investigated (Arsyad et al., 2020b). Other reported features included limited critical engagement with the literature and limited use of questions (Rochma et al., 2020), while explicit challenges to previous studies were rare or absent in the corpora examined (Arsyad, 2013c; Rochma et al., 2020). These rhetorical patterns may not always align with the conventions commonly expected in research-article introductions published in English-medium international journals and may therefore present challenges for authors targeting those journals. The differences may partly reflect authors' linguistic and cultural backgrounds, although the reviewed evidence does not establish a direct causal relationship. These also imply that authors need to be aware of rhetorical convention of their purposive journals because comparable cross-cultural variation was reported by Farnia and Barati (2017), who found that authors in their English corpus employed a wider range of rhetorical strategies than authors in their Iranian corpus. By this awareness, thus, the possibility to get accepted and published in the journal may increase.

The method section

In the method section, differences between Indonesian and English method sections appear to be limited. The findings of the analyses are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3. The findings of genre studies in Indonesian RA methods

Genre Studies in Indonesian RA methods	Findings
Arsyad (2013a)	The findings imply that Indonesian authors may not find problematic issues when writing the method section.
Arsyad et al. (2020b)	The findings indicate that there are no big issues on method sections compared to English counterparts.
Warsidi (2021)	The method section of Indonesian RAs in the History and Law disciplines contained limited information. As a result, the information is lack of details.

The reviewed studies identified some rhetorical differences in the method sections, although these were relatively limited. Arsyad (2013a) and Arsyad et al. (2020b) found no substantial move-level differences between Indonesian and English-language research-article method sections. The principal differences occurred at the step level and concerned the amount and specificity of the methodological information provided. Warsidi (2021) reported that Indonesian method sections tended to be shorter and contain less methodological detail than their English-language counterparts. This limited detail may reduce authors' ability to explain their procedures and provide clear rationales for their data-collection and analysis decisions. By contrast, the English-language method sections examined by Warsidi (2021) provided greater methodological detail, allowing the authors to justify their procedures and use of data more explicitly. Thus, this finding implies that providing the information details, procedures, analytical approach concerning data need to be explicitly addressed.

The results and discussion section

Genre studies of the results and discussion sections of Indonesian research articles indicate several rhetorical differences from their English-language counterparts, particularly in the discussion section. Table 4 summarises these findings.

Table 4. The findings of genre studies in Indonesian RA results and discussion

Genre Studies in RA results and discussion	Findings
Arsyad (2013b)	While the findings shared no significant differences of rhetorical structures in the discussion section, Indonesian authors never refer or contrast their findings to previous research findings.
Arsyad et al. (2020b)	Indonesian RAs have rhetorical problems in writing the introduction, results and discussion sections. Indonesian authors never compare their findings to those in the literature.
Sanjaya et al. (2015)	Hedge is less employed in Indonesian RADs than those in English RAs. The findings suggested that Indonesian authors less cautiously make claims than English authors.
Suherdi et al. (2020)	Although the results and discussion sections of Indonesian research articles exhibit move-level rhetorical structures like those of their English-language counterparts, differences occur at the step level. The findings suggest that Indonesian authors provide less detailed realisations of certain moves, which may reduce the clarity of their arguments.
Arsyad et al. (2021)	The findings revealed that while rhetorical structures of Indonesian RAs have addressed the moves in English RAs, but their argument quality still is still weak and needs improvement.
Warsidi (2021)	The findings revealed that Indonesian authors employed different rhetorical structures from the English RAs.
Warsidi and Maniam (2024)	Indonesian authors employed few academic conflict units, particularly for comparing and contrasting findings with literature.

Genre Studies in RA results and discussion	Findings
Warsidi et al. (2025a).	The differences are that Indonesian authors do not compare and contrast their findings to literature to evaluate and create meaningful findings.
Khairani et al. (2023)	The findings indicate that Indonesian RAs have different rhetorical structures from those published in English reputable journals.
Sanjaya et al. (2015)	Hedge is less employed in Indonesian RADs than those in English RAs. The findings suggested that Indonesian authors less cautiously make claims than English authors.

