Rhetorical Convention and Artful Persuasions in RAD:
A Comparative Study between Applied Linguistics and Literature

Andriadi
UIN Fatmawati Sukarno Bengkulu
Corresponding email: andriadi@mail.uinfasbengkulu.ac.id

Abstract

Academic struggles in employing rhetorical convention and persuasive strategies in RAD affect the quality of articles in international journals. However, non-native English literature authors might struggle to produce impactful findings and interpretations in their RAD. The study compares rhetorical conventions and persuasive strategies in RAD between international applied linguistics journals and Indonesian literature publications, analyzing 15 articles from each group (2022-2023). Beforehand, 20% of articles were co-coded, ensuring reliability using Cohen's Kappa coefficient. Results, adhering to Kanoksilapatham's standard (2005), follow Creswell's (2014) recommended systematic analysis steps. Drawing on qualitative content analysis, the findings showed that authors in applied linguistics demonstrate higher consistency in using obligatory conventions, while authors in literature display variations and prefer conventional conventions, potentially influenced by the professional knowledge and skills required for crafting standard RAD. Both authors in applied linguistics and literature journal tend to be minimal in using persuasive strategies. Academic difficulties in employing rhetorical conventions and persuasive strategies in RAD may impact international journal article quality, especially for non-native English literature authors. Recommending targeted training and support for these authors, alongside integrating literary aspects into curricula, can improve publication quality.

Keywords: Rhetorical Convention, Artful Persuasion, RAD.

Introduction

Research Article Discussion (RAD) as the author's rhetorical effort to convince readers of unexpected or extraordinary research findings (Swales, 1990) and space for authors to develop their ideas and interpretations (Boonyuen & Tangkiengsirisin, 2018) presents a significant challenge, particularly for both native and non-native English writers (Swales, 2004). Academic failure in doing rhetorical moves/steps and creating persuasive arguments in RAD impact the quality of articles published in international journals. In addition, non-native authors are often attributed to inappropriate referencing (Arsyad Ramadhan & Maisarah, 2020). Emphasizing the primary purpose of logical writing techniques and providing robust support for claims is essential in RAD. Conventional rhetorical moves and varied persuasive strategies significantly impact the quality of articles in international journals. Therefore, comprehending and studying these conventional moves and persuasive strategies holds high importance.

How to write a RAD section has a significant impact on how readers interpret research results and influences journal publication decisions. Arsyad, Purwo, & Adnan (2020) state that a RAD should be persuasive with well-constructed arguments, requiring the use of appropriate rhetorical style and linguistic tools to ensure that potential readers accept their new knowledge claims. Failing to craft it effectively and persuasively can affect readers' interest in continuing the article; even it may become a reason for journal rejection for publication. Therefore, researchers aiming to publish high-quality articles in international journals need to pay special attention to conventional rhetoric and argument formulation (Malawaet & Trakulkasemsuk, 2021). In other words, the utilization of conventional

rhetoric and readers' positive impressions of the author's findings and interpretations are key factors in creating valuable articles that capture readers' attention and the journal publisher's authority.

Despite numerous studies in international journals by both native and non-native authors, articles on the discussion writing are still scarce. While there have been some prior studies in RAD (Hashemi & Gohari Moghaddam; 2019; Arsyad, Purwo, & Adnan, 2020; Malawaet & Trakulkasemsuk, 2021; Abbasi Montazeri, Jalilifar, & Hita, 2023), none have compared persuasive strategies in applied linguistics RAD sections between native-English-authored articles in international journals and non-native-English-authored literature in Indonesian national journals. It is crucial for proficient native English authors in globally recognized journals, like applied linguistics, to set the benchmark for evaluating less proficient non-native authors (Nodoushan, 2023). Distinct academic backgrounds might utilize varied persuasive strategies to engage readers.

Authors of Research Articles (RAs) attempt to adhere to English RA writing norms to meet reader expectations, particularly those of editors and reviewers. Understanding the rhetorical function aids novice researchers in overcoming barriers, streamlining the RA writing process (Kuhi & Soltani, 2022). Research on the 'discussion' structure is scarce, with Swales and Feak (1994) being early scholars highlighting complexities influenced by research questions, design types, genre, and elements shaping the 'discussion's focus on findings, solutions, or other angles. This indicates that different question types demand authors to focus on RAD for rhetorical conventions and artful persuasion of supporting arguments.

