ACADEMIC CONFLICTS IN RESEARCH ARTICLE DISCUSSIONS: THE CASE OF INDONESIAN AND MALAYSIAN AUTHORS

Warsidi WARSIDI*[1]
Vegneskumar MANIAM[2]
[1]Universitas Islam Makassar, Indonesia
[2]University of New England, Australia
[1]warsidi.dty@uim-makassar.ac.id
[2]vmaniam@une.edu.au

ABSTRACT

Since academic authors aim to enhance the value of their current research findings compared to earlier studies, understanding how to convince journal gatekeepers is crucial. This study analysed the use of academic conflict units in English research article discussions (RADs) published in reputable Indonesian and Malaysian journals within the discipline of language education. The analysis employed four academic conflict units as an analytical framework. The results revealed that both Indonesian and Malaysian RADs tended to employ proposing claims (PC), but the other three academic conflict units, namely, inconsistency indicator (II), opposing claims (OC), and conflict resolution (CR) were rarely used. Regarding gaining visibility and recognition in international knowledge sharing, this finding appears to contradict English RADs written by native English authors published in highly reputable journals. It also suggests that authors discuss their research findings by establishing a global context, comparing them with international literature, and concluding their research articles by considering broader impacts. This finding may offer insights into the literature and draw implications for designing academic writing instruction.

Keywords: academic conflict units; English research article discussion (RADs); reputable Indonesian journals; reputable Malaysian journals

Introduction

Rhetorical structure within research articles (RAs) has gained widespread scholarly attention. Many linguistic scholars have investigated the abstract section (Andika et al., 2018; Swales et al., 2009), introduction section (Adnan, 2011; Afshar et al., 2018; Alharbi, 2021; Arsyad, 2013; Arsyad et al., 2020; Lu et al., 2021; Rochma et al., 2020; Swales, 1990), methods (Cotos et al., 2017; Kutay, 2016; Zhang & Wannaruk, 2016), results (Williams, 1999), and discussion (Amnuai, 2017; Basturkmen, 2012; Moreno, 2021; Moyano, 2019). These studies suggest that understanding the rhetorical structures of research articles is essential.

Besides, studies on one specific functional move within RAs have also been carried out widely. For example, in the introduction section, some scholars have investigated research promotion (Abdi & Sadeghi, 2018; Moreno, 2021; Wang & Yang, 2015; Warsidi, 2023; Zibalas & Šinkūnienė, 2019), indicating a research gap (Suryani et al., 2015), and establishing a niche (Amnuai, 2021; Lim, 2012). In the discussion section, some linguists analysed the evaluation and comments on results (Lim, 2010; Liu & Lim, 2014), theoretical implications (Cheng, 2020), and academic conflict (Cheng & Unsworth, 2016; Sadeghi & Alinasab, 2020). All these studies indicate that comprehending how the genre of a certain functional move is employed in a discourse community is also pivotal.

However, although many studies have explored rhetorical structures and specific functional moves, academic conflict within RAs has received relatively little attention. Academic conflict involves a discussion of current research findings by comparing and contrasting them with earlier related studies, thus, enhancing the value of current knowledge. Its application allows authors to refine and articulate their argumentative judgments. It has four academic conflict units: proposed claim (PC), inconsistency indicator (II), opposed claim (OC), and conflict resolution (CR) (Cheng & Unsworth, 2016; Hunston, 1993; Sadeghi & Alinasab, 2020). Despite this, our review over the past few years reveals that only two studies have addressed this fundamental issue (Cheng & Unsworth, 2016; Sadeghi & Alinasab, 2020).

Firstly, Cheng and Unsworth (2016) investigated academic conflict units within empirical research article discussions (RADs) in the field of applied linguistics. The method used in the study was a rhetorical analysis using two frameworks (Hunston, 1993; Martin & White, 2003). The results revealed 30 RADs employed functional units of academic conflict: proposed claim, opposed claim, inconsistency indicator, and conflict resolution. In this regard, while 29 of them employed proposed claims, and 28 employed opposed claims, and all 30 RADs employed inconsistency indicators and conflict resolution. This finding emphasises the importance of proposing academic conflict in RADs to enhance the value of current research findings.