As shown in Table 4, genre studies of Indonesian research-article discussions (RADs) identified three rhetorical differences. First, Indonesian authors referred to previous literature relatively infrequently when discussing their findings (Arsyad, 2013b), particularly when comparing and contrasting their results with those of earlier studies (Warsidi & Maniam, 2024). Second, Arsyad et al. (2020c) identified instances in which the cited references were not directly relevant to the findings being discussed. Third, some results and discussion sections provided limited detail and displayed less developed argumentation (Suherdi et al., 2020). Even when Indonesian authors related their findings to previous literature, they tended to use the cited studies primarily to introduce supporting ideas or evidence. By contrast, authors in the English-language corpus more consistently used previous research to compare and contrast findings (Warsidi et al., 2025a). Such comparisons enable authors to evaluate their findings, identify similarities and differences, and propose possible explanations for the observed patterns. In this way, the findings can be situated within the broader literature and their scholarly significance more clearly established.

All in all, the rhetorical structures of Indonesian research articles are broadly comparable to those of English-language research articles across the major sections, from the abstract through the conclusion (Khairani et al., 2023). Nevertheless, experienced Indonesian authors are more likely than novice authors to signal a research gap explicitly (Nabilla et al., 2021). This finding suggests that experience in publishing in reputable English-medium international journals is associated with greater familiarity with their rhetorical expectations. Such familiarity can expand authors' rhetorical repertoires, enabling them to respond more effectively to target-journal expectations and participate more fully in global scholarly conversations and knowledge production.

Discussion

Following the presentation of findings from previous genre studies of Indonesian research articles, this subsection brings those findings together to provide an integrated account of their rhetorical structures and to identify implications for future research and practice. By synthesising the reported patterns and variations, the discussion aims to develop a clearer understanding of Indonesian research-article rhetoric. It is organised according to the major research-article sections: the abstract, introduction, method, and results and discussion.

In their abstracts, Indonesian authors used explicit gap-indicating statements less frequently than their English-language counterparts (Arianto et al., 2021).

Authors targeting journals in which explicit niche establishment is expected may therefore benefit from stating the research gap concisely, thereby clarifying the rationale for their study. A gap can be expressed in a single sentence, as in the following example: "However, these newly formulated insights are dispersed among various studies, which warrant a comprehensive review for future scholars to refer to" (Xia, 2020, p. 141). Formulating an accurate gap statement requires a thorough review of the relevant literature and access to recent research. This task may be particularly challenging for authors who have limited access to current research articles. In this regard, more Indonesian academics have limited access to international reputable journals, compared to international authors who have free and open access reputable journals (Adnan, 2010; Warsidi, 2021).

In the introduction section, the reviewed studies identified several differences in how Indonesian authors justified their research. During the first decade, authors frequently based their research rationales on personal or professional experience, practical problems, and unexpected circumstances. Studies from the second decade and the final half-decade reported rationales based on subjective claims, limited engagement with the literature, infrequent challenges to previous studies, and less explicit identification of research gaps. These strategies tended to foreground the practical problems that the research sought to address. Practical problem-solving is a legitimate research purpose; however, authors targeting English-medium international journals may also need to articulate the scholarly relevance and contribution of their studies. In this regard, authors of English RAs in reputable journals foreground knowledge gap to establish their research niche (Lim, 2012). The CARS model, as the representation of English RAIs, represents rhetorical structures of the introduction section through three principal moves: establishing a research territory by demonstrating the importance of the topic and reviewing relevant literature; establishing a niche by identifying a gap, raising a question, extending an established line of research, or adding to existing knowledge; and occupying the niche by presenting the current study and explaining how it addresses the identified need (Swales, 1990; 2004). These rhetorical functions can help editors and reviewers recognise the novelty and potential contribution of a study to its field.

In the method section, Warsidi (2021) found that the information provided was sometimes insufficiently detailed and that methodological choices were not always adequately justified. This finding suggests that authors may need to explain more explicitly how their methods enable them to answer their research questions. The research design should be described clearly, together with the rationale for selecting the particular approach. Authors should also identify their data-collection instruments, explain why those instruments were appropriate, and describe the data-collection procedures in sufficient detail. Similarly, the procedures and theoretical or analytical frameworks used to analyse the data should be clearly presented and justified. The central rhetorical purpose of this section is to demonstrate that the chosen methods are appropriate, coherent, and acceptable for addressing the research questions (Lim, 2006). Providing this information enables readers to evaluate the research process and strengthens the credibility of the findings.

Relatively few of the reviewed studies examined the results section separately because results and discussion were often combined. Consequently, only limited implications can be drawn for this section. Tessuto (2015) found that 71% of the authors in the corpus restated their research purposes, while all authors presented

their findings through tables or figures and described those displays. These findings suggest that the principal rhetorical function of the results section is to present the outcomes of the analysis clearly and demonstrate how they address the research questions.