The rhetoric move model developed by Yang and Allison (2003) serves as a roadmap to identify the moves in RAD of RAs. This model was chosen for several reasons: first, Yang and Allison (2003) analyzed a rich corpus of discussions across various genres of applied linguistics (Nodoushan, 2023). Then, other scholars listed elements within scholarly RAs, offering a comprehensive move analysis framework without steps (Swales, 1990; Kanoksilapatham, 2005). Yet, Yang and Allison (2003) proposed a seven-move rhetorical framework that covers multiple steps to describe move/steps of the discussion sub-genre of applied linguistics, making it a more precise and encompassing model in applied linguistics. Yang and Allison (2003) proposed a model for the rhetorical convention of the discussion sub-genre with the following moves and steps:

Table 1: Yang and Allison's (2003) Model for the Rhetorical Move Structure of Discussion

Move	Steps	focus
Move 1	Presenting background information	
Move 2	Reporting result	
Move 3	Summarizing result	
Move 4	Commenting on result	
	Step 1	Interpreting result
	Step 2	Comparing Result with literature
	Step 3	Accounting for result
	Step 4	Evaluating result
Move 5	Summarizing the study	
Move 6	Evaluating study	
	Step 1	Indicating limitation
	Step 2	Indicating significance
	Step 3	Evaluating Methodology
Move 7	Deduction from research	
	Step 1	Making suggestions
	Step 2	Recommending further research
	Step 3	Drawing pedagogic implication

Persuasion is pivotal in academic discourse, embodying a respected rationality linked to absolute truth and empirical evidence (Hyland, 2008). The presentation of research data hinges on how academics articulate claims and seek support through text-practices. Native authors favor complex

language, focusing on interpretation, while non-native authors simplify, emphasizing result comparison and explanations (Al-Shujairi and Al-Manaseer, 2022). The use of reporting verbs and first-person plural pronouns is common in discussions, assisting non-native writers in presenting clear arguments (Jasim, 2023). Hyland (2008) highlights that achieving persuasive goals involves employing stance and engagement in discourse, with forms serving dual functions, such as presenting claims, commenting on truth, building solidarity, and establishing the writer's credibility. In essence, persuasion plays a pivotal role in academic discourse, reflecting a revered model of rationality connected to absolute truth and empirical evidence.

Stance in academic writing involves vital elements like hedges, boosters, attitude markers, and self-mention, impacting interactions and persuasion (Hyland, 2008). English discussions, compared to Malay, emphasize hedging, subtly moderating argument strength (Loi & Lim, 2019). Quantitative applied linguistics articles prioritize reader-oriented hedging, seeking approval (Hashemi & Shirzadi, 2016; Livytska, 2019). Cultural influences on stance markers serve as meta-discourse in research writing (Hashemi & Hosseini, 2019). Despite similar booster usage, hedges and boosters vary across disciplines (Akman & Karahan, 2023). Recognizing these nuances is crucial for researchers navigating persuasive strategies in articles, emphasizing the ongoing exploration of similarities and distinctions in these strategies.

Utilizing reader pronouns, directives, personal asides, and questions establishes disciplinary solidarity and guides interpretations (Hyland, 2008). Experienced authors emphasize engagement markers (EMs) for reader connection (Popa, Blok & Wesselink, 2020). Students favor directive EMs, mirroring experienced authors (Aisyah, Hardiah, & Fadhli, 2022). English writers show higher EM frequency, influenced by linguistic-cultural variations (Tikhonova, Kosycheva & Golechkova, 2023). The widespread use of EMs plays a crucial role in fostering reader engagement and understanding in diverse academic contexts.

This indicates a research gap, suggesting the performance of non-native writers can be compared to native writers using criteria from internationally published benchmark articles. Diverse academic backgrounds may employ varying conventional rhetoric and persuasive strategies, raising questions for further exploration:

1. How is the rhetorical convention in RAD used in applied linguistics articles authored by Native-English speakers and published in internationally renowned journals compared to the application of these in literature written by non-native-English speakers published in Indonesian national journals?
2. Are there any similarity and distinction existing in the persuasive strategies employed in these articles?

Research Method

The research employed a mixed-method approach, combining elements of qualitative and quantitative analysis. It involved collecting a corpus of research articles, analyzing them using a predefined framework, and employing both qualitative and quantitative techniques for data analysis and reliability assessment. In this research, the researchers utilized an analytical framework to identify persuasive strategies and linguistic features, along with data coding to codify the analysis results. Additionally, the researcher employed Cohen's Kappa coefficient to assess inter-rater reliability, which is detailed subsequently.

