



P-ISSN 2355-2794
E-ISSN 2461-0275

Potential Factors Influencing the Rhetorical Patterns of Research Article Discussion Sections

Lulus Irawati*

Post Graduate Program, Universitas Persatuan Guru Republik Indonesia (PGRI)
Madiun, Madiun 63118, INDONESIA

Abstract

The present study reports potential factors influencing the rhetorical patterns of research articles (RA) discussion sections. The study was conducted by utilizing descriptive qualitative research. The researcher purposefully focused on investigating 10 bilingual writers who wrote both one English and one Indonesian research article. The selected writers were those who had an educational background in language and language teaching. The interviews covered the interviewees' background information, current activities, writing activities, and their rhetorical patterns of discussion sections. The interviews were conducted by utilizing the snowball technique to search for more information. The interview data were analyzed into some steps namely, transcribing the interview data, organizing data, summarizing data, and interpreting data. All data transcription was then categorized and coded. Research findings revealed that the writers' choice of move structure could be as a result of learning from other people's rhetorical patterns, believing themselves, having high self-confidence, having high writing frequency, and having high awareness in the micro and macrostructure of writing discussion sections. The Indonesian writers have opened their minds to learn and read other researchers' articles and then determine whether the patterns are suitable for them or not. The writers' starting point of experiencing to have their RA published made them believe in themselves and felt self-confident. Thus, the more they wanted to write RA, the higher they had writing frequency and awareness in the micro and macrostructure of writing discussion sections.

* Corresponding author, email: lulusirawati@unipma.ac.id

Citation in APA style: Irawati, L. (2022). Potential factors influencing the rhetorical patterns of research article discussion sections. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 9(1), 115-131.

Received June 8, 2021; Revised October 2, 2021; Accepted December 1, 2021; Published Online January 17, 2022

<https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v9i1.21267>

Keywords: Bilingual writers, potential factors; discussion sections, research articles, rhetorical patterns.

1. INTRODUCTION

In publishing a research article, the discussion section becomes one of the challenging sections. Some research articles exhibit the discussion section combined with the Results section, and the others show the discussion and result sections separately. However, [Swales \(1990\)](#) states the discussion section starts from elaborating the results themselves to placing them within the established literature and to reviewing their general significances. The foundation to write the discussion section is by inserting the results based on the research questions. Thus, it is in contrast to the introduction section that comprises elaboration of general overview based on the previous research.

In the past decades, many researchers have been challenged to investigate rhetorical patterns of the research article sections, especially introduction and discussion sections ([Amirian et al., 2008](#); [Arsyad, 2013](#); [Basthomi, 2006](#); [Holmes, 1997](#); [Hopkins & Dudley-Evans, 1988](#); [Mirahayuni, 2002](#); [Peacock, 2002](#); [Swales, 1990](#)). In the wider contexts, there are many models used to analyze the rhetorical patterns of RA discussion sections. [Hopkins and Dudley-Evans \(1988\)](#) show that there are eleven moves found in the RA discussion sections. Meanwhile, [Swales \(1990\)](#) has suggested that there are eight moves found in the RA discussion sections. In the Indonesian context, some studies are to investigate both introduction and discussion sections viewed from the difference or similarities of Indonesian and English RAs' patterns ([Arsyad, 2013](#); [Basthomi, 2006](#); [Mirahayuni, 2002](#)). All in all, the previous studies above mostly focused on the rhetorical patterns of the RA discussion sections and identify how the patterns flowed. The studies did not investigate further whether the differences and similarities of the rhetorical patterns were found in the RA discussion section written by an individual or team writer.

Furthermore, investigating English and Indonesian RA discussion sections written by different writers shows the differences and similarities of rhetorical patterns of RA discussion sections. The studies only focus on the patterns without digging into the reasons for using the patterns. There are some interesting parts inquired in line to the previous studies that one writer has different educational and linguistic backgrounds, she/he is from a different country, she/ he is a native or non-native speaker, and she/he uses the writing style suggested by the selected journals. The rhetorical patterns found can be a result of the way the writers use the language since they write using different languages that have certain patterns. It is a matter of what they know but they do not want to use it or they can, but they prefer not to do it. Accordingly, the present study is to investigate potential factors influencing bilingual writers in writing their discussion sections of English and Indonesian research articles. This study uses the rhetorical patterns of English and Indonesian RA discussion sections written by the same bilingual writers as a basis for investigating the factors influencing their choice of rhetorical patterns. The writers can consciously or unconsciously choose particular patterns of their discussion sections as they write and can be influenced by their cultural, psychological, and linguistic backgrounds. Thus,

the research question is: What are potential factors influencing the rhetorical patterns of research article discussion sections?

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Models in Rhetorical Patterns of Discussion Sections

There are at least four models mostly used by previous researchers in investigating the rhetorical patterns of discussion sections. [Hopkins and Dudley-Evans \(1988\)](#) serve that the discussion sections of research articles and dissertations are not linear, but cyclical in terms of the choice of moves. This, then, results in the development of a model to analyze discussion sections consisting of eleven moves:

- Background information
- Statement of results
- (Un) expected outcome
- Reference to the previous research
- Explanation of unsatisfactory result
- Exemplification
- Deduction
- Hypothesis
- Reference to previous research
- Recommendation
- Justification

Furthermore, [Holmes \(1997\)](#) investigates the structure of RA discussion sections in three disciplines by using [Hopkins and Dudley-Evans' \(1988\)](#) modified model. Holmes found that there are fundamental similarities and some distinctive features of moves in the three disciplines. Similarly, [Amirian et al. \(2008\)](#) analyze the discussion sections of applied linguistics RAs by using [Hopkins and Dudley-Evans \(1988\)](#) model and reveal considerable differences across the three corpora regarding the generic features under investigation.