In the discussion section, Indonesian authors referred to a limited range of previous literature (Arsyad, 2013b), sometimes cited sources that were not directly relevant to the findings under discussion (Arsyad et al., 2020c), and occasionally presented underdeveloped arguments (Suherdi et al., 2020). They also compared and contrasted their findings with previous research relatively infrequently (Warsidi et al., 2025a; Warsidi & Maniam, 2024). These findings suggest that authors could strengthen their discussions by engaging strategically with relevant literature to interpret their results. The current findings should remain the principal focus, while previous research should provide a basis for comparison, interpretation, and explanation. For example, the formulation "The present finding contrasts with earlier studies that…" foregrounds the current result more effectively than "Earlier findings contradict the present study…," which places the emphasis on previous literature. Such choices help authors maintain the focus on their contribution while positioning it within the wider scholarly conversation.

The reviewed evidence indicates that the rhetorical structures of Indonesian research articles differ in some respects from those commonly reported in English-language research articles. Comparable cross-linguistic variation has also been identified in research articles produced by authors from Persian, Chinese, Malay, Spanish, and other linguistic backgrounds. English-language research-article introductions employed a wider range of CARS-model steps than Iranian introductions (Farnia & Barati, 2017; Farnia & Rahimi, 2017) and used a wider range of inter-step strategies to formulate research questions than their Chinese counterparts (Gong et al., 2024). English-language research-article discussions also contained more units of academic conflict than the Indonesian discussions with which they were compared (Warsidi & Maniam, 2024), while English-language introductions aligned more closely with the CARS model than Spanish introductions (Sheldon, 2011). These differences do not demonstrate that one rhetorical tradition is inherently superior; rather, they show that rhetorical practices vary across scholarly communities and publication contexts. Authors seeking to publish in reputable English-medium journals may therefore benefit from understanding the expectations of their target journals and expanding their rhetorical repertoires accordingly. This awareness can support their effective participation in global scholarly conversations and knowledge production.

Conclusion

This review of two and a half decades of genre studies of Indonesian research articles (RAs) demonstrates that rhetorical practices in Indonesia are both distinctive and dynamic. The introduction and discussion sections exhibit the most marked differences from the patterns described in English-language comparison corpora. The reviewed studies reported a greater emphasis on problem-oriented research justifications and less frequent engagement with previous literature. By contrast, the abstract and method sections show greater alignment, although they tend to be more concise and provide less elaboration. These findings resemble patterns reported in other multilingual or non-Anglophone contexts, including Iran,

China, and Malaysia. Differences from the CARS model and other English-language rhetorical frameworks are therefore not unique to Indonesian academic writing but may reflect contextual and disciplinary variation.

Theoretically, this synthesis reinforces the view that rhetorical conventions are situated rather than universal. They are shaped by local academic cultures, values, disciplinary practices, and communicative purposes. Indonesian RAs frequently foreground practical problems, policy priorities, and applied relevance. These are legitimate rhetorical strategies within their discourse communities. Conventions associated with English-medium international journals often place greater emphasis on novelty, critical positioning, and an explicit disciplinary contribution. These orientations may overlap, but they are not identical. Differences between them should not necessarily be interpreted as deficiencies. Instead, they demonstrate the plurality of academic discourse practices across scholarly communities.

Practically, the findings highlight the importance of developing rhetorical flexibility among Indonesian scholars. Authors seeking to publish for different audiences need to adjust their rhetorical choices to the expectations of particular journals while retaining elements of their local scholarly traditions where appropriate. The more frequent use of explicit gap-establishing strategies by experienced Indonesian authors suggests that such selective adaptation is already occurring. English for Research Publication Purposes (ERPP) programmes can support this process by increasing awareness of journal-specific rhetorical expectations, providing strategies for establishing research gaps, and developing stronger critical and dialogic engagement with previous literature.

Future research should move beyond textual analysis to investigate the social, institutional, cultural, and motivational factors that shape Indonesian scholarly writing. Examining why authors adopt particular rhetorical strategies, including the influence of cultural norms, institutional pressures, publication experience, and access to scholarly resources, could provide a fuller understanding of how local and global discourse practices interact. Research combining genre analysis with interviews, ethnographic observation, or authors' publication histories would be particularly valuable. Such work would benefit Indonesian scholarship and contribute to global genre studies by questioning assumptions of universality and foregrounding the diversity of academic voices.