The Corpus of the Research

The corpus comprises 30 research articles by Indonesian authors in English, with 15 from native-English authors in Applied Linguistics (Q1 international journals) and 15 by non-native authors in Literature (Sinta 2, 3, 4 Indonesian national journals, 2022-2023). Criteria include conventional articles with a discussion section (IMRD structure) and a length of 800 to 1,000 words.

Procedures of Data Analysis

In data analysis, the researcher follows a systematic set of steps recommended by Creswell (2014), which include journal selection, article collection, framework creation, article analysis, data coding, frequency calculation, data comparison, identification of similarities and differences, and the writing of a research report encompassing findings and responses to research questions.

Inter-rater Reliability Analysis

To confirm the coding reliability before the next stage of data analysis, 20 percent of the research articles, which is six research articles (three from each corpus), were coded by a co-coder. The co-coder is a university lecturer with experience in move analysis research. After comparing and discussing the coding results with the co-coder, this study employed Cohen's Kappa coefficient analysis to evaluate the inter-rater reliability of persuasive strategies and linguistic features in the ERR section of RA samples. The description for the Kappa Cohen statistical analysis ranges from 1.00 as the maximum score to 0.00 as the minimum score. A Kappa Cohen score less than 0.40 is considered 'poor,' between 0.40-0.59 is considered 'fair,' between 0.60-0.74 is considered 'good,' and 0.75 or above is considered 'excellent' (Kanoksilapatham, 2005). After comparing the identification results of persuasive strategies and linguistic features in the six samples between the researcher and the co-coder, The Kappa Cohen value, calculated at 0.83, indicates 'excellent' reliability.

Findings

1. The Rhetorical Convention in RAD used in applied linguistics literature Articles.

The rhetorical convention (moves/steps) in RAD performed in applied linguistics articles authored by Native-English speakers and published in internationally renowned journals and literature written by non-native-English speakers published in Indonesian national journals differed in significant ways.

Table 2: Moves and Steps in Applied Linguistics and Literature RAD

Move	Step	Applied Linguistics			Literature		
		F	**%**	**Type**	**F**	**%**	**Type**
1		11	73	Conventional	14	93	Conventional
2		15	100	Obligatory	11	77	Conventional
3		13	87	Conventional	11	77	Conventional
4		15	100	Obligatory	13	87	Conventional
	1	14	93	Conventional	11	73	Conventional
	2	13	87	Conventional	9	60	Conventional
	3	14	93	Conventional	10	67	Conventional
	4	15	100	Obligatory	9	60	Conventional
5		14	93	Conventional	13	87	Conventional
6		15	100	Obligatory	11	73	Conventional
	1	15	100	Obligatory	7	47	Optional
	2	15	100	Obligatory	9	60	Conventional
	3	14	93	Conventional	11	73	Conventional
7		14	93	Conventional	10	67	Conventional
	1	15	100	Obligatory	7	47	Optional
	2	14	93	Conventional	3	20	Optional
	3	9	60	Conventional	5	33	Optional

The table compares move and step frequency between native English-speaking authors in renowned journals and non-native English-speaking authors in Indonesian journals. Native authors use conventions conventionally (73%), while non-native authors exhibit a higher frequency (93%). In reporting and commenting on results, native authors favor obligatory conventions (100%) compared to non-native authors relying on conventional conventions (77%). In concluding steps, native authors use obligatory conventions more frequently, while non-native authors prefer conventional and optional conventions. Overall, the comparison reveals how native and non-native authors apply rhetorical conventions, emphasizing cultural and writing context influence. The realization of the moves and steps found in the RAD as follow:

Table 3: Moves/Steps Found in Literature RAD

Move	Step	Examples Found from the Corpus
1		Among four queens in the analyzed folklore, Queen Kalinyamat, Queen Kencanawungu, and Madam Undang are …
2		Sharma reveals that cultural identity is complicated for individuals who experience conflicting cultures …
3		The hero character in this film fulfills all the characteristics of an adventure genre film. However, what's interesting is …
4		An independent attitude characterizes individuals with a high level of autonomy, can resist social pressures to …
	1	One of many themes of The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn is the clash between civilization life and natural life…
	2	Leigh Teabing who is a researcher of the Holy Grail and he has put all his efforts in this field, he is confident to…
	3	The next feminine trait on Jo March that the writer analyzes is her nurturing and caring nature…
	4	In the feminism perspective, the historical data depicts that four women in the folklore have … Queen Kalinyamat are not emphasized, as a bias of patriarchic power in …
5		In the context of the Javanese culture, it is also essential to explore how …
6		However, the purpose of making the film must be questioned again. If in fact, this film wants to present a new worldview of Native Americans or Indian tribes, then why …
	1	In reality, the Priory of Sion has no plans to reveal …. Marie, Sophie's granddaughter, state that it was... The Priory of Sion is not a faction against the …
	2	If analyzed from the point of view of popular literature, the portrayal of the character Tonto, played by Johnny Depp, is acceptable. This is because…
	3	However, the purpose of making the film must be questioned again. If in fact…
7		According to the feminist perspective, the study discovers that there has been no gender discrimination of …
	1	Women's awareness must be built from the women's unity to fight for their rights…
	2	…Children literature dealing with different cultures or social issues can promote intercultural understand and social justice…
	3	It can be concluded that studying folklore with a feminist perspective will reopen the identity of women in society…

Table 4: Moves/Steps Found in Applied Linguistics RAD

Move	Step	Examples Found from the Corpus

1		The analysis of our data collected among university learners enrolled in an *ab initio* Korean language course shows epistemic anxiety and curiosity to be unrelated…
2		The study found that students supported one another cognitively, linguistically, socially, and emotionally...
3		These results are consistent with the writing superior effect previously investigated by Sletova and Isurin (2022), which, now, can be expanded to include lower levels of proficiency as well.
4		However, the complex power dynamics between traditional and new speakers can end up deterring the latter from using the minority languages they have acquired, and the results of our study indicate that this is the case in Fryslân.
	1	These results are consistent with the writing superior effect previously investigated by Sletova and Isurin (2022)...
	2	This fact is likely consistent with the view that writing provides more opportunities to produce more complex and more accurate output due to a lower pace of production and the repeated access to forms...
	3	Given the significant positive impact that FilDWs have on local, bilingual HK children's L2 English acquisition, it is hoped that the present study's findings would contribute to changing …
	4	This suggests that although very important, peer support is only one of the potential language sources in a language classroom…
5		This study makes a notable contribution by helping to build an understanding of new speakers' activation—a process that ought to constitute an important goal in revitalization policies and …
6		We have seen that although students were able to support one another, the extent (and quality) of support differed widely among pairs…
	1	Using a questionnaire enabled us to collect qualitative as well as quantitative data from a sizable participant sample, thereby yielding more nuanced and more comprehensive insights than we could …
	2	Given the significant positive impact that FilDWs have on local, bilingual HK children's L2 English acquisition, it is hoped that the present study's findings would contribute to changing the …
	3	However, more research—with a larger sample of participants Learning Frisian to become active speakers—is needed to re-assess the significance of this finding.
7		Arguably, such principles should be created and decided together with the students…
	1	For example, because requests for clarification and explanations were rather rare and because requesting an explanation, explaining, and applying an explanation are crucial features of high-quality verbal helping behavior...
	2	Future research could study the influence of L2 writing on L2 speaking accuracy in Advanced learners.
	3	Nevertheless, teaching such strategies must be engrained in the capacities or principles that students need to develop to allow such strategies to happen.

2. *Similarity and Distinction the Persuasive Strategies Employed in the Articles*

Then, there are some significant similarities and distinctions exist in the persuasive strategies employed in these articles.

Table 5: Stance and Engagement Featured in Applied Linguistics and Literature RAD

Features	Applied ling.		Literature	
	F	**%**	**F**	**%**
Stance				
Hedges	*5*	33	*2*	13
Boosters	*4*	27	*3*	20

Attitude Markers	7	47	7	47
Self-Mention	5	33	0	0
Engagement				
Reader Pronoun	4	27	0	0
Directive	4	27	3	20
Personal Aside	4	27	5	33
Question	9	60	8	53
Share Knowledge	9	60	3	20

The table provides a comprehensive overview of persuasive strategies in articles by native and non-native English speakers, exploring similarities and distinctions. Native authors commonly use hedges (33%), boosters (27%), and attitude markers (47%), while non-native authors employ them less (hedges 13%, boosters 20%, and attitude markers 47%). Interestingly, non-native authors do not use self-mention, unlike native authors (33%). In terms of engagement, natives frequently use reader pronouns (27%), directives (27%), personal asides (27%), questions (60%), and appeals to share knowledge (60%), whereas non-natives use them less (reader pronouns 0%, directives 20%, personal asides 33%, questions 53%, appeals to share knowledge 20%). The data highlights commonalities and distinctions in persuasive strategies, revealing that both native and non-native authors tend to minimize their usage in articles.

