A Contrastive Genre-Based Study of English and Indonesian RAIs in the History Discipline

Warsidi[a,*], Zifirdaus Adnan[b], Vegneskumar Maniam[c]

[a]warsidi.dty@uim-makassar.ac.id, English Literature Study Program, Universitas Islam Makassar, Indonesia
[b]zadnan@une.edu.au, School of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences, University of New England, Australia
[c]vmaniam@une.edu.au, School of Education, University of New England, Australia
* Corresponding author, Email: warsidi.dty@uim-makassar.ac.id

ABSTRACT

Genre studies of Research Articles (RAs) have increased over the years. However, our review indicates that RA studies on RAs in the history discipline are still limited both to English and Indonesian languages. By identifying this gap, we are encouraged to analyze their rhetorical structures in the introduction section because this section plays an important role in publishing RAs in journals. For analyzing the rhetorical structure of both data sets, we employed the Create Research Spaces (CARS) model (Swales, 1990). The results showed that the rhetorical structures of English Research Article Introductions (RAIs) are similar to the CARS model, while the rhetorical structures of Indonesian RAIs in the present study do not conform to the model. This finding implies that Indonesian RAIs in the present study have different rhetorical structures from those found in English RAIs both in the present study and those in the CARS model. Besides, it implies

that Indonesian authors in the History discipline meet challenges when they want to publish works in English journals.

Keywords: English and Indonesian RAIs, genre analysis, rhetorical structures, the history discipline

Introduction

Studies on genre analyses of Research Articles (RAs) have increased in recent years globally. One of the growing concerns about genre studies in RAs is rhetorical structures. Many linguistic scholars have investigated this concern in Research Article Introductions (RAIs) using a Create Research Spaces (CARS) model (Swales, 1990) for their analytical framework. Their results indicate that most rhetorical structures of English RAIs written by English native speakers (ENSs) fit the CARS model (Helal, 2014; Lim, 2012; Mirahayuni, 2002; Samanhudi, 2017; Sheldon, 2011). Besides, RAIs published in highly indexed journals also conformed to this model (Sheldon, 2011; Suryani et al., 2013), such as establishing a niche (Helal, 2014; Lim, 2012) and claiming centrality (Warsidi, 2023). However, some questions may arise in response to these earlier studies: Does this model fit the rhetorical structure of RAIs from different language backgrounds?

Although some earlier contrastive studies between English RAIs and those from other language backgrounds have been carried out and indicate that their results are different from English, rarely did they show to what extent their differences are and what their rhetorical model looks like. Besides, they need to investigate the RAIs in the History discipline, both in English and Indonesian. Therefore, in the present study, we fill this gap by analyzing the rhetorical structures of English and Indonesian RAIs in the History discipline with the following research questions.

1. Do English RAIs written by ENSs and Indonesian RAIs written by INSs in the History discipline have similar rhetorical structures?
2. If so, to what extent are their similarities? If not, to what extent are their differences, and what is their rhetorical model like?

By answering the above questions, the results may draw implications theoretically and practically. The results may add to the literature regarding genre studies in RAIs in the History discipline. Practically, these may also provide an understanding for novice authors, particularly those whose English is their foreign language (EFL), about how to write English RAIs.

Literature Review

Genre studies in RAIs have been widely investigated, and one of their growing concerns is to identify their rhetorical structures (Adnan, 2010, 2011; Afrizon & Arsyad, 2018; Arsyad & Zainil, 2023; Safnil, 2013; Swales, 1990, 2004). The results indicate that English RAIs published in reputable journals tend to employ the CARS model. This model contains three functional moves: establishing a territory (Move 1), establishing a niche (Move 2), and occupying the niche (Move 3) (Swales, 1990). In this regard, while Move 1 is to show purposive readers that the current research topics is significant, Move 2 is to show readers that the current research is original and contains a novelty. Then, Move 3 is to present the current research (Warsidi, 2021). All these three functional moves appeared in all American RAIs and indicate that it is the appropriate rhetorical structures for American RAIs. In contrast, this model is not the typical rhetorical structure of French RAIs because of the three functional moves; only Move One and Move Three appeared in French RAIs (Helal, 2014).

Move 2 of the CARS model is very important in RAIs in the Management discipline published in high-indexed journals. To realize this functional move, authors employed two ways: indicating a gap and adding to what is known. However, the most important way to establish a niche is by indicating a research gap, which appears in 29 of the 30 RAIs, while the other way, adding to what is known, appears only in six of the 30 RAIs (Lim, 2012).

In the context of Scopus Index journals, Suryani et al. (2013) investigated the rhetorical moves of five English RAIs in the Computer Engineering discipline using the CARS model. The articles were written by Malaysian authors and published in 2010. The results indicate that all five RAIs are relevant to the CARS model, as all their rhetorical structures fit it. The model is, therefore, ideal for English RAIs in the Computer Engineering discipline published in Scopus Index journals.