Meanwhile, there is a model used by [Peacock \(2002\)](#). He uses [Hopkins and Dudley-Evans' \(1988\)](#) revised model consisting of moves:

- Information move
- Statement of result
- Finding
- (Un) expected outcome
- Reference to previous research
- Explanation
- Claim
- Limitation
- Recommendation

[Peacock \(2002\)](#) has analyzed 252 RA discussion sections of seven disciplines (36 from each discipline). He reports that several marked interdisciplinary and NS/NNS differences are found in the type and number of moves and move cycles. All in all, [Hopkins and Dudley-Evans' \(1988\)](#) model is greatly focused on the result of the analysis of moves cycles.

Another model used in the previous research is CARS (Create a Research Space) to also analyze the RA discussion section. It has been developed by [Swales \(1990\)](#) consisting of moves:

- Background information
- Statement of the results
- (Un) expected outcome
- Reference to previous research
- Explanation
- Exemplification
- Deduction and Hypothesis
- Recommendation

The model, then, is seen in the research of [Mirahayuni \(2002\)](#) and [Rakhmawati \(2013\)](#), that investigate the generic structure of English RAs that focus on the Introduction and Discussion sections between English (native) and Indonesian (non-native) writers in contributing to their acceptance for international publication. They report that RA introduction sections consistently exhibit moves based on Swales' and RA discussion sections employ the various number of moves, ranging from four to seven moves.

2.2 Models in Rhetorical Patterns of Discussion Sections on Other Disciplines

Other researchers also execute Swales' model for discussion sections analysis on various disciplines. According to [Basturkmen \(2012\)](#), the discussion sections can largely be accounted for in terms of moves and steps in the framework (thus indicating a broadly similar rhetorical organization). [Arsyad \(2013\)](#) analyzes 47 selected RAs published mainly in university-based journals in Indonesia from social science and humanity disciplines, and reports that there is no significant difference of the move structures in the Indonesian RAs and the fields of discipline. Furthermore, [Maswana et al. \(2015\)](#) report that among 67 engineering RAs of five sub-disciplines, they found that no common move pattern exists throughout the paper across the sub-disciplines. Thus, the moves in Swales' model can be found either at eight moves altogether or less than eight moves.

The other models also used to analyze the RA discussion sections are [Nwogu's \(1997\)](#) and [Kanoksilapatham's \(2003\)](#) models. Both models are executed to analyze not only one section of RA, but also all sections of RA, namely Introduction, Method, Results, and Discussion. Both models, therefore, provide more than eight moves. [Nwogu \(1997\)](#) reports that an eleven-move schema has been identified and there are three moves in the discussion section, namely highlighting the overall research outcome, explaining specific research outcomes, and stating research conclusions. Similarly, [Kanoksilapatham \(2005\)](#) who has investigated 60 biochemistry RAs, informs 15 distinct moves: three moves for the Introduction section, four for the Method section, four for the Results section, and four for the Discussion section, to capture a basic yet complete and representative template of rhetorical organization. In summary, the two models are still well-known for analyzing articles in the field of science such as the medical and biochemistry paper.

The rhetorical patterns of the discussion section are merely a writer's choice based on his/her field of community. The authors at least master two or more languages that help them compose written information for a particular community or context.

Canagarajah (2006) reports that in the multilingual orientation, differences are seen as choice/option, a writer is rhetorically creative and as an agent, writing focuses on rhetorical context and writers construct multiple identities. The different choice of operating the rhetorical patterns is therefore not categorized as deficiency or errors. It becomes one of the factors influencing the writers during writing, especially journal articles. Moreover, one's cultural background also becomes a factor that can influence a writer's written products. Liu (2007), for instance, shares information that Chinese writers prefer to use the strategy of an indirect approach to realize their intention of criticizing or enlightening a certain audience without making the audience offended. Thus, there is an interrelationship between fundamental cultural values and the rhetorical patterns chosen in the written or spoken products. To sum up, the present study attempts to further investigate not only the existence of moves or rhetorical patterns as reported by the previous research but also the factors that might influence the choice of rhetorical patterns of Indonesian academicians.

2. METHODS

The study was conducted by utilizing descriptive qualitative research. The move analysis was employed to know the rhetorical pattern of RA discussion sections before the researcher interviewed the Indonesian bilingual writers. To analyze moves, the researcher analyzed their discussion sections by using Swales (1990) model, the so-called CARS consisting of eight moves in the RA discussions sections:

- Background information (I)
- Statement of the results (II)
- (Un) expected outcome (III)
- Reference to previous research (IV)
- Explanation (V)
- Exemplification (VI)
- Deduction and Hypothesis (VII)
- Recommendation (VIII)

Then, the content analysis was used to examine the interview results to describe and interpret the data naturally.

