



## Research Gap Strategies in the Introduction Section of Local Journal Articles in the Field of Language Teaching and Literature

Jamaludin<sup>1</sup>, Dian Eka Chandra Wardhana<sup>2</sup>, Safnil Arsyad<sup>3</sup>, Ade Hidayat<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1,2,3</sup>Universitas Bengkulu, Indonesia

<sup>4</sup>Universitas Jambi, Indonesia

Corresponding author. E mail: [hjamaludin07021968@gmail.com](mailto:hjamaludin07021968@gmail.com)

Permalink: <http://dx.doi.org/10.24036/ld.v20i1.134996>

Submitted: 13-07-2025

Accepted: 31-05-2026

DOI: 10.24036/ld.v20i1.134996

Published: 24-06-2026

### Abstract

Research gap statement in the introduction section of a research article is very crucial in order to show the quality and contribution it makes to scientific knowledge, serving as key factor to be accepted for publication in nationally accredited or reputable international journals.. Previous studies have found several ways of research gap employed by authors; however, these studies have not fulfilled all aspects, especially regarding the research gap strategy in the field of Indonesian Language Teaching and Literature. Therefore, this research fills this gap by describing the authors' strategy in presenting the research gap and its linguistic features in the introduction sections of articles published in nationally accredited journals. The data were fifty articles written by Indonesian authors, randomly selected from nationally accredited journals in the field of Indonesian Language Teaching and Literature. The data were analyzed using content analysis with qualitative design, grounding from five types of research gaps proposed by Arianto et al. (2021). The findings of the study show that there was a tendency for Indonesian authors to present research gap in the introduction section by suggesting solution to the research problem. This strategy is addressed by using particular linguistic features, such as phrases indicating the need for further study on the topic under investigation and phrases suggesting recommendations, which emerged as the two most frequently used expressions. The implication of these findings is the development of a deeper understanding of research gap writing strategies by Indonesian new authors is beneficial before composing academic texts for scientific publication such as research articles published in journals.

**Keywords:** *Introduction Section, Indonesian Language Teaching and Literature, Nationally Accredited Journal, Research Gap Strategy*

### INTRODUCTION

The introduction section serves as the most critical part of a research article, providing an overview of the research topic, linking it to relevant literature, and demonstrating its relationship to previous studies. Furthermore, this section plays a significant role in encouraging readers to engage with the entire article (Safnil, 2013). Therefore, the introduction must be presented in an engaging and convincing manner to attract the attention of readers, particularly researchers and reviewers (Lim, 2012). To capture the interest of readers, especially reviewers, the introduction must clearly

demonstrate the novelty of the research (Arianto & Basthomi, 2021). Research novelty can be addressed by addressing the research gap strategy (henceforth RGS) in the introduction can be identified through the use of RGS (Swales, 1990, 2004). This approach highlights the differences between previous studies and the current research, thereby establishing the importance of the new study (Arianto et al., 2021). Thus, the ability to effectively present a RGS can determine the quality of the research and may influence whether an article is accepted for publication in nationally accredited or internationally reputable journals.

The presentation of novelty in the introduction is generally accompanied by the RG (Swales, 1990, 2004). This is intended to engage readers, especially reviewers, so that after reading the introduction, they can assess the novelty of the work and its worthiness for further reading (Arianto & Basthomi, 2021). This also allows for the identification of differences between existing research and the current study (Arianto et al., 2021). Therefore, the ability to present a RG is likely to determine the quality of the research and may be a deciding factor in whether a research article is accepted by nationally accredited or internationally reputable journals.

Research gap strategy is one of the main things that needs to be considered in research, as it generally shows the position of the research and the contribution it makes to scientific knowledge. Typically, authors present the novelty of their research by emphasizing RG, particularly in the early sections of their research reports. Likewise, in research journal articles, novelty can be identified in the abstract and introduction sections (Hyland, 2013; Shehzad, 2008). Presenting RG at the beginning provides readers with potentially needed information, which may attract them to read further, or alternatively, skip certain parts of the article (Amnuai, 2019). Therefore, careful attention should be paid to how the research gap is presented to ensure it achieves the desired impact.

Research gaps are typically presented at the beginning of research articles, specifically in the abstract and introduction sections. In the abstract, RG should be presented explicitly and concisely with the aim of enticing readers to explore other sections of the article. However, due to certain limitations—particularly word count restrictions—authors are unable to provide extensive information in the abstract. Arianto et al. (2021) found that authors tend to elaborate more on novelty in the introduction than in the abstract. These constraints make it more feasible for authors to present detailed information about the novelty of their research in the introduction.