Another linguist investigating English RAIs is Sheldon (2011), who conducted a contrastive study using the CARS model to analyze 54 RAIs. Of these RAIs, 18 were written in English by English Native Speakers (ENSs). English NS refers to people born in English-speaking countries who use English daily. Another 18 RAIs were written in English by English second-language authors (referred to as non-native speakers (NNSs), and the other 18 RAIs were written in Spanish by Spanish NSs. The results showed that all English RAIs written by English NSs fit all three moves of the model. However, the English RAIs written by English NNSs and Spanish RAIs written by Spanish NS do not fit the model, as they rarely employ Move 2 (establishing a niche) of the model. Thus, English RAIs written by English

NSs have the same rhetorical structures as the CARS model, while English RAIs written by English NNSs and Spanish RAIs written by Spanish NSs have different rhetorical structures from those suggested in the CARS model.

In the Indonesian context, some scholars have also analyzed the rhetorical structures of Indonesian RAIs using the CARS model. For example, Mirahyuni (2002) analyzed the rhetorical structures of 58 RAs in Language and Language Teaching disciplines, focusing on the introduction sections by employing the CARS model (Swales, 1990). The corpora are from different cultural and language backgrounds, with 20 RAs in English and written by ENSs, 19 English RAs written by Indonesians Native Speakers (INSs); and 19 RAs in Indonesian and written by INSs. The results showed that the rhetorical structures of English RAIs written by ENSs are similar to the CARS model. They tend to review previous related research to enhance their writing knowledge and determine research territory.

In contrast, Indonesian RAIs lack literature reviews as a central claim (Mirahayuni, 2002). They tend to make a local claim and not based on reviewing the literature, which usually suggests practical contributions to the Indonesian national development or government policy, such as offering contributions to the government. In this regard, they have different factors from English RAIs in justifying studies. They tend to take a position in claiming their *research interest* and then shed light on their research territory. At the same time, authors of English RAIs find the knowledge background and gap to justify their study (see Mirahyuni, 2002, p.48). Thus, Indonesian authors justify their study by presenting their experiences, realities in the field, or government regulations, not by referencing previous relevant studies (Adnan, 2008, 2009; Arsyad, 2013b; Arsyad & Arono, 2016; Arsyad et al., 2020; Mirahayuni, 2002) because of several factors: practical factors, journal conventions, writing traditions, disciplinary conventions, and government policy (Adnan, 2010; Warsidi, 2021).

As reviewed above, most rhetorical structures of the English RAIs analyzed in those studies fit the CARS model, while Indonesian RAIs seem different from the model because they do not refer to previous studies, but they refer to their experiences, problems in the fields, and government policy to situate their position (Adnan, 2009, 2011; Arsyad, 2013a; Arsyad & Arono, 2016; Mirahayuni, 2002). Although Indonesian academics publish their RAIs in English, their rhetorical styles still differ from English RAIs written by ENSs (Arsyad & Adila, 2018). However, the reviews above show that Linguistics, Language, Social Science, and Education are among the most investigated. At the same time, many other disciplinary RAIs still need to be investigated to date, such as those in the History discipline. Thus, the present study intends to compare the rhetorical structure of RAIs written in English

by English NSs and Indonesian by Indonesian NSs by answering the research questions as presented in the introduction section.

Method

This section aims to present data sets, data analysis, and the reliability of the analysis results. The purpose of analyzing data sets is to answer the two above research questions.

Data Sets

In this study, we analyzed 30 RAIs in the History discipline, 15 of which were written in English and by ENSs, while the other 15 RAIs were written in the Indonesian language and by INSs. For selecting the English RAIs, the authors chose three English journals in the History discipline using several criteria. Firstly, the selected journals must be published in English. Then, the journals contain a term *history* to ensure they publish articles in the history discipline. Besides, the journals focus on publishing research in the History discipline. It can be found in their online system under a feature of *Focus and Scope*. After that, the journals are indexed in Scopus Quartile 1 (Q1) with SJR above 0.50. Three English journals meet these criteria: *Historical Archaeology, Historical Methods*, and *Journal of Global History*. All three journals are published in English-speaking countries. Thus, the authors selected five articles from each selected English journal. Lastly, articles taken from these journals were published in the last five years and written by native English authors, which can be identified by their English names (such as John, Jane, Charles, William, George, etc.), their affiliations (such as from England, US, Australia, Canada, New Zealand, etc.), their short bibliographies in their articles, and their journal based countries.

Then, for selecting 15 Indonesian RAIs, the authors employed the following criteria. Firstly, the articles must be published in journals of History disciplines in Indonesia with the highest accreditation from the Indonesian Directorate of Higher Degree Research and Education (DIKTI) because they were considered to have the highest quality, proven by their accreditation. The highest level of accreditation in the History disciplines was rated 2 in Indonesia, and only three journals received this accreditation status. The three journals are *Jurnal Sejarah Citra Lekha, Patanjala: Jurnal Penelitian Sejarah dan Budaya*, and *Patra Widya: Seri Penerbitan Penelitian Sejarah dan Budaya.* Thus, all three journals were selected for the present study because they were considered high-quality and consistent writing styles. Then, articles selected from these Indonesian journals were published in the last five years and written by Indonesian native authors by identifying their names and

affiliations. After that, to meet 15 corpus numbers in this selected discipline, five RAIs from these three journals were randomly selected for the analyses. A description of the present data sets is presented in a short description in Table 1.