The source of data consisted of 10 bilingual writers as the researcher purposefully selected and focused on those who had written one English RA and one Indonesian RA. Those research articles should have been published in Indonesian academic journals accredited at levels 1-4 by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology from the past 10 years.

The selected writers were those who had an educational background in language and language teaching. Most writers earned doctoral degrees and only one is a doctoral candidate. In other words, the writers of RAs were selected from those who have mastered Linguistics, Applied Linguistics, and TEFL linear to their educational background. The writers come from different domicile areas of Indonesia. The interview guide covered the interviewees' background information, current activities, writing activities, and their rhetorical patterns of discussion sections. The interviews were conducted by utilizing a snowball technique that could help the researcher obtain more detailed information.

The data were initially collected by conducting move analysis on the RA discussion sections and then, the researcher interviewed 10 bilingual writers (A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, A6, A7, A8, A9, and A10). The move analysis showed that the distribution of each move was found in the writers' RA discussion sections. It also informed each writer's move structure of his/her RA discussion section. Table 1 showed the general move structures and their distribution in English RA discussion sections, and Table 2 showed general move structures and their distribution in Indonesian RA discussion sections. The move structures represented the flow of moves of RA discussion sections; meanwhile, the distribution informed the number of move occurrences in the RA discussion sections. The researcher used the analysis to guide the interview to be more focused, and later be the stimulated recall interview.

Table 1. Results of general move structure and their distribution in English RA Discussion sections.

Data	Move Structures	Move I	Move II	Move III	Move IV	Move V	Move VI	Move VII	Move VIII
A1	VII-II-V-IV-III-V-IV-V-IV-V-II-V-VIII-IV-VII	-	2	1	4	5	-	2	1
A2	II-VII-II-II-V-III-VI-V-III-VI-III-V-II-V-II-III-IV-V-II-V-VI-V-VII	-	6	4	1	7	3	2	-
A3	I-II-IV-V-II-VI-II-VI-III-II-VI-II-II-IV-II-III-IV-II-V-VI-V-V-II-V-III-V-II-V-II-IV-V-VI-II-V-VI-VII	1	12	3	4	9	6	1	-
A4	I-II-V-VII-V-VII-V	1	1	-	-	2	-	2	-
A5	VII-IV-V-II-III-V-VIII-II-IV-V-VII-V-II-V-II-V-II-V-VII-V-IV-V-IV-V-VII	-	5	1	4	11	-	4	1
A6	I-II-VII-II-II-VII-IV-V-III-II-VII-V-IV-V-II-VII-V-VIII-III-II-VII-IV-VII-II-IV-V-VII-IV	1	7	2	5	5	-	7	1
A7	II-III-IV-V-II-V-II-III-IV-V-VII-IV-V-II-V-IV-VII	-	4	2	4	5	-	2	-
A8	II-IV-V-III-IV-III-IV-V-VI	-	1	2	3	2	1	-	-
A9	II-V-IV-III-IV-V-III-IV-VII	-	1	2	3	2	-	1	-
A10	I-II-IV-V-III-V-IV	1	1	1	2	2	-	-	-
Total		4	40	19	30	50	10	20	3

Table 2. Results of general move structure and their distribution in Indonesian RA Discussion sections.

Data	Move Structures	Move I	Move II	Move III	Move IV	Move V	Move VI	Move VII	Move VIII
A1	VII-II-V-IV-V-II-III-IV-V-II-V-VI-II-VII	-	4	1	2	4	1	2	-
A2	II-V-IV	-	1	-	1	1	-	-	-
A3	II-VII-II-V-IV-V-II-V-IV-VII-V-III-VII-IV-VI-V-IV-IV-III-IV-VII-IV-V-VII-II-V-III-IV-VII-II-VII-V-IV-VII	-	5	3	10	9	1	8	-
A4	II-V-IV-II-IV-V-VI-III-V-IV-V-IV-V-II-IV-VI-V-VII-III-VI-VII-V-II-VI-V-II-V-VI-VII-IV-VII-II-VI-II-V-V-II-VI-V-II-V-VII	-	9	2	6	13	9	5	-
A5	II-V-VII-V-VII-II-VII-V-VII-V-II-III-V-VII	-	3	1	-	5	-	5	-
A6	II-V-IV-II-V-II-V-IV-IV-I-II-VI-V-V-VI-V-V-VI-V-II-II-V-V-VI-V-VI-VI-VII-IV-II-V-II-II-IV-II-V-II-V-VII-IV-IV-II-V-II-III-IV-II-V-II-VII-IV-II-IV-II-V-II-III-IV-II-VII-IV	1	19	2	12	17	6	4	-
A7	II-V-II-V-III-II-V-II-III-V-III-V-II-V-VII-III-IV-II-II-VII-V-VII-II-V-VII-I-I-IV-VII-V-III-V-III-V-VII-IV	2	8	6	3	12	-	6	-
A8	I-II-IV-V-III-V-IV	1	1	1	2	2	-	-	-
A9	II-III-V-VI-III-V-VI-III-VI	-	1	3	-	2	3	-	-
A10	II-III-V-IV-VI-IV-VII-IV-V-VII	-	1	1	3	2	1	2	-
Total		4	52	19	39	67	21	32	-

The interview data were analyzed into some steps namely, transcribing the interview data, organizing data, summarizing data, and interpreting data. First, the

interview data, which are recorded, were played and transcribed. In this analysis, the researcher transcribed all data without reduction, yet. After that, the researcher organized the data by re-reading all data taken from the interview and field notes. The data were categorized and coded. Then, she selected and reduced the data, and selected only were useful and important data to answer the research question. By so doing, she then extended her activities to understand the selection of the data that had been put in the same categories. She also looked for the links or connections among them. Moreover, she drew some statements related to the connections within the data of the same or different categories and patterns. Last but not least, she continued to search the meaning behind the data and interpreted them to answer the research questions. The data could cast light on her ideas to generate a theory showing the relationship among the categories and patterns.