To clarify the use of persuasive approaches in RAD by native English authors and non-native English authors, here are some descriptions of their usage.

Table 6: Types of Stance & Engagement in Applied Linguistics RAD

Features	Examples Found from the Corpus
Stance	
Hedges	The manifestations of gender inequality in the form of economic marginalization, subordination, violence, stereotypes, and workloads occur at various levels.
Boosters	Emma does not show high independence.
Attitude Markers	This research presents a very interesting finding about the status and position of women in the social life of society.
Self-Mention	-
Engagement	
Reader Pronoun	-
Directive	The teacher can encourage student's reading engagement through interactive and critical class discussions
Personal Aside	Morally, we are the ones who appreciate ourselves
Question	Was there no escape?
Share Knowledge	The teacher belief reflected in children's literature as a medium to foster critical thinking

Native authors masterfully use linguistic devices in research discussions, employing hedges for nuanced uncertainty, boosters for impact, and attitude markers for positivity. Engaging readers with pronouns, directives, and appeals, they create persuasive discourse across diverse academic audiences.

Table 7: Types of Stance & Engagement by in Literature RAD

Features	Examples Found from the Corpus
Stance	
Hedges	It is impossible that the word's meaning will change while the emotive content remains the same.

Boosters	<u>Our most important finding</u> showed that while the arousal elicited by words of negative valence tended to increase over difficult times, the arousal elicited by words of positive valence tended to decrease.
Attitude Markers	This is a <u>rather surprising</u> finding because it had been anticipated that children who had known each other for many years and had been used to working with each other would display more prosocial behavior.
Self-Mention	<u>In our study,</u> <u>we</u> set two objectives: to collect the emotional valence and arousal ratings of words during and after the coronavirus pandemic and to compare them with the estimates collected before the pandemic.
Engagement	
Reader Pronoun	<u>As we will see,</u> despite first-generation children's very high performance...
Directive	Teachers <u>should</u> consider training their students in the use of support strategies.
Personal Aside	This <u>may be related to the fact</u> that ORs without gender mismatches are later acquired even by monolingual children.
Question	A relevant question then is <u>whether</u> the critical interactions observed in this study were driven by items that used the…
Share Knowledge	<u>Recent research argued that</u> FilDWs' English proficiency could be used as strength in 'bargaining' to get better treatment (Tong and Jiang 2020).

Non-native authors skillfully employ linguistic strategies in research article discussions, utilizing hedges for nuanced perspectives, boosters for result emphasis, and attitude markers for conveying emotions. Their engagement includes directives, personal asides, questions, and appeals, ensuring persuasive and credible discourse across academic audiences.

Discussion
In this research, it was found that native authors demonstrate a higher level of consistency in using obligatory conventions, while non-native authors exhibit variations and prefer conventional conventions. Interestingly, both native authors in international journals and non-native authors in national journals tend to be minimal in utilizing persuasive strategies. These findings illustrate an intriguing dynamic between native and non-native authors in presenting their research results, with significant differences observed in the use of conventions and persuasive strategies.

My findings align with the recent research by Nodoushan (2023), highlighting that the majority of rhetorical moves considered obligatory or conventional by the English-native group are regarded as optional by the non-native group, represented by Iran. Another study by Alfin Zalicha Hilmi, Toyyibah, & Nur Afifi (2022) examined the steps in discussions of qualitative and quantitative research articles in international journals, revealing a comprehensive use of steps in both types of articles, with no significant differences in discussion patterns. Essentially, crafting the discussion section with effective rhetorical conventions transcends cultural and methodological influences, underscoring the importance of professional knowledge and skills needed to write a standard RAD.

In the realm of persuasive strategies, a striking revelation emerges: both native authors in international journals and their non-native counterparts in national journals tend to employ these strategies less frequently. Various scientific disciplines do exhibit a tendency to adopt persuasive strategies to influence readers, as highlighted by Ghahremani Mina & Biria's (2017) research. However, within the fields of linguistics and literature, Geng & Wei's (2023) findings indicate a higher prevalence of interactive markers compared to interactional markers in crafting Research Article (RA) abstracts. Consequently, it can be inferred that persuasive strategies are not always the primary choice for article writers seeking to convince readers.