Secondly, Sadeghi and Alinasab (2020) academic conflict within RADs was analysed in the applied linguistics discipline within three different contexts: RADs written by native English authors, non-native English authors, and native Persian authors. The study, utilising a theoretical framework of academic conflicts proposed by Cheng and Unsworth (2016), examined 60 RADs, with 20 from each context. The results revealed that native English authors employed the most academic conflict

units (ACUs), followed by non-native English authors, while native Persian authors employed the fewest ACUs. These findings indicated that native and non-native English authors discussed their findings in comparison to those found earlier in the literature more than those of native Persian authors. Besides, they tended to resolve conflicts more than those of native Persian authors. These findings may contribute to the teaching of academic writing for publishing RAs, particularly to those for whom English is their second or a foreign language.

However, there are notable limitations in the two studies. For instance, the method sections lack clarity in explaining how data were analysed. The information about indicating academic conflicts was mainly described in the literature or introduction sections, and examples of academic conflicts were described in the method section. In addition, language signals to indicate academic conflicts were described in the results sections.

While academic conflict has been investigated in RADs, many questions remain unresolved and pose urgent issues for further studies. For example, how fundamental is this issue in countries where English is a second or foreign language, such as Malaysia and Indonesia? Is there a statistically significant difference between RADs from those published in English reputable journals? If so, to what extent are the differences? Answering these questions may not only expand the existing knowledge but also provide insights for readers, highlighting that proposing academic conflict units within RADs can critically evaluate knowledge claims (Swales & Feak, 2004), and employ criticism strategies (Salager-Meyer et al., 2003). By doing so, their future research papers may provide more value and more meaningful research findings.

This study investigated how academic conflict units are proposed in English RADs published in reputable language education journals in Indonesia and Malaysia. The purpose of this investigation is to answer the following research questions:

1. To what extent are academic conflict units proposed in English RADs published in reputable Indonesian journals?
2. To what extent are academic conflict units proposed in English RADs published in reputable Malaysian journals?
3. Do these two data sets have statistical differences? If so, to what extent?

Method

Data Sets

This study used 40 English RADs within the discipline of language education, sourced from two different contexts. Specifically, 20 RADs were written by Indonesian academics and published in reputable Indonesian journals, while the remaining 20 were written by Malaysian authors and published in reputable Malaysian journals. Here, reputable journals are defined as those indexed in Scopus with a Scimago journal rank (SJR) of 0.20 or above. The choice of this number of articles was influenced by the desire for representation, considering that some earlier studies employed fewer articles (Kwan, 2006; Soler-Monreal et al., 2011; Warsidi et al., 2023).

To form these corpora, this study adhered to several standard criteria. Firstly, the RAs were written in English and published in Indonesian and Malaysian institutions. Additionally, they were published in Scopus-index journals with an SJR of 0.20 or above and published in the last four years (2020-2023). Furthermore, the selected articles were empirical research articles, discerned by the presence of method sections. They were also attributed to Indonesian academics (for the Indonesian corpus) or Malaysian academics (for the Malaysian corpus), identified by their names and affiliations. Moreover, each article had an explicitly separate discussion section, disregarding any combined sections (e.g., Results and Discussion) to focus on the discussion section.

Based on the above standard criteria for selecting corpora, this study determined three Indonesian Scopus-indexed journals that meet the standard criteria, namely *Studies in English Language and Education (SiELE), Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics (IJAL),* and *International Journal of Language Education*. However, because more than 20 RADs from these three journals met these standard criteria, this study only considered 20 of them. Then, this study also determined two Malaysian Scopus-indexed journals for corpus selection, *the GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies,* and *3L: Language, Linguistics, Literature* because only these two journals in language education met the above standard criteria. However, this study selected 20 RADs from these two journals because a large number of RA also met these criteria.

Data Analysis Procedures

To analyse the data in the present study, academic conflict units within both corpora were analysed. In this regard, four academic conflict units from earlier studies (Cheng & Unsworth, 2016; Sadeghi & Alinasab, 2020) were used as an analytical framework: PC, II, OC, and CR. However, earlier studies did not provide a complete understanding of the processes for identifying academic conflict units. Thus, to make these four academic conflict units more understandable, this study establishes the processes for identifying academic conflict units. In this regard, Table 1 describes each unit.