The trustworthiness was prominent to be utilized since the present study tended to be subjective, in the case of analyzing the data. There are three components of trustworthiness demanding attention namely, credibility, dependability, and conformability. To address credibility, the researcher conducted triangulation on the data and method. She did moves analysis of English and Indonesian RA discussion sections written by the same Indonesian writers and the raw results of the analysis were shared and discussed with the Indonesian writers as informants. The raw results came up as one of the topics for interviewing the RA writers. In dependability and conformability, she relied on an independent audit of the research method by a competent peer. These activities were done by a practicing professional in the field of language and language teaching. Soon after she completed the data analysis and wrote the sets of results and discussion, the auditor carefully examined her audit trail consisting of the original transcripts, data analysis documents, field notes, and the text of the present study itself. The auditor also examined dependability and conformability, completeness, and availability of proper documents.

4. RESULTS

Some potential factors appear in the writers' RA discussion sections analysis and interview results that are importantly connected to answer in what way the bilingual writers write their English and Indonesian RA discussion sections. They were educational background and interests, learning other people's rhetorical patterns, beliefs, and self-confidence, writing frequency, awareness in micro and macrostructure of writing.

4.1 Educational Background and Interests

It is not excessively said that one's rhetorical pattern is shaped by his/her educational background. The bilingual writers in the present study consciously confess that the way they write research articles was influenced by their educational background. What they obtained from their educational process, automatically became their habits and led them to build their rhetorical pattern of writing. They realized that their ways of writing were shaped by their interests in the field of research. The writers were in the specialty of ELT (English Language Teaching), Applied Linguistics, and Linguistics. They were more comfortable writing their RA discussion sections

integrated with results or findings since they think integrating both result and discussion sections were something simpler and did not need a lot of space.

Since all writers were bilingual scholars, they were good at using not only their first language, Indonesian but also English. Accordingly, it happened since they all graduated from the English Department who were interested in the research field of either linguistics or language teaching. The use of English alongside Indonesian was something usual and can be interchangeable. They confirmed by stating in their interview result (E refers to Excerpt, W refers to writer participant):

E1 “There is no difference between writing English RA and Indonesian RA”. (W1)

Again, they stated that their writing patterns of English RA and Indonesian RA were not very different. They keep organizing their writing patterns concerning English writing patterns, although the data or the research results are reported in Indonesian.

4.2 Learning from Other People’s Rhetorical Patterns

One’s rhetorical pattern can be shaped by learning from other people’s rhetorical patterns. One of the writers explicitly stated that she wanted to play safe about her desire of publishing RA in nationally accredited journals. She tended to follow writing patterns required by the journal and also stated her comfortable choice in reporting results integrated within the discussion section. However, most writers learned from other people’s RA in a journal that integrating results and discussion was considered as something usual. They understood that the results were different from the discussion viewed from the contents. The results section was a report stating pure and original results, free of the RA writer’s point of view, while the discussion contains a further elaboration of implied messages behind the results. It assumes that identifying results apart from the discussion is not seen from the markers, but the flow of rhetorical patterns appears in the result and discussion.

The writers also informed that the way other researchers organize their rhetorical patterns could inspire them to have RA ideas.

E2 “...it can be inspired by other researchers who have special ways or pattern or something important, that we can use them as a trigger to search ideas...”. (W2)

Based on E2, their research ideas that were derived from other RA writers could influence their rhetorical patterns. It shows that they found out the implied patterns of others’ RAs as tricks or tips to organize interesting ideas. In conclusion, all 10 Indonesian writers consciously shaped their rhetorical patterns as a result of learning and reading many RAs from various journals.

4.3 Belief and Self-Confidence

Some writers’ beliefs and self-confidence came up to the surface as their writings were successfully published in journals for the first time. They were more motivated and felt confident to write more RAs. The feeling of happiness became the indicator. It made them continue to write and send the articles to be published since they had got their flow of writing article patterns. They were first successful in making their RA

accepted by the journals, became the basis of making other RAs, and continued the writing activity as a target to be achieved in the next semesters or years to come. By realizing these confidences, they automatically started to shape their rhetorical patterns.

Other writers did not directly express their beliefs and self-confidence but had them. W3 unswervingly stated that she felt comfortable with the pattern of writing integrated results and discussion. It is seen from the following excerpt:

E3 “I was comfortable to integrate result and discussion since there was always result inside discussion”. (W3)

The expression in E3 indirectly shows her belief and self-confidence. Similarly, W5 only stated that he learned how to write an article because he needed it for his studies (i.e., postgraduate degree) overseas. Besides, there are also worth journal articles learned to support the writers’ rhetorical pattern choices. This is similar to what is said in E4.