Exploring the dimension of stance, both Indonesian and native authors commonly utilize hedges, boosters, and attitude markers. The distinct propensities observed among authors from diverse cultural backgrounds emphasize the nuanced strategies employed in persuasive writing (Somsakoon, Wongsa, Promdam, & Suwannasom, 2023). Despite the similar frequency of hedges and boosters usage between

native and non-native authors, they demonstrate distinct preferences in specific contexts (Ekoç-Özçelik, 2023). This underscores the crucial role of cultural and disciplinary awareness in shaping persuasive strategies in article writing, particularly emphasizing the significance of employing stance within persuasive discourse.

This research underscores the necessity to investigate the absence of self-mention in the rhetorical analysis RAD of Indonesian writers. In reality, the integration of first-person plural pronouns (we, our) and reporting verbs (e.g., find, show) significantly impacts the clarity of the discussion section, aligning with Jasim's (2023) perspective. However, my study reveals substantive differences from Yuliawatia et al.'s (2023) findings, indicating an increased awareness of self-mention among Indonesian writers in marine and fisheries. Nevertheless, the fact that the frequency of self-mention in the Indonesian corpus remains significantly lower than in the English corpus remains a serious concern. Iraq, as an English as a Foreign Language (EFL) country, has demonstrated an understanding of the importance of self-mention in Research Articles (RAs), identifying 'we' as the most common indicator, especially in the Introduction and Results sections (Yasir Bdaiwi Jasim Al-Shujairi, 2020). It is evident that the dearth of self-mention in the rhetorical analysis RAD of Indonesian writers may stem from an insufficient awareness of the impactful role of personal involvement in fortifying arguments.

Furthermore, Wakerkwa's (2023) results highlight significant differences in the tendencies of Iraqi writers, where female writers tend to use pronouns more frequently, whereas male writers tend to use noun phrases more often in structuring their texts. According to Nawawi & Ting (2023), the frequency of self-mention tends to be high, especially in the Results-Discussion-Conclusions section, followed by the Method, Introduction, and Abstract sections in RA Quartiles 1, 3, and 4. In conclusion, it can be inferred that the use of self-mention in an RA is influenced not only by the reputation of the article but also by the gender differences among the authors.

My research, alongside similar studies using national and international journals, emphasizes the significance of employing directives to engage readers in RAD. Aligned with Jalilifar & Mehrabi (2014), both native and non-native English academic writers universally employ directives as a persuasive strategy in the discussion section, highlighting common trends across legitimate scientific disciplines. These findings contribute to learners' awareness of conventions and lexicogrammatical features in English-language RAs.

My study's methodology follows a systematic approach, guided by Creswell's (2014) recommended data analysis steps. Transparency and replicability are ensured through well-defined criteria for article selection, considering the IMRD structure, database index quartiles, and Sinta index levels. The inclusion of a knowledgeable co-coder enhances the reliability analysis, aligning with established standards, including the application of Cohen's Kappa coefficient. Categorizing reliability scores according to predefined thresholds adds clarity to the assessment. Despite acknowledging limitations, the meticulous attention to detail, systematic analysis procedures, and reliability checks contribute to the research's overall rigor.

The study unveils that native English writers consistently employ obligatory rhetorical conventions, while non-native authors favor more conventional approaches, minimizing the use of persuasive strategies. These findings underscore the profound influence of writing context, reflecting the intricate interplay of language and culture in scholarly work. In comparison with existing literature, the study aligns with Nodoushan's (2013) emphasis on understanding rhetorical functions and Yang and Allison's (2003) seven-move rhetorical model for Research Article Discussions (RAD). The exploration of persuasion resonates with Hyland's (2008), emphasizing its significance in presenting claims. Cultural nuances in persuasive strategies, identified in the study, align with Geng & Wei's (2023) research on linguistic and literature corpora. The absence of self-mention in Indonesian writers' RAD, contrary to Yuliawatia et al. (2023), and the influence of gender on self-mention, as noted by Wakerkwa (2023) and Nawawi & Ting (2023), add nuanced layers to the discussion. Methodologically, the study's robust approach includes 15 articles from each group, co-coding, Cohen's Kappa coefficient for reliability, adherence to Kanoksilapatham's (2005) standards, and Creswell's (2014) recommended steps, bolstering the research's credibility and validity in distinct linguistic and literary contexts.