Table 1

A Framework for Analysing Academic Conflict Units within Rads

Academic conflict unit	Definition	Example	The processes for identifying academic conflict units
Proposing Claims (PC)	Proposing claims based on the current research findings	The data **analysis results** of the present study **revealed** that … The **present data** analysis **showed** that … The **present study found** that …	1. Reading a whole discussion section focusing on identifying signals indicating authors' claim 2. Highlighting and coding language signals indicating authors' claim

		This **finding demonstrates …**	3.	Ensuring the meaning and context are a proposing claim
Inconsistency Indicator (II)	Contrasting the present finding with those found in earlier studies	**This result is different** from … **This finding contradicts** those … The present research findings **seem in contradiction** with those of … However, **unlike those found in earlier studies**, the present findings seem …	1. 2. 3.	Reading a whole discussion section focusing on signals indicating comparing and contrasting authors' findings to those of literature Highlighting and coding comparison and contrast of authors' findings with those of literature Ensuring the meaning and context are comparing or contrasting findings to those of literature
Opposing Claims (OC),	Restating earlier contradictory research findings	**Wang (2009) noted** that none of the RAs employed … **Some earlier findings revealed** that different language backgrounds of RAs may have … **Some studies have indicated** that …	1. 2. 3.	Reading a whole discussion section focusing on signals indicating comparison and contrast. However, unlike II, authors in this manner focus on literature as subject for discussion. Highlighting and coding OC Ensuring the meaning and context are discussing literature that is different from the present study
Conflict Resolution (CR)	Presenting possible reasons for the contradiction from those found in earlier studies. Here, the present	**One of the possible reasons** for the difference is that … **The findings are possibly** that … **The reason for these differences may** be because the context of the present study is different from …	1.	Reading a discussion section focusing on signals about to stop academic debates, such as stating possible reasons for the contradiction. In this manner, authors tried to elude further debates.

	author attempts to describe the reason for the contradiction.	2. Highlighting and coding the signals indicating CR 3. Ensuring the meaning and context are finding possible reasons for the inconsistencies

Inter-rater Reliability

Thus, since the analyses of academic conflict units in the present study employed this analytical framework (Table 1), misanalyses, and misinterpretations might be easily avoided. Besides, the first author analysed the academic conflict units using the framework while the second author checked the results of the analysis. However, to ensure the inter-rater reliability, the first author provided three example findings from each academic conflict unit, which means 12 examples from all four academic conflict units. The purpose of providing these examples is to ensure that both authors have agreement in understanding these four academic conflict units. Then, the result revealed that both authors have 100% agreement. More details regarding the agreement of data analysis samples are presented in Table 2.

Table 2
Authors' Agreements in Relation to Inter-Ratter Reliability

Academic conflict units (ACU)	The findings from the first author	The second author's agreement	Match
PC	3	3	All match
II	3	3	All match
OC	3	3	All match
CR	3	3	All match
Total match		12	
Total counts		12	
Inter-Ratter Reliability		100%	

Results

This section reports the results to answer the three research questions in the study. Table 3 shows the frequency and mean for academic conflict units found in English RADs published in reputable Indonesian and Malaysian journals. Firstly, academic conflict units are only employed in a small portion of Indonesian RADs. Of the four academic conflict units, only PC was employed in all Indonesian RADs and had a mean number of 4.2, while the other two units (II and CR) were seldom used in Indonesian RADs. However, one unit (OC) was not used in Indonesian RADs. Secondly, academic conflict units also hardly appeared in Malaysian RADs. Of the four academic conflict units, only PC predominated in the corpus and had a mean of 3.85, while the other three were rarely found in the data. Thirdly, these two data sets seemed to be similar, as they tended to employ PC but neglected the other three academic conflict units.

Table 3

Frequency and Mean for Academic Conflict Units Found in English RADs Published in Reputable Indonesian and Malaysian Journals

Academic conflict units (ACUs)	English RADs published in reputable Indonesian journals		English RADs published in reputable Malaysian journals		P-Value
	Total numbers	Mean	Total numbers	Mean	
PC	84	4.2	77	3.85	0.653
II	7	0.35	3	0.15	0.321
OC	0	0	3	0.15	0.354
CR	1	0.05	2	0.10	0.982

As shown in Table 3, academic conflict units were only partially employed in both Indonesian and Malaysian corpora. Of these four units, PC was the most frequently used in both data sets, while the other three units were rarely employed in them. After that, the statistical analysis (p-value above .05) indicates that there is no significant difference between Indonesian and Malaysian RADs regarding the employment of the four academic conflict units. Further details of academic conflict units found in both data sets and their statistical comparisons are presented in each of the following units:

Proposing Claims (PC)

In this functional move, authors propose claims based on their current research findings. This functional move appeared in all data. It appeared higher in the Indonesian corpus than in the Malaysian corpus (4.2 and 3.85 respectively). However, the difference did not reach statistical significance because the *p*-value (0.653) is higher than the standard alpha value (0.05) (see Table 3). This finding implies no statistical difference between the Indonesian and Malaysian corpus in employing PC. The ways authors employed this functional move are exemplified in (1) to (6). The bolded texts indicate the signal words of the functional move "proposing claims".
Indonesian corpus:

(1) **Based on the findings of this research, it is found that** the Foreign and Defence Minister of Indonesia employed three forms of discourse markers: textual discourse marker, interpersonal discourse marker, and cognitive discourse marker. Indonesian corpus 02

(2) **The finding showed that** both RLP and DJW were effective in improving the writing ability of students with different self-esteem. Furthermore, the analysis indicated that the students in the RLP class performed better than those in the DJW class. Indonesian corpus 04

(3) Furthermore, **based on the statistical analysis gained from pre-test and post-test scores of students with high and low self-esteem, it could also be inferred that** the implementation of the DJW technique could also improve the student's writing performance. Indonesian corpus 04

Malaysian corpus:

(4) **The findings essentially revealed several interesting phenomena** about the literacy aptitudes of the participants. Among the things realised in this study was that in exploring the horizons of possibilities of the short story, the participants were productive in using different ways of thinking involving critical, creative, and imaginative thinking. Malaysian corpus 01

(5) **The findings of this study indicate that** 54.1% of the respondents found the criterion 'how interesting the oral history text is' played a significant role during the evaluation process. Malaysian corpus 02

(6) **The findings revealed that** most of the respondents had difficulties with the prescribed teaching materials provided by the Ministry of Education. This can be implied from viewpoints expressed by respondents 3, 5, 6, and 7 (refer to Table 2). Malaysian corpus 06

Examples (1) to (3) were found in the Indonesian corpus, while Examples (4) to (6) were found in the Malaysian corpus. In this regard, the authors proposed claims based on their findings by stating "the findings revealed" and "the findings indicate".

Inconsistency Indicator (II)

In this functional move, authors contrast their current findings with those found in the literature. Unfortunately, this functional move rarely appears in both data sets. In the Indonesian corpus, it appeared a maximum of 4 and a minimum of 0 times, while in the Malaysian corpus, it occurred a maximum of 2 and a minimum of 0 times. Its mean value was 0.35 in the Indonesian corpus, but 0.15 in the Malaysian corpus. Thus, the Indonesian corpus employed this functional move more than the Malaysian corpus. However, the difference was also not statistically significant because our inferential statistic test showed that the *p*-value (0.321) is higher than the alpha value (0.05) (see Table 3). The ways authors contrasted their findings with the literature are presented in examples (7) to (12):

Indonesian corpus:

(7) **This result is different from that** of Widodo et al. (2020). Their study shows that the students applied the rhetorical structure in closing their speech. This difference might be explained by the fact that the present study analysed the speech in more detail, focusing not only on the speech in general but also on the speech into three structures, i.e., introduction, content and conclusion. Indonesian corpus 06

(8) **These findings do not really support McPhee and Cushman's (1980) argument** indicating that predisposition to action and affective evaluation are the same. Indonesian corpus 10

(9) **It also contradicts** Toledo's (2005) argument that one who learns a language should have knowledge about genres in the language in order to obtain the purpose of communication successfully because this study finds that genre with the presence of other factors does not determine reading comprehension. Indonesian corpus 14

Malaysian corpus:

(10) **The finding, however, contradicts** Burkhauser and Lesaux's (2017) earlier findings in which experienced teachers, as opposed to novice teachers, were found to have a better ability to adapt curriculum materials by extending curriculum activities and integrating different materials and activities. Malaysian corpus 06

(11) **However, the findings do not bear a resemblance to what** Grossman and Thomson (2008) found; they found that novice teachers were reported to have closely followed the prescribed materials with limited adaptations. Malaysian corpus 06

(12) **Although the findings of this study** which are based on an analysis of argumentative discourse **differ from those reported** by Noor (2001) and Hinds (1990) who focused on expository discourse, some cross-genre similarities need to be highlighted here. Malaysian corpus 10

In examples (7) to (12), some text is bolded to show signal words indicating a contradiction between the current research findings and those found in earlier studies. In this regard, authors may use signal words such as "this finding is different from," "this finding contradicts," "this finding does not support," "these findings differ," or other language signals. However, again, this functional move was rarely employed in both corpora.