Table 1

A short description of both English and Indonesian RAIs

Corpora	Word numbers	Mean per RAI	Years of publication
English RAIs	12758	850,53	2017-2022
Indonesian RAIs	16075	1071,67	2017-2022

As presented in Table 1, Indonesian RAIs have longer and more word numbers than those of English RAIs. In this regard, Indonesian RAIs have 1071,67 words per RAI, while English RAIs have 850,53 words per RAI.

Data Analysis

In analyzing data, we focused on analyzing the rhetorical structures of both English and Indonesian RAIs in the History discipline by identifying their communicative moves and events in their RAIs. Communicative move or event means the authors' ways to achieve their writing purposes or goals (Swales, 1990). It means that concerning their purposes in writing an RA, the authors have some communicative moves or events, also called moves and steps. So, the communicative moves mean the authors' way to reach their writing goals or purposes. The move is a broader class of communicative events than a step because one move might have several steps.

For identifying moves and steps in RAIs, we employed the Create Research Spaces (CARS) model (Swales, 1990) in both data sets. However, only the English data fit this model, while the Indonesian RAIs did not. Thus, as the purpose of this context is to discover the rhetorical structures of Indonesian RAIs, another model was then employed to analyze the Indonesian data. In this regard, a social and political science model (*Isocpol* model) (Adnan, 2010) was employed because this model was designed based on Indonesian RAIs from the disciplines of Social and Political Sciences, which are closely related to the present research data, RAIs in the History discipline. Thus, by employing these two rhetorical models, the rhetorical structures of English and Indonesian RAIs in the History discipline could be discovered.

Besides, we also used Swales' strategies (1990) to find the communicative moves and steps in every sentence, clause, phrase, or group

of sentences. Considering Arsyad (2014), each clause must only have one issue or purpose. Therefore, to recognize whether a phrase, clause, or sentence contains a communicative purpose, we utilize linguistic signals to comprehend its meaning and purpose and then give them codes (Loi et al., 2016). By employing Swales' strategies, considering Arsyad's comprehension, and understanding the linguistic signals for the analysis, we could find the rhetorical structure of both data sets.

The Reliability of the Rhetorical Structure Analyses

In this study, to ensure the reliability of the rhetorical structure analyses. We, as authors, divide our roles in the present study. The first author read and analyzed the rhetorical structures of both data sets at least three times. Then, the second and third authors checked (at least three times) the validities of the data analysis results and translated data. To ensure their analysis validities, these three authors communicated and discussed their data analyses via emails and Zoom meetings. During this study period, there was no disagreement (which means 100% agreement) between these three authors regarding the analysis results. The only needs during this study are the confirmation for further details and the translated version appropriateness. Thus, these agreements indicate that the analysis results are reliable and valid.

In addition, the second and third authors are linguistic experts, as their educational background and research are in linguistics. Moreover, the second author is an expert in genre studies of RA because he has been conducting and publishing many works in this area, including his Ph.D. thesis, books, and RAs. These facts may make the data analysis results reliable.

Findings and Discussion

This section aims to answer the research questions in the introduction: Do English and Indonesian RAIs in the History discipline have the same rhetorical structures? If so, to what extent are their similarities? If not, what are their differences, and what is their rhetorical model like? Besides this section also discusses the findings of the present study compared to earlier research findings on the genre of RAIs.

To answer the above research questions, we employed the CARS model from Swales (1990) for analyzing both data sets. The results revealed that English RAIs have similar moves to the CARS model, while Indonesian RAIs have different rhetorical moves from the tested model. The summary analysis results employing the model are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

The Summary Analysis Employing the CARS Model in Both English and Indonesian RAIs

Moves and Steps in the CARS model (Swales, 1990)	English RAIs in the History Discipline		Indonesian RAIs in the History Discipline	
	Appearances N=15	Percentage 100%	Appearances N=15	Percentage 100%
Move 1: Establishing a territory	**15**	**100%**	**4**	**26.67%**
Step 1 Claiming centrality and/ or	7	46.67%	0	0
Step 2 Making topic generalization and/or	5	33.33%	3	20%
Step 3 Reviewing items of previous research	14	93.33%	3	20%
Move 2: Establishing a niche	**10**	**66.67%**	**3**	**20%**
Step 1A Counter claiming, or	4	26.67%	0	0
Step 1B Indicating a gap, or	3	20%	3	20%
Step 1C Question-raising, or	3	20%	2	13.33%
Step 1D Continuing a tradition	-	0%	-	0%
Move 3: Occupying the niche	**15**	**100%**	**14**	**93.33%**
Step 1A Outlining purposes, or	3	20%	8	53.33%
Step 1B Announcing present research	13	86.67%	11	73.33%
Step 2 Announcing principal findings	4	26.67%	8	53.33%
Step 3 Indicating RA structure	3	20%	0	0

Notes: N= total number of RAIs

As presented in Table 2, English RAIs employ more moves and steps of the CARS model compared to Indonesian RAIs. For example, all English RAIs (100%) employ Move 1 (*Establishing a territory*) of the model, while Indonesian RAIs only employ it in four (26.27%) of their total corpus. Then, ten English RAIs (66.67%) utilize Move 2 (*Establishing a niche*) of the model, while Indonesian RAIs only employ it in 3 (20%) Indonesian corpus. Lastly, English RAIs employ Move 3 (*Occupying the niche*) in all RAIs (100%), while Indonesian RAIs employ it in 14 (93.33%) RAIs of their corpus.