In conclusion, Indonesian RAs illustrate the complex negotiation between local scholarly traditions and international publication expectations. By valuing rhetorical diversity while equipping scholars to respond strategically to different publication contexts, Indonesian academics can participate more fully in international knowledge production without erasing their rhetorical heritage.

References

Abbasi, M. E., Jalilifar, A., & Hita, J. A. (2023). Evaluative language in applied linguistics research article discussions: Exploring the functions and patterns of that-structures in argumentative texts. *Language Awareness*, *32*(2), 193–216. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2021.1990938

Adila, D. (2016). The rhetorical style of Indonesian authors' citation in English research articles introductions. *Proceedings of ISELT FBS Universitas Negeri Padang, 4*(1), 156-164. https://ejournal.unp.ac.id/index.php/selt/article/view/6923/5457

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*. 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

Adnan, Z. (2014). Prospects of Indonesian research articles (RAs) being considered for publication in 'center'journals: A comparative study of rhetorical patterns of RAs in selected humanities and hard science disciplines. In *Occupying niches: Interculturality, cross-culturality and aculturality in academic research* (pp. 79-99). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-02526-1_6

Afshar, H. S., Doosti, M., & Movassagh, H. (2018). A genre analysis of the introduction section of applied linguistics and chemistry research articles. *Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 21*(1), 163-214. https://www.sid.ir/paper/673329/en

Alkamillah, M., Azwandi, A., & Maisarah, I. (2022). The conclusion sections in applied linguistics international journal articles written by Indonesian authors. *Journal of Applied Studies in Language, 6*(2), 118-130. https://doi.org/10.31940/jasl.v6i2.543

Alzarieni, M. M., Zainudin, I. S., Awal, N. M., & Sulaiman, M. Z. (2019). Rhetorical Structure of the Arabic Patent Abstracts. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies, 19*(4), 148-168. https://doi.org/10.17576/gema-2019-1904-08

Arianto, M. A., Saukah, A., Basthomi, Y., & Wulyani, A. N. (2021). Previous studies have several limitations…: Indonesian doctoral students', Indonesian academics', and international authors' research gap strategies in ELT research article abstracts and introductions. *Journal of Language and Education, 7*(2), 25-44. https://doi.org/10.17323/jle.2021.11735

Arsyad, S. (2000). *Rhetorical structure analysis of the Indonesian research articles*. [Doctoral Dissertation, 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://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/17447143.2013.849711

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

Arsyad, S. (2013c). A genre-based analysis on 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., & 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. (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., Nur, S., Nasihin, A., & Adnan, Z. (2021). Writing in a foreign language: The rhetorical and argument styles in research article drafts by nonnative speakers of English in linguistics and language education. *International Journal of Language Education, 5*(3), 135-151. https://doi.org/10.26858/ijole.v5i3.19506

Arsyad, S., Purwo, B. K., & Adnan, Z. (2020a). 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., Purwo, B. K., Sukamto, K. E., & Adnan, Z. (2019). Factors hindering Indonesian lecturers from publishing articles in reputable international journals. *Journal on English as a Foreign Language, 9*(1), 42-70. https://doi.org/10.23971/jefl.v9i1.982

Arsyad, S., Ramadhan, S., & Maisarah, I. (2020b). The rhetorical problems experienced by Indonesian lecturers in social sciences and humanities in writing research articles for international journals. *The Asian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 7*(1), 116-129. https://caes.hku.hk/ajal/index.php/ajal/article/view/716

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

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

Barghamadi, M., & Siyyari, M. (2021). Citation quality analysis in Iranian and international high-rank journals. *Language Testing in Focus: An International Journal, 4*, 1-12. https://doi.org/10.32038/ltf.2021.04.01

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

El-Dakhs, D. A. S. (2018). Comparative genre analysis of research article abstracts in more and less prestigious journals: Linguistics journals in focus. *Research in Language (RiL), 16*(1), 47-63. https://doi.org/10.2478/rela-2018-0002

Farnia, M., & Barati, S. (2017). Writing introduction sections of research articles in applied linguistics: Cross-linguistic study of native and non-native writers. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 7*(2), 486-494. https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v7i2.8357

Farnia, M., & Rahimi, S. (2017). Comparative generic analysis of introductions of English and Persian dentistry research articles. *Research in English language pedagogy, 5*(1), 27-40. https://relp.isfahan.iau.ir/article_533644_042bfd33027afad954b4be3ee7f5995c.pdf