Opposing Claims (OC)

In this functional move, authors re-explain earlier contradictory research findings. The purpose may be to debate or go against the authors' current research findings. Unfortunately, this functional move was absent from the Indonesian corpus (0), but in the Malaysian corpus, it had three appearances with a maximum of 2 and a minimum of 0 within one RAD. Its mean value was 0 in the Indonesian corpus, but 0.15 in the Malaysian corpus. Although this functional move only appeared in the Malaysian corpus, the difference between both corpora in the use of OC was not statistically significant because our inferential statistic test showed that the *p*-value (0.354) is higher than the alpha value (0.05) (see Table 3). The ways authors re-stated earlier contradictory research findings were exemplified in the Malaysian corpus in (13)-(15) as follows:

(13) **Although Hyland (1990, p. 70) has highlighted the role of "gambits**" in the argumentative genre in English, **the researchers have proposed a new linguistic profile that has not been reported** in previous research, in that it illustrates the five key functions of 'arousing readers' interest' in relation to their associated resources in the argumentative essays (see Table 3). Malaysian corpus 10

(14) **Keramati et al. (2019) found that self-mentions** in three applied linguistics journals increased in the 1996 to 2016 period, **but the frequency is still far** less than boosters, hedges, and attitude markers,

despite a decrease in the use of these three markers. Malaysian corpus 16

(15) **Moreover, Khedri (2016) also found frequent use of self-mentions** in the method section of applied linguistics articles, **but psychology articles have more self-mentions** in the introduction section, and environmental engineering and chemistry articles have the most self-mentions in the results and discussion sections. Malaysian corpus 16

The opposing claims serve to contrast current findings with earlier claims, and by doing so, readers may feel encouraged to read the discussion further.

Conflict Resolution (CR)

In this functional move, the authors attempted to reconcile the disagreement between current findings and those of earlier research. Unfortunately, authors in both data sets rarely utilised this functional move in their discussion. It had only one occurrence in the Indonesian corpus (with a mean of 0.05) and two appearances in the Malaysian corpus (with a mean of 0.10). Its appearances also indicate statistically insignificant differences between the Indonesian and Malaysian corpus because the *p*-value (0.982) is higher than the alpha value (0.05) (see Table 3). The ways authors employed this functional move are exemplified in (16)-(18) as follows:

Indonesian corpus:
(16) **In other words, individuals' gender, age, and education level factors cannot be considered the absolute factors that make changes in attitudes** and behaviours when delivering health protocol messages by using their mother tongue audio visually. Indonesian corpus 10

Malaysian corpus:
(17) In the present study, most of the self-mentions in the political science articles are in the method section, similar to the applied linguistics articles in Khedri's (2016) study. **Political science is in the arts discipline, like applied linguistics. It is generally considered as a social science (not a pure/applied science**). In the present study, political science researchers highlight their role in the research process using first-person pronouns. In so doing, they emphasize their ownership of the methodology and justify why the method was chosen (Khedri, 2016). Malaysian corpus 16

(18) **The strong writer presence** in the method section of political science articles **is possibly reflective of the arts inclination toward**s an author-centred approach as opposed to the object-cantered approach of the sciences. Malaysian corpus16

In examples 16 to 18, the authors attempted to find a reason for the contradiction and reconcile their disagreement with literature to summarise their discussion. In (16), the author presented that several factors cannot be

overgeneralised to make a claim. In (17), the author attempted to present the similarities in "political science and applied linguistics" as one discipline of arts. In (18), the author intended to create speculation about their disagreement by stating "possibly." All these examples indicate that the authors intended and attempted to reconcile their disagreements with the literature. However, this functional move was rarely found in both data sets of the present study.