However, there is one step *indicating methods* appearing in 6 (40%) English RAIs, but it is not included in the CARS model. This step is very possibly located in Move 3 because it mostly appears at the end of the introduction section. These findings indicate that the rhetorical structures of English RAIs are still similar to the CARS model. Although one additional step *indicating methods* is found in English RAIs, it is not included in the CARS model; it does not influence the number of Move 3 appearances. Thus, the

rhetorical structures of English RAIs still have similar moves to the model. In contrast, the rhetorical structures of Indonesian RAIs are primarily different from the model, mainly Move One and Move Two of the model. These results imply that the rhetorical structures of English RAIs in the History discipline are primarily different from those of Indonesian RAIs, except for Move 3 (*Occupying the niche*).

In this section, we only focus on describing and exemplifying moves and steps that appear in English RAIs but do not occur in Indonesian RAIs. The reasons for only describing and exemplifying them are to provide comparisons and differences. By doing this, the results can provide more meaningful understandings and create awareness for Indonesian authors, particularly in this selected discipline.

Move 1: Establishing a Territory

Establishing a territory is a move to convince audiences of a discourse community that the current research topic is significant. Swales (1990) found three steps in English RAs that realize this move: Step 1, *claiming centrality*; Step 2, *making topic generalizations*; and Step 3, *reviewing items of previous research*. RA authors may employ one, two, or all the steps to realize this move. In the present study, this move is obligatory in English RAIs because it appears in all English RAIs (100%) in the History discipline. However, this move is optional in Indonesian RAIs as it appears only in 4 (26.67%) Indonesian RAIs. In employing this move, English RAIs use all these three possible steps. As presented earlier, in this section, we only exemplify steps employed in the English RAIs that do not appear in the Indonesian corpus. In Move 1, only Step 1 (*Claiming centrality*) appears in English RAIs but does not occur in Indonesian RAIs.

Step 1: Claiming centrality

Claiming centrality means that the authors declare that the topic being discussed is currently significant, as proven by many researchers who have studied it earlier. In English RAIs in the present study, seven RAIs are employing this step, like the following examples:

> Ex. 01: The study of naval diets **has many advantages**. As Frederic Lane writes, "The diets and wages of seamen are useful historical benchmarks in the history of welfare economics. They are one of the few standards which are stated numerically in the sources" (Lane 1966, p. 263). (EHRAIs 08)
> Ex. 02: The Algerian War of Independence (1954–62) was **crucial to exten**ding the modern international refugee regime beyond Europe.[1] (EHRAIs 14)

Ex. 03: **Refugee history has emerged as an essential field** of scholarship without anyone writing a manifesto or charting a course that scholars might follow. It has developed piecemeal, fuelled by an interest in the experiences of individuals and communities caught up in wars and other disasters and affected by upheavals such as border changes, decolonization and the formation of new states. It gained further traction as the phrase 'refugee crisis' began to appear regularly in the Western news media after 2014.[1] (EHRAIs 15)

The examples above indicate that their current studies are essential, which can be identified by the signal words of the bold texts. Thus, we include them as Move 1, Step 1 Claiming centrality because the signal words are similar to what this move says in the CARS model (Swales, 1990). In Indonesian RAIs, we also found authors claiming that their study is significant, but their claims are different from a critical review of the literature. Instead, their claims are based on real-world phenomena. Some examples are:

Ex. 04: *Kearifan sistem religi lokal dalam integrasi umat Hindu dengan Islam di Bali sangat menarik untuk dikaji melalui jejak sejarah pemukiman enclave Islam di Bali.* (IHRAIs 01)
[The local wisdom of the religious system between Hindus and Islam in Bali **is very interesting to study** through Bali's historical Islamic enclave settlements.]

Ex. 05: *Naskah-naskah dari Betawi ini mempunyai keunikan, baik dalam penggunaan bahasa maupun gaya bercerita dengan berbagai dekorasi.* (IHRAIs 06)
[**These Betawi manuscripts are unique**, concerning both the use of language and storytelling style with various decorations.]

The two examples above (Example 04 and 05) state that their topics are interesting; however, their claims are based on real-world phenomena on the ground. Example 04 is a claim about the integration of Hinduism and Islam in Bali, and the following example is about the uniqueness of the Betawi manuscript; however, neither mention their reasons for saying uniqueness and interestingness to research in terms of research gap in the literature. Therefore, we did not consider these two examples as a claiming centrality as defined by Swales (1990). However, they could be claiming centrality in terms of Samraj's "real-world significance" (Samraj, 2002).

Move 2: Establishing a Niche

English RAIs employ this move in 10 (66.67%) RAIs, while the Indonesian corpus employs it in 3 (20%) RAIs. As stated earlier, we only describe steps that appear in English RAIs but are absent in the Indonesian corpus to provide more meaningful comprehension. In this move, only Step

1A (counter-claiming) appears in English RAIs but is absent in the Indonesian corpus.