Gong, Z., Liu, Y., & Liu, Y. (2024). A comparative study of research questions written by L1 English authors and Chinese EFL scholars. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 69*, 101383. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2024.101383

Khairani, A. J., Kurniawan, E., & Lubis, A. H. (2023). A comparative move analysis of inter-disciplinary research articles written by reputable Indonesian authors throughout their early-career period. *Indonesian EFL Journal, 9*(2), 95-108. https://doi.org/10.25134/ieflj.v9i2.8783

Kurniawan, E., & Sabila, N. A. A. (2021). Another look at the rhetorical moves and linguistic realizations in international and Indonesian journal articles: A case of tourism research. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 11*(2), 318-329. https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v11i2.32055

Lim, J. M.-H. (2006). Method sections of management research articles: A pedagogically motivated qualitative study. *English for Specific Purposes, 25*(3), 282-309. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2005.07.001

Lim, J. M.-H. (2012). How do writers establish research niches? A genre-based investigation into management researchers' rhetorical steps and linguistic mechanisms. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 11*(3), 229-245. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2012.05.002

Lin, L. (2014). Variability in the rhetorical structure of research article introductions: The case of civil engineering. *Revista Española de Lingüística Aplicada/Spanish Journal of Applied Linguistics, 27*(2), 405-432.

Lin, L. H., & Morrison, B. (2021). Challenges in academic writing: Perspectives of Engineering faculty and L2 postgraduate research students. *English for Specific Purposes, 63*, 59-70. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2021.03.004

Mezmir, E. A. (2020). Qualitative data analysis: An overview of data reduction, data display, and interpretation. *Research on humanities and social sciences, 10*(21), 15-27. https://doi.org/10.7176/RHSS/10-21-02

Miasari, S., Arsyad, S., & Arono. (2018). Indonesian authors' stances in citing English research article introductions literature in sciences. *EduLite: Journal of English Education, Literature and Culture, 3*(2), 173-187. https://doi.org/10.30659/e.3.2.173-187

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

Mozaheb, M. A. (2015). A comparative genre-based study of research articles method and results sections authored by Iranian and English native speakers. *International Journal of Arts & Sciences, 8*(6), 139-151.

Nabilla, S., Luthfianda, S. N., Suherdi, D., Kurniawan, E., Gunawan, W., & Lubis, A. H. (2021). How do novice and experienced Indonesian authors rhetorically organize research article introduction? *Thirteenth Conference on Applied*

Linguistics (CONAPLIN 2020), 502-507. https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.210427.076

Rochma, A. F., Triastuti, A., & Ashadi, A. (2020). Rhetorical styles of Introduction in English language teaching (ELT) research articles. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 10*(2), 304-314. https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v10i2.28593

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

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

Sanjaya, I. N. S., Sitawati, A. A. R., & Suciani, N. K. (2015). Comparing hedges used by English and Indonesian scholars in published research articles: A corpus-based study. *TEFLIN Journal, 26*(2), 209-227.

Sheldon, E. (2011). Rhetorical differences in RA introductions written by English L1 and L2 and Castilian Spanish L1 writers. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 10*(4), 238-251. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2011.08.004

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 University Press.

Swales, J. M. (2004). *Research genres: Explorations and applications*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524827

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

Warsidi. (2023). Promoting research through claiming centrality and explicit research contributions in applied linguistics research articles. *JOALL (Journal of Applied Linguistics and Literature), 8*(2), 264-280. https://doi.org/10.33369/joall.v8i2.26491

Warsidi. (2024). 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. (2025). *Genre analysis in research articles*. Publisher Azriel Alfarizqi Akkbar.

Warsidi, & 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, 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. https://so04.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/LEARN/article/view/270422

Warsidi, Adnan, Z., & Maniam, V. (2025a). Rhetorical problems of Indonesian research article results and discussion in the history and law disciplines. *LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching, 28*(1), 1-19. https://doi.org/10.24071/llt.v28i1.9095

Warsidi, Halim, A., Kamal, A., Halim, N. M., Adnan, Z., Samad, I. A., & Irawan, A. M. (2025b). Responses to earlier literature in research article introductions: A rhetorical study in applied linguistics. *Studies in English Language and Education, 12*(1), 398-411. https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v12i1.35160

Warsidi, 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

Warsidi, & 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

Xia, S. A. (2020). Genre analysis in the digital era: Developments and challenges. *ESP Today, 8*(1), 141-159. https://doi.org/10.18485/esptoday.2020.8.1.7