E4 “I learned good articles when I was in postgraduate, and I had found my pattern of writing, I only needed to search more creative ideas”. (W5)

E4 expressed how W5’s belief about his study qualification contributed to his belief in writing articles. Hence, no matter what kind of belief it is, it can shape their rhetorical patterns at the end. Belief, happiness, comfort, and self-confidence were some unique feelings that existed as internal factors that stimulated each of them to write more and to shape their rhetorical pattern.

4.4 Writing Frequency

The saying ‘practice makes perfect’ is a suitable word for one’s efforts to make his/her work to become better. It is similarly needed to improve one’s ability or skill, that is writing skill. The more frequent one writes; the more qualified his/her writing products will be. By doing so, one person can establish his/her rhetorical pattern.

The writers’ frequency of writing did not only refer to RA, but also conceptual articles, research reports for a grant, books, and book reviews. One of the writers confessed that his writing activities are in the form of articles published in academic journals and mass media (i.e., national newspapers), as quoted from the excerpt:

E5 “I sent my conceptual articles to Jawa Post or Malang Post”. (W4)

From E5, he was not only writing research articles, but also conceptual articles. Similarly, the rest of the writers also shared information that at the beginning, they wrote the conceptual articles to be sent to the journals. They then treated writing articles as a routine of their professional life by planning to write one or two articles a year. It is seen from the number of articles published in journals ranging from about 18-50 articles. This implies that their rhetorical patterns were settled as a result of being active in writing write RAs. As quoted in E6:

E6 “I, fortunately, have written 50 articles”. (W6)

4.5 Awareness in Micro and Macrostructure of Writing

The rhetorical pattern can also be seen in the way the writers organize the micro and macrostructure in their RAs consciously. Microstructure in RA includes the use of word choice, hedging, discourse markers, and sentence forms, while macrostructure is a pattern organizing the order structure of an RA, in which each section in an RA has its macrostructure. According to Swales (1990), this RA macrostructure is called moves. The micro and macro structures are the ones that appear in the discussion section or/and integrated result and discussion section. Through having the awareness above, the writers can make their rhetorical patterns settled.

W1 confirms that he operated the same moves either in English RA discussion and Indonesian RA discussion sections. He informed that the flow of writing discussion sections starts from explaining the results, relating to the previous research or theories, and at last, showing implications theoretically and practically. He added that the difficult part of the move in his English RA discussion is Move VII (Deduction and hypothesis) since the move contains a claim based on findings or results. He chose a better and convenient formula, by using the auxiliary ‘may’ since his findings had limitations. But he never used the word choice ‘may’ for a claim in his Indonesian RA. He thought that Indonesian people seemed often to use the word ‘may’. He, therefore, stated clearly how his findings were like, and what it was useful for.

W3 also commented on the same ideas as W1. She thought that using ‘may’ became an important aspect to show that her findings were not true and using discourse markers while writing integrated results and discussion. It is shown in the excerpt:

E7 ‘This may imply that in Bahasa Indonesia, we can also find universal metaphor...’. (W3)

W3 was aware of using microstructure in both English and Indonesian RAs. She was comfortably expressing the discussion by stating ‘there should be or there might/may be’.

Concerning word choice used in RAs, W3 also confirmed that she used the word ‘may’ to explain the relativity of truth in her research findings. It means that the truth is absolute with some conditions and having an expired limit. The research findings can be broken by others’ studies. This statement refers to her excerpt:

E8 “Since as researchers, we know that our findings have relative truth, our findings can be broken down or debated by other researchers, however, we need to believe that what we found truly happens”. (W3)

In terms of macrostructure or moves, W3 chose to often use Moves I (background information), II (statement of results), IV (reference to previous research), V (explanation), and VI (exemplification). She has her rhetorical pattern concerning her field of study, which is linguistics. She chose not to use Moves VII (deduction and hypothesis) and VIII (recommendation) since her data were empirical, and the readers could also directly interpret them.

Meanwhile, W2 explains that she preferred to use straight expressions to make readers get the points of discussion. She chose not to manipulate the language. W2 was more comfortable and interested in using a kind of transactional language, which was more practical. W2 also stated that she operated an almost similar micro and macrostructure either for her English or Indonesian RAs. Similar information was also

mentioned by W4 that he had not written his English and Indonesian RAs differently, in terms of using micro and macrostructure.

W5 and W8 reported that they used different expressions in both their English and Indonesian RAs. They used the punctuation mark, comma for additional information in writing English RAs. It was such as constructing a clause through omitting the determiner and then, it was replaced by a comma. They did not use this kind of sentence construction in writing their Indonesian RAs. They confirmed that they were aware of the use of microstructure in writing both English and Indonesian RAs.