In short, academic conflict units hardly appeared in the Indonesian RADs. Among the four academic conflict units, only PC was the most employed in the Indonesian corpus, while II and CR were rarely used. Furthermore, OCs were not utilised in the Indonesian corpus. Similarly, academic conflict units were also only partially employed in Malaysian RADs, with PC being the most frequently used unit, while the other three academic conflict units were rarely used. Our inferential statistics analysis revealed no statically significant difference between Indonesian and Malaysian corpus in employing academic conflict units, including in employing PC, OP, II, and CR.

Discussion and Conclusion

The study showed that academic conflict units were hardly used in the Indonesian and Malaysian corpus. In both corpus, PC was the most employed unit, while the other three units were rarely utilised (II, OP, and CR). Our statistical analysis also revealed that these two data sets did not have significant differences.

As these two data sets tend to be similar more than to be different, thus, in this discussion, we present the similarities between these two data sets. The first similarity is that both tended to propose claims more than the other three academic conflict units when discussing their current research findings. The next similarity is that, however, both rarely compared their research findings with those of earlier literature (II and OC), and thus, this fact may explain the infrequent presentation of solutions for the debate (CR). The reasons may be writing traditions and journal conventions. Regarding writing tradition, countering research findings is considered impolite in Indonesian culture (Adnan, 2010), which may also apply to Malaysian culture because of their geographic proximity and historical connections. For example, their national languages are closely related, and both countries' religious majority is Islam. In this situation, contrasting findings to those written by more senior academics are considered impolite, and thus Indonesian authors (Adnan, 2011; Arsyad & Adila, 2018; Arsyad & Arono, 2016; Mirahayuni, 2002), as well as Malaysian authors (Ahmad, 1997; Zainuddin & Shaari, 2021), tend to avoid critics, evaluation, or countering those of earlier research findings. Besides, Malaysian authors rarely present unexpected outcomes or inconsistent indicators (II), and thus, they seldom describe the reasons for the contradiction (Loi et al., 2016).

The RADs in the present study tended to employ more PC, interpret their findings, and support them with either data or literature. This result means that the main purpose of the discussion section was to announce the analysis results and convince readers that the current research findings were essential, interesting, and consistent with earlier studies (Arsyad et al., 2020). However, in the present study, the authors related their findings to the literature; nonetheless, their purpose for

employing literature was not to establish a direct comparison between their current findings and those in the existing literature. Instead, they used literature to support their claims and reference experts, and, in doing so, aimed to convince their target readers of the significance, interest, and logical coherence of their current research findings. Their objective was to encourage readers to accept their findings rather than inviting challenges in a "reference proposition" (Samanhudi & O'Boyle, 2022). In doing so, the discussion section of RAs in the Indonesian and Malaysian contexts could still be written without any reference (Samanhudi & O'Boyle, 2022), and some RADs in the present study also supported this claim.

In contrast, the present finding seems inconsistent with academic conflict units employed in English RADs (Cheng & Unsworth, 2016; Sadeghi & Alinasab, 2020). For example, in the present findings, three academic conflict units (II, OC, and CR) were rarely employed in RADs. On the other hand, in English RADs, II (average 1.70), OC (average 1.75), and CR (average 2.1) occurred in each RAD, which means that comparing and contrasting current research findings is essential in reputable English journals (Sadeghi & Alinasab, 2020). This comparison indicates that, while the Indonesian and Malaysian authors in the present study rarely or even hardly ever compared their current research findings with those found in literature, English RADs in reputable international journals tend to employ this functional move (Arsyad, 2013) by presenting inconsistency indicators and opposed claims (Cheng & Unsworth, 2016; Sadeghi & Alinasab, 2020) to enhance the theoretical value of current knowledge findings (Cheng, 2020) and to promote the novelty of current research findings (Cheng, 2021).

The reason for these differences may be that the authors' purposes in the present study were different from those of native English authors, as studied by Sadeghi and Alinasab (2020). The authors in the present study may have aimed to solve practical problems and expected their research findings might contribute to overcoming practical problems, as expected by the government (Dimyati, 2020), and making recommendations for government policy (Warsidi, 2021). In contrast, native English authors, as studied by Sadeghi and Alinasab (2020), may aim to interpret their findings deeply. To find meaningful interpretations and to enhance the value of the current research findings, native English authors compare their current findings with those found in the literature. By doing so, they can elaborate and explore the potential contribution of their current research findings to create more meaningful results and advance knowledge production.

The findings of the present study may practically be used to design teaching material for those taking a course in English for publishing purposes. Besides, it may also be used as a practical guide when writing a discussion section to conceptualize a global context and incorporate international literature, and thus, the discussion may result in a broader impact.