Step 1A Counter-claiming

This move indicates that the authors disagree with earlier claims. They state the weaknesses of previous studies, such as by presenting the study's limitations. Here, the authors may use signal words that indicate disagreement, such as however, nevertheless, yet, but, and unfortunately. The following are examples found in English RAIs:

> Ex. 06: These are all important stories, **but things have changed since they were written. Demography in the United States today therefore looks very different than** the picture drawn by existing historical accounts. (EHRAIs 06)
> Ex. 07: **However, this literature builds on the premise that distinctively Black names emerged** as a product of the Black Power movement (Fryer & Levitt, 2004), **ignoring more historical relationships between Black identity**, naming patterns and socioeconomic outcomes. (EHRAIs 09)
> Ex. 08: **However, unfortunately, these contain truncations of some of the source transcriptions**, omissions of some whole occupational descriptor strings, the gap for 1871, and the absence of parsing and coding of the employer and farmer responses. **This has limited the utility** of these data for studies of businesses. This deficiency has been overcome in a further data deposit of the 1851–1911 censuses that developed ICeM for business proprietors by infilling truncations and other gaps and supplements it for 1871: the British Business Census of Entrepreneurs (BBCE). (EHRAIs 10)

The above examples indicate that English RA authors encounter earlier studies, as the bold text shows. However, this step only appears in Indonesian RAIs in the present study.

Move 3: Occupying the Niche

This move is to address the niche as established in Move 2 (Swales, 1990). It appears in all English RAIs but 14 (93.33%0 in Indonesian RAIs. In realizing this move, authors may employ up to three possible steps. However, in this paper, we only exemplify one of the three steps, which only appears in English RAIs but is absent in the Indonesian corpus.

Step 3 Indicating RA structures

In realizing this step, an author outlines the structures of the current research paper. It can be identified by signal words such as structures, set up,

organize, presented, begin, next section, etc. Three English RAIs (20%) employ this step, while none of the Indonesian RAIs employ it. In English RAIs, the appearances of this step are the following examples:

> Ex. 09: In the following section, **we set up our research** question by describing the crisis demography faced between the mid-1970s and the mid-1980s. **We then describe the PAA Oral History Project and explain** why it is an ideal "archive" to begin answering our question. **The next section** makes a case for structural topic modelling and explains how we fit a model to our corpus. The final two sections draw on the results of our model — together with illustrative passages from the PAA Oral History Project — to answer our research question. (EHRAIs 06)
>
> Ex. 10: **I begin by examining Edward Gibbon Wakefield's writings** on colonization in light of what Onur Ulas Ince has recently termed 'colonial capitalism', the global system of capitalist relations that emerged in the context of the early modern British empire.[13] …………………………. **The article will then analyze how and why** company colonization re-emerged in the antipodes, in particular tracing the repeated rhetorical appeals by the colonial reformers to North American precedent. (EHRAIs 11)

As exemplified above, the bold texts indicate how authors structure their RAs. This step usually appears at the end of RAIs.

In short, the rhetorical structures of English and Indonesian RAIs are different, particularly in presenting Move 1 and Move 2 of the CARS model. The rhetorical structures of English RAIs are similar to the CARS model, while the rhetorical structure of Indonesian RAIs is mostly different from the model. As Indonesian RAIs have different rhetorical structures from the model, what is the rhetorical model of the Indonesian RAIs like?

To answer this last research question, we analyzed Indonesian data using the Indonesian Social and Political (Isocpol) model (Author, 2010) as an analytical framework. The result indicates that this model is more appropriate than the CARS model in Indonesian RAIs. Move 1 of the Isocpol model has 15 (100%) employment, Move 2 has 10 (66.67%) appearances, and Move 3 has 12 (80%) employment.

However, there is some more information that needs to be included in the Isocpol model. For example, our analyses found three critical pieces of information indicating Move 1, such as referring to government regulation, presenting the real condition in the field, and describing how the ideal condition should be. Then, we also discovered one new strategy for Move 2: describing the current situation. On the other hand, our data did not employ Strategy C of Move 2 of the Isocpol model. Furthermore, we also noted a strategy for Move 3, stating the subject of the present study needs modification to capture the rhetorical structure of Indonesian RAIs.

Therefore, to find out the best capture of the communicative events found in Indonesian RAIs, we modified the Isocpol model by including those newly found strategies and deleting one inapplicable strategy from the original model. The modified Isocpol model is presented in Figure 1:

Figure 1

The Modified Isocpol Model for Best Capturing Indonesian RAIs in the History Discipline

Move 1: Describing the condition to establish the current study (modification)
Strategy 1A: Making a centrality claim with or without references and/or
Strategy 1B: Making a general claim with or without references and/or
Strategy 1C: Defining key terms and/or objects of the research and/or (modified)
Strategy 1D: Reviewing the literature and/or
Strategy 1E: Referring to a government document(s) or official statement(s), (new) and/or
Strategy 1F: Presenting a real condition or phenomenon in the field (new) and/or
Strategy 1G: Describing how the ideal condition should be (new)
Move 2: Justifying the study
Strategy 2A: Describing the current situation (new) and/or
Strategy 2B: Raising an issue question(s), and/ or
Strategy 2C: Stating the interestingness of the topic under investigation (modified) and/or
Strategy 2D: Indicating a gap in the literature with or without a literature review
Move 3: Describing the study
Strategy 3A: Stating the purpose(s) or subject of the study (modified) and/or
Strategy 3B: Announcing the research questions (further) and/or
Strategy 3C: Explaining the theoretical framework

The modified Isocpol model, as shown in Figure 1, was built based on Indonesian RAIs in the History discipline. Concerning its applicability, the model was employed to analyze Indonesian RAIs. The results of the analyses are presented in Table 3.