In terms of macrostructure or moves, W5 and W10 focused more on the existence of Move II (statement of results), Move III ((un) expected outcome), Move IV (reference to previous research), and Move V (explanation). Thus, containing something new also referred to the evidence of expected outcomes or unexpected outcomes. W5 said:

E9 “Good discussion sections are those containing good interpretation from data that have been compared with others’ research, and having something new”. (W5)

To sum up, all 10 writers confirmed that constructing a good discussion section in both English and Indonesian RAs was needed to operate either proper microstructure or macrostructure. The microstructure was used to make the expression or information clearer and softer. Meanwhile, the macrostructure or moves mostly used are Moves II (statement of results), III ((un) expected outcome, IV (reference to previous research), V (explanation), VI (exemplification), and VII (deduction and hypothesis). Organizing both structures properly indicated that they had the awareness to strengthen their rhetorical patterns.

5. DISCUSSION

By using Swales’ (1990) model to analyze the writers’ discussion sections, the move structures or the rhetorical patterns of discussion sections in both English and Indonesian RAs written by the same Indonesian writers were slightly different. However, most moves exist similarly either in the move structure of Indonesian RA discussion sections or in the move structure of English RA discussion sections. Based on the results, it can be postulated that (1) Indonesian writers’ educational background (field of study) supported them to operate different rhetorical patterns of discussion sections of both in English and Indonesian Ras, (2) Indonesian writers’ personality traits supported them to operate different rhetorical patterns of discussion sections of both in English and Indonesian Ras, and (3) Indonesian writers, who have more writing products published, showed more settled rhetorical patterns of discussion sections of both their English and Indonesian RAs.

The writers’ research interests referred to the field of study that most Indonesian writers mastered. Based on the results, it showed that most Indonesian writers investigated in the present study were majoring in English Language Teaching, Linguistics, and Applied Linguistics. The field of studies can be seen from most RAs that they have written in the text analysis and interview results. Among 10 Indonesian writers investigated in the present study, six writers majored in English Language Teaching, two writers majored in Linguistics, and two writers majored in Applied

Linguistics. In other words, the writers' research interests were linear to their educational background.

Nearly all Indonesian writers' participants were convinced that their research interests emerged since they earned their bachelor's degree and started to teach in universities. They got lots of ideas to be inserted into their RAs by observing and getting involved directly with their surroundings. They also read and learned RAs written by other researchers of the same field, to further dig ideas for writing up their RAs. Furthermore, it implies that their research interests determined their choices of writing patterns.

Accordingly, in the field of English Language Teaching, the writers did not operate Move VI (exemplification), containing examples to support the research result. It shows that they presented a research result that was directly followed by Move IV (reference to previous research) or Move V (explanation) in the discussion sections. This is in line with what [Peacock \(2002\)](#) investigates that Move V occurs most in the Language and Linguistics research field. The Indonesian writers informed that the explanation helped to make their readers better understand what they have written since everything was reported in the result section. Furthermore, [Loi et al. \(2015\)](#) also reported that a good discussion is organized logically and based on points stem from the previous research. The Indonesian writers seemed to choose operating discussion sections into something simple, straight, and effective concerning their purposes. Certainly, their choices were influenced either intentionally or unintentionally by their fields of study, research interests, and educational background namely English Language Teaching.

The Indonesian writers from the field of Applied Linguistics started with the same move, Move VII (deduction and hypothesis). The writers seemed to only operate Move VII (deduction and hypothesis) to replace Move II (statement of result) and continue with Move II or Move V (explanation) as mentioned in the field of English Language Teaching. Similarly, [Mirahayuni \(2002\)](#) notifies that the overlap between points found in the summary and the statement in the concluding remark makes it difficult to determine as parts of Move VII or Move II. On the contrary, [Arsyad et al. \(2020\)](#) report that Move II can be seen occurring before Moves IV and V in a purpose to elaborate and justify the findings of the research. Again, [Atai and Falah \(2005\)](#) find that no Move VII occurs in the discussion sections of Applied Linguistic written by Persian native speakers. Thus, the rhetorical pattern chosen by those writers from the field of Applied Linguistics is, then, not too different from that of the field of English Language Teaching.

In the field of Linguistics, the frequency of move occurrences is less than that of other fields in the present study. Based on the results, W3 showed that the discussion section of the field of Linguistics was integrated with the result section. It is, then, convincing that Move VI (exemplification) occurred more in the discussion section of Linguistics. She seemed to make her discussion section clearer by providing examples. In more detail, she also informed that she frequently operated Moves I (background information) to VI (exemplification), but rarely operated Moves VII (deduction and hypothesis) and VIII (recommendation) in the field of Linguistics. Moves VII and VIII are more suitable for applied research. This is supported by [Peacock \(2002\)](#) that Move VII does not occur in the discussion section of the Language and Linguistics and Move IX, similar to Move VIII (in Swales' Model), occurs less in the discussion section of the Language and Linguistics.

Additionally, while these 10 Indonesian writers reported their results and write the discussion sections in the RAs, they operated nearly similar moves indicated as their settled rhetorical patterns. This is assumed to happen because the way they chose moves was consciously based on their field of study. [Canagarajah \(2006\)](#) adds that using English does not mean using a single way of writing, because the same language may be used to construct different texts or specific modes of writing based on the contexts and communities. This implies that the contexts understood by the writers in the present study were their field of study and their selected topic area of the RAs. They may use the same language, L1 (Indonesian) or L2 (English) in their writing, but they may construct different rhetorical patterns.