It is important to note that this study is restricted to the analysis of academic conflict units in only two different contexts. Given these limitations, further studies examining academic conflict units in the RADs across diverse disciplines, different language backgrounds, and discourse communities are encouraged. Such studies can contribute to, strengthen, confirm, or expand upon the findings of the present study.

This approach may lead to a more comprehensive understanding of genre knowledge concerning academic conflict units in RADs.

References

Abdi, J., & Sadeghi, K. (2018). Promotion through claiming centrality in L1 and L2 English research article introductions. *International Journal of English Studies, 18*(1), 53-70. https://doi.org/10.6018/ijes/2018/1/297381

Adnan, Z. (2010). *Rhetorical patterns of Indonesian research articles: A genre of Indonesian academic writing*. VDM Verlag Dr Müller.

Adnan, Z. (2011). "Ideal-problem-solution" (IPS) model: A discourse model of research article introductions (RAIS) in education. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics, 34*(1), 75-103. https://doi.org/10.1075/aral.34.1.05adn

Afshar, H. S., Doosti, M., & Movassagh, H. (2018). A comparative study of generic structure of applied linguistics and chemistry research articles: The case of discussions. *Research in Applied Linguistics, 9*(1), 28-56. https://doi.org/10.22055/rals.2018.13404

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

Alharbi, S. H. (2021). A comparative genre-based analysis of move-step structure of RAIs in two different publication contexts. *English Language Teaching, 14*(3), 12-24. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v14n3p12

Amnuai, W. (2019). The textual organization of the discussion sections of accounting research articles. *Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences, 40*(2), 389-394. https://so04.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/kjss/article/view/242166

Amnuai, W. (2021). A comparison of niche establishments in English research article introductions published in international and Thai journals. *Discourse and Interaction, 14*(2), 24-40. https://doi.org/10.5817/DI2021-2-24

Andika, R. P., Arsyad, S., & Harahap, A. (2018). Rhetorical moves and linguistic features of journal article abstracts by postgraduate students, national and international authors in applied linguistics. *JOALL (Journal of Applied Linguistics & Literature), 3*(1), 129-142. https://doi.org/10.33369/joall.v3i1.6539

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

Arsyad, S., & Arono. (2016). Potential problematic rhetorical style transfer from first language to foreign language: A case of Indonesian authors writing research article introductions in English. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses, 11*(3), 315-330. https://doi.org/10.1080/17447143.2016.1153642

Arsyad, S., Purwo, B. K., & Adnan, Z. (2020a). The argument style in research article discussions to support research findings in language studies. *Studies in English Language and Education, 7*(2), 290-307. https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v7i2.16626

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

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.2016.09.001

Cheng, F.-W. (2020). Negotiating theoretical implication in management research article discussions. *ESP Today, 8*(1), 90-113. https://doi.org/10.18485/esptoday.2020.8.1.5

Cheng, F.-W., & Unsworth, L. (2016). Stance-taking as negotiating academic conflict in applied linguistics research article discussion sections. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 24*, 43-57. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2016.09.001

Cheng, F.-W. (2021). Crafting theoretical value in management research article discussion sections. *Ibérica: Revista de la Asociación Europea de Lenguas para Fines Específicos (AELFE), 41*, 61-82. https://doi.org/10.17398/2340-2784.41.61

Cotos, E., Huffman, S., & Link, S. (2017). A move/step model for methods sections: Demonstrating rigour and credibility. *English for Specific Purposes, 46*, 90-106. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2017.01.001

Dimyati, M. (2020). *Panduan penelitian dan pengabdian kepada masyarakat edisi XIII*. https://lppm.unri.ac.id/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/Panduan-Penelitian-dan-Pengabdian-kepada-Masyarakat-Edisi-XIII.pdf

Hunston, S. (1993). Professional conflict—Disagreement in academic discourse. In M. Baker, G. Francis, & E. Tognini-bonelli, *Text and technology* (pp. 115). John Benjamins.