Table 3

The Summary Results of the Analysis Employing the Modified Isocpol Model in Indonesian RAIs in the History Discipline

Moves and strategies in the modified Isocpol model	Number of articles	
	N=15	Percentage 100%

Move 1: Describing the condition to establish the current study (modification)	15	100%
Strategy 1A: Making a centrality claim with or without references	12	80%
Strategy 1B: Making a general claim with or without references	9	60%
Strategy 1C: Defining key terms and/or objects of the research (modified)	10	67.67%
Strategy 1D: Reviewing the literature	3	20%
Strategy 1E: Referring to a government document(s) or official statement(s) (new)	2	13.33%
Strategy 1F: Presenting an actual condition or phenomenon in the field (new)	14	93.33%
Strategy 1G: Describing how the ideal condition should be (new)	6	40%
Move 2: Justifying the study	15	100%
Strategy 2A: Describing the current situation (new)	3	20%
Strategy 2B: Raising an issue question(s)	5	33.33%
Strategy 2C: Stating the interestingness of the topic under investigation (modified)	9	60%
Strategy 2D: Indicating a gap in the literature with or without a literature review	3	20%
Move 3: Describing the study	15	100%
Strategy 3A: Stating the purpose(s) or subject of the study (modified)	7	46.67%
Strategy 3B: Announcing the research questions (further),	5	33.33%
Strategy 3C: Explaining the theoretical framework	8	53.33%

Notes: N= number of RAIs

The analysis revealed that Indonesian RAIs employ all moves of the modified Isocpol model. As presented in Table 3 above, all RAIs employ Move 1, Describing the condition to establish the current study (100%), Move 2, Justifying the study (100%), and Move 3, describing the study (100%). Thus, all the moves of the modified Isocpol model are obligatory in Indonesian RAIs.

Based on our data analyses, the rhetorical structures of Indonesian RAIs are different from those found in the CARS model. They are more appropriate with the Isocpol model than the CARS model. However, five strategies were repeatedly found in Indonesian RAIs, which were unavailable in the original Isocpol model from Adnan (2010). Therefore, the present study modified the original Isocpol model, and the result showed that this modified Isocpol model best captured the rhetorical structure of Indonesian RAIs because all moves of the modified model became obligatory.

Hunston (2002) stated that the purpose of the introduction section is to show the readers that the research undertaken is essential and that there is a knowledge gap that needs further investigation. These communicative purposes also appear in the CARS model from Swales (1990). The rhetorical

structures of English RAIs in the present study are similar to this model. However, the rhetorical structures of Indonesian RAIs in the present study differ from this model.

The most notable difference between English and Indonesian RAIs is the way of justifying a study. English RAIs justify their study by reviewing the literature to find a research gap and situate their study. Those ways include Move 1 establishing a territory and Move 2 establishing a niche, which is pivotal in English RAIs. In this context, English authors sometimes employ Move 2, Counter-claiming, while another study indicates a research gap in 29 of the 30 English RAIs (Lim, 2012). In contrast, Indonesian RAIs justify their study by presenting real-world phenomena, government documents, problematic issues from the field, and the interestingness of the topics. By doing so, the authors expect to attract readers to read their papers. These findings seem similar to the Thai RAIs in that they also do not interact with the literature, so they also do not show the knowledge gaps (Amnuai & Wannaruk, 2013).

The present findings also revealed that the communicative purpose of English and Indonesian RAIs in reviewing the literature is different. In English RAIs, reviewing the literature, evaluating the literature, and being critical of the literature is pivotal to establishing a research niche and, or finding out the research gaps. Besides, English RAIs review the literature to provide knowledge backgrounds to determine their research territory (see Mirahayuni, 2002, p. 48), evaluate previous research's weaknesses (Safnil, 2000), and fill the research gap (Swales, 1990). Maswana et al. (2015) also found that this purpose is also crucial in the RAIs published in English international journals. On the other hand, Indonesian RAIs in the present study also review the literature, but their purposes are not to evaluate or find a research gap. They aim to ensure that their study is new and has no duplication. They employed citations to promote their ideas, justify their position (Arsyad & Adila, 2018), convince the readers that they have sufficient knowledge to do the research (Arsyad, 2000), and present the interestingness of the topic being discussed. They tended to make a subjective claim to demonstrate their research interest and then shed light on their research territory (see Mirahayuni, 2002, p. 48). Thus, these results indicate that the communicative purpose for reviewing the literature differs between English and Indonesian RAIs. English RAIs are similar to those in the CARS model in Swales (1990) and the international journals (Maswana et al., 2015), while Indonesian RAIs want to ensure their current study is new.