Finally, synthesizing the extensive study outcomes and drawing pedagogic implications, it is evident that RAD presents a formidable challenge for both native and non-native English writers. The intricacies of rhetorical conventions and persuasive strategies significantly influence the quality of articles, impacting how readers interpret research results and affecting publication decisions. The study's

dual objectives—analyzing rhetorical conventions and persuasive strategies—reveal that while native authors consistently employ obligatory conventions, non-native authors display variations, influenced by cultural and contextual factors. Interestingly, both groups tend to minimize the use of persuasive strategies. This aligns with existing literature and emphasizes the profound impact of writing context on authors' preferences and decisions.

Conclusion and Suggestion

This study reveals that native authors consistently adhere to mandatory conventions in international journals, while non-native authors, potentially influenced by the importance of professional knowledge and skills required for crafting standard Research Article Discussions (RAD). Interestingly, both native authors in international journals and their non-native counterparts in national journals exhibit a minimal inclination towards utilizing persuasive strategies. This emphasizes the importance of professional knowledge, academic cultural awareness, and scientific discipline in shaping article writing strategies, particularly adopting a certain stance in persuasive discourse. The outcomes of this study serve as an initial step in drawing scholars' attention to the benefits of professional skills and cultural awareness. The findings might be limited to the academic and literary cultural context in Indonesia, necessitating larger sample studies in the future to support generalizations. Indonesian writers may encounter challenges in acknowledging the importance of personal engagement in strengthening arguments, necessitating further research to boost professional skill and academic cultural awareness as well as promote the adoption of more active persuasive strategies.

References

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

Aisyah, S., Hardiah, M., & Fadhli, M. (2022). Engagement Markers in Discussion Section of Research Articles Written by English Education Students and Articles Published in Reputable English Journal. Journal of English Education and Teaching; Vol 6, No 1 (2022); 1-13 ; 26225867 ; 2685743X. https://ejournal.unib.ac.id/index.php/JEET/article/view/20499

Akman, E., & Karahan, P. (2023). Hedges and boosters in academic texts: a comparative study on English language teaching and physiotherapy research articles. *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, (32), 1335-1349. https://doi.org/10.29000/rumelide.1252902

Alfin Zalicha Hilmi, Toyyibah, & Nur Afifi. (2022). A Genre Analysis on the Discussion Section Of Quantitative And Qualitative Research Articles In ELT And Linguistics. JEELS (Journal of English Education and Linguistics Studies), 8(2), 341–369. https://doi.org/10.30762/jeels.v8i2.3264.

Al-Shujairi, Y. B. J., & Al-Manaseer, F. A.-J. (2022). Back- grounding the Discussion Section of Medical Research Articles. Open Journal of Modern Linguistics, 12, 71-88. https://doi.org/10.4236/ojml.2022.121008

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

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. https://caes.hku.hk/ajal/index.php/ajal/article/view/716.

Boonyuen, T., & Tangkiengsirisin, S. (2018). The investigation of the textual organization of research article Discussion sections in the field of second language writing. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ) Volume*, *9*. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol9no3.8

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches 4th Edition*. Singapore: Sage Publication.

Ekoç-Özçelik, A. (2023). Hedges and boosters in research article abstracts of Turkish and Chinese scholars. *Dil Eğitimi ve Araştırmaları Dergisi*, *9*(1), 150-162. https://www.ceeol.com/search/article-detail?id=1134309

Geng, H., & Wei, H. (2023). Metadiscourse Markers in Abstracts of Linguistics and Literature Research Articles from Scopus-Indexed Journals. *Journal of Modern Languages*, *33*(1), 29-49. DOI: https://doi.org/10.22452/jml.vol33no1.2

Ghahremani Mina, K., & Biria, R. (2017). Exploring interactive and interactional metadiscourse markers in discussion sections of social and medical science articles. *International Journal of Research in English Education*, *2*(4), 11-29. http://ijreeonline.com/article-1-71-en.html

Hyland, K. (2008). Persuasion, interaction and the construction of knowledge: Representing self and others in research writing.. *International Journal of English Studies*, *8*(2), 1–23. Retrieved from https://revistas.um.es/ijes/article/view/49151

Jasim, Y.B. (2023). Restating Research Findings in Research Articles Discussion Section: A Corpus Analysis of Linguistic Cues and Lexical Bundles. GEMA Online® Journal of Language Studies. https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:257250732.