Kutay, U. (2016). A genre analysis of the methodology sections of descriptive medical-surgical nursing articles. *Journal of Computer and Education Research, 4*(7), 65-81. https://doi.org/10.18009/jcer.09009

Kwan, B. S. (2006). The schematic structure of literature reviews in doctoral theses of applied linguistics. *English for Specific Purposes, 25*(1), 30-55. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2005.06.001

Lim, J. M.-H. (2010). Commenting on research results in applied linguistics and education: A comparative genre-based investigation. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 9*(4), 280-294. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2010.10.001

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

Loi, C. K., Evans, M. S., Lim, J. M.-H., & Akkakoson, S. (2016). A comparison between Malay and English research article discussions: A move analysis. *SAGE Open, 6*(2), 1-11. https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244016652925

Liu, M. S.M., & Lim, J. M.-H. (2014). How do writers evaluate their own empirical research? A genre-based inquiry into economics journal papers. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 134*, 13-22. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.04.219

Lu, X., Casal, J. E., Liu, Y., Kisselev, O., & Yoon, J. (2021). The relationship between syntactic complexity and rhetorical move-steps in research article introductions: Variation among four social science and engineering disciplines. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 52*, 101006. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2021.101006

Martin, J. R., & White, P. R. (2003). *The language of evaluation* (Vol. 2)*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. https://link.springer.com/book/10.1057/9780230511910

Mirahayuni, N. K. (2002). Investigating generic structure of English research articles: Writing strategy differences between English and Indonesian writers. *TEFLIN Journal, 13*(1), 22-57. https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v13i1/22-57

Moreno, A. I. (2021). Selling research in RA discussion sections through English and Spanish: An intercultural rhetoric approach. *English for Specific Purposes, 63*, 1-17. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2021.02.002

Moyano, E. I. (2019). Knowledge construction in discussions of research articles in two disciplines in Spanish: The role of resources of appraisal. *Journal of Pragmatics, 139*, 231-246. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2018.09.011

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

Sadeghi, K., & Alinasab, M. (2020). Academic conflict in Applied Linguistics research article discussions: The case of native and non-native writers. *English for Specific Purposes, 59*, 17-28. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2020.03.001

Salager-Meyer, F., Ariza, M. a. Á. A., & Zambrano, N. (2003). The scimitar, the dagger and the glove: Intercultural differences in the rhetoric of criticism in Spanish, French and English medical discourse (1930–1995). *English for Specific Purposes, 22*(3), 223-247. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(02)00019-4

Samanhudi, U., & O'Boyle, A. (2022). Citation practice in research articles in Indonesia-based journals and international journals. *Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes*, *9* (4), 741-751. https://doi.org/10.22190/JTESAP2104741S

Soler-Monreal, C., Carbonell-Olivares, M., & Gil-Salom, L. (2011). A contrastive study of the rhetorical organisation of English and Spanish PhD thesis introductions. *English for Specific Purposes, 30*(1), 4-17. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2010.04.005

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

Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge University Press.

Swales, J. M., & Feak, C. B. (2004). *Academic writing for graduate students: Essential tasks and skills* (Vol. 1). University of Michigan Press Ann Arbor, MI.

Swales, J. M., Irwin, V., & Feak, C. (2009). Online commentary for abstracts and the writing of abstracts. *Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press*.

Wang, W., & Yang, C. (2015). Claiming centrality as promotion in applied linguistics research article introductions. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 20*, 162-175. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2015.05.002

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

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

Warsidi, W., Irawan, A. M., Adnan, Z., & Samad, I. A. (2023). Citation studies in English vs. Indonesian research article introductions (RAIs) in the history discipline. *Studies in English Language and Education, 10*(2), 598-613. https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v10i2.28343

Williams, I. A. (1999). Results sections of medical research articles: Analysis of rhetorical categories for pedagogical purposes. *English for Specific Purposes, 18*(4), 347-366. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(98)00003-9

Zainuddin, S. Z., & Shaari, A. H. (2021). A genre-inspired investigation of establishing the territory in thesis introductions by Malaysian ESL writers. *3L The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies, 27*(2), 144-160. https://doi.org/10.17576/3L-2021-2702-11

Zhang, B., & Wannaruk, A. (2016). Rhetorical structure of education research article methods sections. *PASAA: Journal of Language Teaching and Learning in Thailand, 51*, 155-184. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1112248

Zibalas, D., & Šinkūnienė, J. (2019). Rhetorical structure of promotional genres: The case of research article and conference abstracts. *Discourse and Interaction, 12*(2), 95-113. https://doi.org/10.5817/DI2019-2-95