Personality traits refer to the quality of the writers' feelings and behaviors that highly appear concerning the writing of discussion sections of both in English and Indonesian RAs. These three personality traits were mostly seen during the Indonesian writers when they shared their activities of writing RAs. Firstly, conscientiousness was seen in the Indonesian writers' experiences of writing the discussion sections of English and Indonesian RAs. The writers felt conscious to recognize the differences in the structure or organization of English and Indonesian writings. However, some of them reported that they did not operate different patterns from writing discussion sections of English and Indonesian RAs. It indicates that they could consciously operate English writing patterns while writing either English or Indonesian RAs. This shows that their quality of English and Indonesian RA discussion sections remained similar. Likewise, [van Weijen et al. \(2009\)](#) comment that L2 proficiency is directly related to L2 text quality, while [Djigić et al. \(2014\)](#) and [Guranda \(2014\)](#) show that conscientiousness helped individuals show more willingness to interact with the members of the L2 community and encourage being more competent in L2 learning. Thus, the conscientiousness and writers' L2 proficiency could lead them to operate a particular rhetorical pattern of the discussion sections of English and Indonesian RAs.

Accordingly, some of them showed that they operated different patterns of the discussion sections between English and Indonesian RAs, in terms of linguistic features. The writers' conscientiousness of linguistic features also indicated their loyalty to the Indonesian discourse community with having different cultural backgrounds. It is in line with what [Canagarajah \(2006\)](#) and [Subandrijo and Susilo \(2007\)](#) suggest that the deviations appearing in the texts of multilingual writers are not errors. They are part of the multicultural background of writers that cannot be abandoned.

The second part of the personality is openness. It refers to the way the writers can accept some beneficial information either in oral or written forms. As academics, the writers read and learned many references to search for organizational ideas of writing RAs and reviewing previous RAs. They, then, composed their organization of writing RAs based on each journal's template although RA has a universal organization consisting of Introduction, Review of Literature, Method, Result, Discussion, and Conclusion sections ([Rakhmawati, 2013](#)). The difference is mostly in terms of particular forms of writing, like numbering, size of font, space, etc. Accordingly, the writers still positively took and accepted the particular organization suggested by a particular journal. This openness was something positive that can maintain their competencies in L2 achievement and interact with the L2 community. Again, [Guranda \(2014\)](#) reports that the openness to novelty is associated with

intelligence, creativity, curiosity, and originality. Thus, the writers' personality of openness led them to create RAs containing their creativity and originality.

The last personality part, identified from the results is self-confidence. Self-confidence refers to the writers' feelings about their experiences or some events faced during their professional life. In the SLA (Second Language Acquisition) area, self-confidence comes up in a similar definition to self-esteem in terms of psychological and social phenomenon. This situation makes an individual able to evaluate his/her competence and own self based on some values (Rubio, 2021). Mardiansyah (2018) also shows that there is a significant correlation between self-confidence and essay writing performance. Besides, He (2019) investigates that personality facets, writing strategy use, and writing performance are found to be closely interrelated with one another. It, therefore, perpetuates a starting point to determine the writers' writing activities. As it is found in the result, one of the writers started writing an article published in mass media. It made him self-confident about his written product being read by other people. He, then, wrote an academic article and send it to a journal. It indicates that he found a way to make other people read his writing and he was also able to determine certain patterns of writing.

Meanwhile, the other writers namely, W3, W5, and W6 did not show a direct feeling of self-confidence, concerning their written products. They implicitly showed their self-confidence by having a good educational background and have learned a lot from some international journal articles. They, therefore, felt self-confident when their settled choice of writing patterns grew in line with their educational achievements. By having felt confident, they write both English and Indonesian RAs as often as possible. It is, then, in line with what Djigić et al. (2014) suggest that self-confident people have the advantages of not fearing rejection as much as those with high anxiety levels and they are, therefore more likely to put themselves in a learning situation and to do so repeatedly. With this sort of feeling, the writer participants could become successful and competent users either in their first language or second language.

The writers' consistency of writing refers to the writers' activities in resulting written products. Their writing products can be in the form of research reports for a grant, books, students' textbooks, books review, conceptual articles, and research-based articles. Based on the interview results, nearly all writers were convinced that they would keep writing, no matter what. They set a sort of individual plan to produce written products at least once a year. They reported that they wrote not only academic articles for journals but also popular articles for the newspaper to maintain their productivity and writing consistency. During their professional life, they had produced 18 to 50 articles published in journals and most articles were written in English. All in all, their writing consistency led them to choose English writing patterns, especially for writing RAs.

To sum up, the writers' consistency of producing written products was not only determined by the number of articles that they had written, but also by the passions they have shown to regularly write articles. Their academic environment also supported them to write more articles and research papers and they became more experienced in writing (Harjanto, 1999). It implies that consistency is a result of the repetition of doing the same thing for a long time. It, then, refers to the achievement of learning L1 and L2, the situation in which each person needs to repeat using a language from time to time, to be a fluent and competent user.

6. CONCLUSION

Concerning the results of the study, there are some points included in the conclusion. First, the Indonesian writers' particular educational backgrounds (field of study) supported them to operate different rhetorical patterns of both English and Indonesia RA discussion sections. The particular move, exemplification is found in Linguistics, but rarely found in other fields: ELT and Applied Linguistics. Thus, their research interests allowed the writers to choose certain moves in the discussion section. Second, the selected Indonesian writers' personality traits supported them to operate different rhetorical patterns of both English and Indonesia RA discussion sections. The personality traits that existed within them had helped and guided them to choose the patterns of writing. Thus, the conscientiousness of linguistic features indicated their loyalty as an Indonesian discourse community with having different cultural backgrounds.