These results seem to support the earlier studies in genre analyses of Indonesian RAIs, such as those presented by Adnan (2009, 2010, 2011), Mirahayuni (2002), Arsyad (2013c), Arsyad and Adila (2018), and (Warsidi, 2023; Warsidi et al., 2023) that the Indonesian RAIs have different generic

microstructures from the English RAIs as found in the CARS model. The first difference concerns the way of presenting the research territory and niche establishment. The Indonesian authors in the present study justify their research by describing the current situation and stating the interestingness of the study. These findings are similar to earlier Indonesian RAI studies that Indonesian authors also justify their study by expressing their experiences, realities found in the fields, or government documents, not referencing previous relevant studies (Adnan, 2009; Arsyad, 2013a; Arsyad & Arono, 2016; Mirahayuni, 2002). They are primarily based on real-world phenomena or problems on the ground bases to state the interestingness of the topic under research. In contrast, English RAIs employed counter-claiming, indicating gaps, and continuing tradition to establish a niche. The reasons for these differences are much influenced by five possible factors: practical factors, journal conventions, writing traditions or writing styles, disciplinary conventions, and government policies (Adnan, 2010; Warsidi, 2021).

Surprisingly, this difference does not only happen between the Indonesian and English RAs, but it also occurs in various language backgrounds, particularly the rear of employing Move 2 of the CARS model, establishing a niche. For example, differences were found between the English and Spanish RAIs (Sheldon, 2011), English and Swedish RAIs (Fredrickson & Swales, 1994), English and Philippine RAIs (Anthony & Sajed, 2017), English and French RAIs (Helal, 2014), English and Malaysian RAIs (Ahmad, 1997), and many more. Hence, the variation was also discovered across disciplines, for example, between Applied Linguistics and Chemistry disciplines, more specifically at the step and sub-step levels (Afshar et al., 2018), and between English Language Teaching (ELT) and Civil Engineering RAIs (Abdullah, 2016).

However, the RAs published in the high index journals follow the CARS model. For example, English and Persian Dentistry RAIs published in high and well-known journals are similar to the CARS model (Farnia & Rahimi, 2017). Besides, 73% of the 150 Malaysian English RAIs in the Computer Science discipline published in the Scopus index journals also employ a step of indicating a research gap in the Swales' CARS model (Suryani et al., 2015). Therefore, all this evidence suggests that authors who publish their RAs in high-index journals adopt the English writing tradition.

After presenting research findings and discussing them with literature, the rhetorical structures of English RAIs written by ENSs are similar to the CARS model. However, they differ from Indonesian RAIs written by INSs in the History discipline. This finding suggests that the rhetorical structures become a challenge for Indonesian authors in this selected discipline when they want their RAs to get published in English high-indexed journals.

Conclusion

Finding the research gaps in the literature review has encouraged us to conduct the present study, analyzing rhetorical structures of English and Indonesian RAIs in the History discipline. The purpose is to discover their rhetorical models and the differences between them. Our data analysis showed two significant findings for the conclusion. Firstly, our data analyses found that the rhetorical structures of English RAIs in the present study are similar to those found in the CARS model (Swales, 1990), while the rhetorical structures of Indonesian RAIs are different from the model. This finding indicates that they have different rhetorical models. Rhetorical differences with those in English RAIs also happen in several cultures, such as those found in French RAIs (Helal, 2014), Filipino RAIs (Anthony & Sajed, 2017), and Spanish RAIs (Sheldon, 2011). However, most RAIs published in international and English high-indexed journals tend to employ the CARS model. Secondly, our analysis also revealed that Indonesian RAIs in the History discipline have their own rhetorical model, as presented in Figure 1, and this model best captured all Indonesian RAIs in the History discipline of the present study.

These findings draw implications theoretically and practically. Theoretically, the present research findings imply that genre depends on the discourse community. For example, our data analysis revealed that English RAIs created in one community have different rhetorical structures from Indonesian RAIs in another community. Practically, from the English teachers' perspectives, these results become challenges for Indonesian authors in the History discipline to comprehend and consider the rhetorical structures of English RAIs (as a discourse community) when they intend to publish academic papers in English index journals. Besides, these results may also contribute to English teachers and lecturers designing teaching materials for publishing purposes.

However, the present study has limitations. It only focuses on the rhetorical structures of English and Indonesian RAIs in the History discipline. As it has a limitation, it draws recommendations for further research to determine whether these and earlier research findings will be similar to further findings. Firstly, it recommends further contrastive genre studies of English and Indonesian RAs on the other sections or other disciplinary RAIs that have never been investigated earlier. Then, it also suggests conducting subsequent analyses in the more extensive corpus studies to confirm the present findings.

Acknowledgements

About the Authors

Warsidi: A senior lecturer at the English Literature Study Program of Universitas Islam Makassar, Indonesia. His PhD study focused on the genre of research articles. His research interests include genre analysis of research articles, academic writings, and designing English teaching materials and methods.