Hashemi, M. R., & Shirzadi, D. (2016). The use of hedging in discussion sections of applied linguistics research articles with varied research methods. *Teaching English as a Second Language Quarterly (Formerly Journal of Teaching Language Skills)*, *35*(1), 31-56. DOI: 10.22099/jtls.2016.3729

Hashemi, M. R., & Gohari Moghaddam, I. (2019). A mixed methods genre analysis of the discussion section of MMR articles in applied linguistics. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, *13*(2), 242-260. https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689816674626

Hashemi, M. R., & Hosseini, H. (2019). Stance and culture: a comparative study of english and persian authorial stance in applied linguistics research articles. Advanced Education; 2019: Issue 12; 21-27 ; Передовое Образование; 2019: ; 21-27 ; Новітня Освіта; 2019: ; 2410-8286 ; 2409-3351. http://ae.fl.kpi.ua/article/view/123284

Jalilifar, A., & Mehrabi, K. (2014). A cross-disciplinary and cross-cultural study of directives in discussions and conclusions of research articles. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, *2*(1), 27-44. https://ijltr.urmia.ac.ir/article_20422_12499d2b697412f1d2957db27aee7d6b.pdf

Kanoksilapatham, B. (2005). Rhetorical structure of biochemistry research articles. English for Specific Purposes, 24, 269-292. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2004.08.003

Kuhi, D., & Soltani, K. (2022). The Recycling of Objective Move in English Research Articles' Discussion Sections. http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12323/6007

Livytska, I. (2019). The use of hedging in research articles on applied linguistics. *Journal of language and cultural education*, *7*(1), 35-53. https://sciendo.com/downloadpdf/journals/jolace/7/1/article-p35.pdf

Loi, C. K., & Lim, J. M. H. (2019). Hedging in the Discussion Sections of English and Malay Educational Research Articles. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, *19*(1). http://doi.org/10.17576/gema-2019-1901-03

Malawaet, N., & Trakulkasemsuk, W. (2021). Use of Adverbials in Discussion Sections of Research Articles in Thai and International Journals. *reflections*, *28*(2), 248-266. DOI: https://doi.org/10.61508/refl.v28i2.253785

Nawawi, N. A., & Ting, S. H. Self-Mentions in Q1 and Q3-Q4 Creative Arts Journal Articles by Rhetorical Section. *Available at SSRN 4592901*. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4592901

Nodoushan, M. (2012). A structural move analysis of discussion sub-genre in applied linguistics. In *International Conference on Languages, E-Learning and Romanian Studies* (pp. 1-12). https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7514774

Nodoushan, M. A. S. (2023). Native experts and reputable journals as points of reference: A study on research-article discussions. *Studies in English Language and Education*, *10*(2), 562-574. DOI: https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v10i2.29282

Popa, E. O., Blok, V., & Wesselink, R. (2020). Discussion structures as tools for public deliberation. *Public Understanding of Science*, *29*(1), 76-93. https://doi.org/10.1177/0963662519880675

Somsakoon, C., Wongsa, J., Promdam, N., & Suwannasom, T. (2023). A Comparative Study of Hedging in English Research Article Discussion Written by Thai, Chinese, and Saudi Arabian Writers. *Journal of Community Development Research (Humanities and Social Sciences)*, *16*(3), 23-34. DOI: https://doi.org/10.14456/jcdr-hs.2023.23

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

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

Tikhonova, E. V., Kosycheva, M. A., & Golechkova, T. Y. (2023). Establishing Rapport with the Reader: Engagement Markers in the Discussion Section of a Research Article. *Интеграция образования*, *27*(3 (112)), 354-372.https://doi.org/10.15507/1991-9468.112.027.202303.354-372

Wakerkwa, D. A. P. (2023). Being Involved or Informative: Gender Differences in the Use of Pronouns and Specifiers in Writing Conclusions. *Leksema: Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra*, *8*(1). DOI: https://doi.org/10.22515/ljbs.v8i1.5632 .

Weissberg, R., & Buker, S. (1990). Writing up research: Experimental research report writing for students of English. Prentice-Hall.

Yasir Bdaiwi Jasim Al-Shujairi (2020) What, which and where: examining self-mention markers in ISI and Iraqi local research articles in applied linguistics, Asian Englishes, 22:1, 20-34, DOI: 10.1080/13488678.2018.1544699.

Yuliawatia, S., Ekawatia, D., Mawarrania, R. E., & Kurniawanb, E. (2023). A corpus-based study of authorial identity in Indonesian writers' research articles. *Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences*, *44*(3), 959-964. https://doi.org/10.34044/j.kjss.2023.44.3.34