Based on the results of this study, determining factors beyond the writing of the discussion section could be traced from the process of producing RA discussion sections through interviewing and noting the writers' experiences. Unfortunately, the researcher has limited situations such as having only ten Indonesian writers who wrote one English and one Indonesian RAs for the moves analysis and interviews and having limited time to crosscheck RAs with the journals' editors to know how far the editors helped them. All in all, the researcher recommends for further research to search more RA discussion sections written by the writers and to interview the journals' editors.

REFERENCES

- Amirian, Z., Kassaian, Z., & Tavakoli, M. (2008). Genre analysis: An investigation of the discussion sections of applied linguistics research articles. *The Asian ESP Journal*, 4(1), 39-63.
- Arsyad, S. (2013). 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., Purwo, B.K., & Adnan, Z. (2020). The argument style in research article discussions to support research findings in language studies. *Studies in Language and Education*, 7(2), 290-307. <https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v7i2.16626>
- Atai, M. R., & Falah, S. (2005, August 2-4). *A contrastive genre analysis of result and discussion sections of applied linguistic research articles written by native and non-native English speakers with respect to evaluated entities and ascribed values* [Paper presentation]. The 10th Conference of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics, Edinburgh University, Edinburgh, United Kingdom.
- Basthomi, Y. (2006). *The rhetoric of research article introductions written in English by Indonesians* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Universitas Negeri Malang.
- Basturkmen, H. (2012). A genre-based investigation of discussion sections of research articles in dentistry and disciplinary variation. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 11(2), 134-144. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2011.10.004>
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2006). Toward a writing pedagogy of shuttling between languages: Learning from multilingual writers. *College English*, 68(6), 589-604. <https://doi.org/10.2307/25472177>

- Djigić, G., Stojiljković, S., & Dosković, M. (2014). Basic personality dimensions and teachers' self-efficacy. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 112, 593-602. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.01.1206>
- Guranda, M. (2014). The importance of adult's personality traits and professional interests in career decision making. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 136, 522-526. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.05.368>
- Harjanto, I. (1999). *English academic writing features by Indonesian learners of English* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Universitas Negeri Malang.
- He, T. (2019). Personality facets, writing strategy use, and writing performance of college students learning English as a foreign language. *SAGE Open*, 9(3). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019861483>
- Holmes, R. (1997). Genre analysis, and the social sciences: An investigation of the structure of research article discussion sections in three disciplines. *English for Specific Purposes*, 16(4), 321-337. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906\(96\)00038-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(96)00038-5)
- Hopkins, A., & Dudley-Evans, T. (1988). A genre-based investigation of the discussion sections in articles and dissertations. *English for Specific Purposes*, 7(2), 113-121. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0889-4906\(88\)90029-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0889-4906(88)90029-4)
- Kanoksilapatham, B. (2003). *A corpus-based investigation of scientific research articles: Linking move analysis with multidimensional analysis* (Order No. 3107368) [Doctoral dissertation, Georgetown University]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.
- Kanoksilapatham, B. (2005). Rhetorical structure of biochemistry research articles. *English for Specific Purposes*, 24(3), 269-292. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2004.08.003>
- Liu, Y. (2007). Cultural factors and rhetorical patterns in classical Chinese argumentation. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, 16(1), 197.
- Loi, C. K., Evans, M. S., Akkakoson, S., Ahmed, S., & Ahmed, S. (2015). Rhetorical patterns in the discussion sections of Malay research articles. *International Journal of Languages, Literature and Linguistics*, 1(2), 118-121. <https://doi.org/10.7763/ijlll.2015.v1.23>
- Mardiansyah, R. (2018). A correlation between self-confidence and essay writing achievement. *Edukasi: Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pengajaran*, 5(2), 154-166. <https://doi.org/10.19109/ejpp.v5i2.2326>
- 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.
- Nwogu, K. N. (1997). The medical research paper: Structure and functions. *English for Specific Purposes*, 16(2), 119-138. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906\(97\)85388-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(97)85388-4)
- Peacock, M. (2002). Communicative moves in the discussion section of research articles. *System*, 30(4), 479-497. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X\(02\)00050-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(02)00050-7)
- Rakhmawati, A. (2013). A comparison of Indonesian and English research articles written by Indonesian academics: Integrating perspectives on genre and

- rhetorical diversity [Doctoral dissertation, University of New England]. Rune. <https://hdl.handle.net/1959.11/16905>
- Rubio, F. (2021). *Self-esteem and foreign language learning*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Subandrijo, E., & Susilo, S. (2007). Thought patterns reflected in the linguistic features in Indonesian and English letters written by Indonesians. *TEFLIN Journal*, 18(1), 43-67.
- Swales, J. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge University Press.
- van Weijen, D., van den Bergh, H., Rijlaarsdam, G., & Sanders, T. (2009). L1 use during L2 writing: An empirical study of a complex phenomenon. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 18(4), 235-250. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2009.06.003>