Zifirdaus Adnan: An Associate Professor, associated with the University of New England, Armidale, NSW, Australia. He has published many works in journals of English as an additional language in research publication and communication, The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly, Australian Review of Applied Linguistics, and Studies in English Language and Education. His research interests are genre analysis in research articles, critical discourse analysis, etc.

Vegneskumar Maniam: A senior lecturer at the University of New England, Armidale, NSW, Australia. He has published his works in the Postcolonial Direction in Education and Qualitative Sociology Review journals. His areas of research interest are Postcolonial Studies, Critical Discourse Analysis and Adult Education, and Multicultural Education.

References

Abdullah, S. (2016). An analysis of cross-discipline research article introduction structures through a modified create-a-research-space (CARS) model. *EFL JOURNAL, 1*(1), 1-16. https://doi.org/10.21462/eflj.v1i1.1

Adnan, Z. (2008). Discourse structure of Indonesian research article introductions in selected hard sciences. In S. B. a. P. Martin-Martin (Ed.), *English as an additional language in research publication and communication* (pp. 39-64). Peter Lang.

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

Afrizon, E., & Arsyad, S. (2018). A discourse analysis of rhetorical style in research article introduction in law studies written by international authors. *Journal of English Education and Teaching, 2*(4), 84-102. https://doi.org/10.33369/jeet.2.4.84-102

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. Retrieved from https://www.sid.ir/paper/673329/en

Ahmad, U. K. (1997). Research article introductions in Malay: Rhetoric in an emerging research community. In A. Duszak (Ed.), *Culture and styles of academic discourse* (pp. 273-303). Mouton de Gruyter.

Amnuai, W., & Wannaruk, A. (2013). A move-based analysis of the conclusion sections of research article published in international and Thai journals. *3L: The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies, 19*(2), pp, 53-63.

Anthony, P., & Sajed, S. I. (2017). Genre analysis of linguistics research introductions. *University of Mindanao International Multidisciplinary Research Journal, 2*(1), 1-12.

Arsyad, S. (2000). *Rhetorical structure analysis of the Indonesian research articles* 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. Retrived from 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. (2014). The discourse structure and linguistic features of research article abstracts in English by Indonesian academics. *Online Submission, 10*(2), 191-223.

Arsyad, S., & Adila, D. (2018). Using local style when writing in English: The citing behaviour of Indonesian authors in English research

article introductions. *Asian Englishes, 20*(2), 170-185.
https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2017.1327835

Arsyad, S., & Arono. (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., Ramadhan, S., & Maisarah, I. (2020). 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. Retrived from
https://caes.hku.hk/ajal/index.php/ajal/article/view/716

Arsyad, S., & Zainil, Y. (2023). Research gap strategies in article
introductions of different rank applied linguistics journals. *Studies in
English Language and Education, 10*(1), 216-234.
https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v10i1.25302

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. Retrieved from
https://relp.isfahan.iau.ir/article_533644_042bfd33027afad954b4be
3ee7f5995c.pdf

Fredrickson, K., & Swales, J. (1994). Competition and discourse
community: Introductions from Nysvenska studier. In P. L. B. N. E.
In B. L. Gunnarsson (Ed.), *Text and talk in professional contexts* (pp. 9-
22). ASLA. Retrieved from https://www.diva-
portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1412770/FULLTEXT01.pdf#page=18

Helal, F. (2014). Genres, styles and discourse communities in global
communicative competition: The case of the Franco–American
'AIDS War'(1983–1987). *Discourse Studies, 16*(1), 47-64.
https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445613496352

Hunston, S. (2002). Evaluation and organization in a sample of written
academic discourse. In M. Coulthard (Ed.), *Advances in written text
analysis* (pp. 205-232). Routledge.

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

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

Maswana, S., Kanamaru, T., & Tajino, A. (2015). Move analysis of research articles across five engineering fields: What they share and what they do not. *Ampersand, 2*, 1-11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amper.2014.12.002

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

Safnil, S. (2013). A genre-based analysis on the introductions of research articles written by Indonesian academics. *TEFLIN Journal, 24*(2), 180-200.

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

Samraj, B. (2002). Introductions in research articles: Variations across disciplines. *English for Specific Purposes, 21*(1), 1-17. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(00)00023-5

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

Suryani, I., Kamaruddin, H., Hashima, N., Yaacob, A., Rashid, S. A., & Desa, H. (2013). Rhetorical structures in academic research writing by non-native writers. *International Journal of Higher Education, 3*(1), 19-38. https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v3n1p29

Suryani, I., Yaacob, A., & Abd Aziz, N. H. (2015). "Indicating a research gap" in computer science research article introductions by non-native English writers. *Asian Social Science, 11*(28), 293-302. https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v11n28p293

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

Warsidi. (2021). *Rhetorical Patterns of Indonesian Research Articles in Law and History Disciplines: A Genre-Based Analysis* [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/https://doi.org/10.33369/joall.v8i2.26491

Warsidi, W., Irawan, A. M., Adnan, Z., & Samad, I. A. (2023). Citation studies in English vs. Indonesian research article introductions

(RAIs) in the history discipline. *Studies in English Language and Education, 10*(2), 598-613. https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v10i2.28343