Several previous studies have examined the presentation of research novelty and the use of RGS between local and international writers. These studies found that local authors tend to use RGS less frequently than international authors do (Keshavarz et al., 2007; Loi, 2010; Amnuai, 2021; Arianto et al., 2021). Arianto et al. (2021) also found that Indonesian writers present RGS less frequently than their international counterparts in the introduction sections of their research articles. This may contribute to the lower success rate of Indonesian researchers, particularly in language education, in publishing in nationally accredited journals. Safnil (2013) found that only half of the introduction sections in research articles written by Indonesian authors included Step 2 or RGS according to the CARS model (Swales, 1990). Indonesian authors also tend to lack the quality and ability to organize ideas effectively in the introduction sections of research articles (Zein et al., 2023).

Other studies on RGS have been conducted in various fields, such as management science by Lim (2012), engineering, health, and natural sciences by Safnil (2013), and computer science by Suryani et al. (2015). Comparative studies have also been conducted between international and local Thai articles by Amnuai (2021)

between articles indexed in Scopus with different quartiles in English language learning (Arianto & Basthomi, 2021), among Indonesian doctoral students, academics, and international authors (Arianto & Basthomi, 2021), among Indonesian doctoral students, academics, and international authors (Arianto et al., 2021), and among Indonesian authors in various disciplines (Hidayat et al., 2023). While these studies have covered a range of fields, none have specifically investigated RGS and research gaps in the context of Indonesian language teaching. Although some studies have involved Indonesian authors, previous research has not specifically examined the RGS and research gaps used by Indonesian authors in Indonesian language teaching, nor has it focused on RGS and research gaps in nationally accredited journal articles.

A recent study by Oktaviani et al. (2024) examined the application of RGS in research articles in the field of Indonesian language teaching authored by Indonesians. This study found that knowledge gap is the mostly used strategy, due to the characteristic of author who does not need to strongly criticize or evaluate the previous studies. However, this study only analyzed RGS and focused on research gaps in the introduction section. It did not investigate the linguistic features used by authors in presenting RGS. Additionally, this recent study used Miles (2017) model, which consists of seven RGS types, while the present study employs the Arianto et al. (2021) model with five RGS types. This difference in RGS models is intended to provide methodological variation, with the expectation of yielding different results. Therefore, this study is important to continue, as it will supplement information on the presentation of RGS and the linguistic features used by Indonesian authors in research journal articles in the field of Indonesian language teaching. Therefore, this study aims to analyze the presentation of RGS in the introduction sections of accredited journal articles by addressing the following questions:

1. What is the frequency of research articles included in this study presenting a research gap strategy?
2. What strategies are predominantly used by Indonesian authors in Indonesian Language Education in presenting research gap?
3. What linguistic features are often used by Indonesian authors in presenting their research gap strategies?

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

Research article introduction provides foundational information about the study. It is the opening section of a research article, which provides the background, related previous studies, problem statement, and research objectives (Rochma et al., 2020). According to (Swales, 1990, 2004), a research article introduction must follow "Create a Research Space" (CARS) model, which include three moves: making topic generalization, establishing niche, and occupying niche. First, the authors must provide background information on the significance of the research, based on the importance, the trend, the raise of new topic, or the real problem related to the topic. Second, the authors must identify the space or niche in the literature. In this move, the authors must present research gap for which the current study may contribute to the existing knowledge. Presenting research gap not only shows the author's understanding of the previous studies, but also emphasizes the urgency and relevance of the next research. Therefore, research gap presentation in introduction sections plays as a promise for the newness of research in relation to the existing knowledge. And the last, the authors must formulate the research questions and research objectives, or the purpose of doing the research. Besides, they can also include hypotheses or prediction on the result of the research.

## METHODS

The method used in this research is content analysis. According to Drisko & Maschi (2016), content analysis is suitable for this research because it provides valid conclusions from texts or other materials in the context of their use. This content analysis method can be used to analyze and record the behavior, opinions, and concerns of a person or group from various backgrounds. In this study, this content analysis method was used qualitatively to describe the strategies used by writers in the field of Indonesian language teaching and literature in stating RG, as a way to express the novelty of the research they are conducting. Furthermore, quantitative data were used to describe the frequency of RGS based on its type according to the model of Arianto et al. (2021).

### The Corpus of the Study

The corpus of this study was selected articles from 10 (ten) nationally accredited journals that focus on the field of Indonesian language teaching and literature. These journals are published in Indonesia and have been indexed in the SINTA ranking (Science and Technology Index). The selected articles are also the latest publications in the last 3 years (2022 to 2024). This selection was based on the intention to provide representative overview of the latest writing style in scientific articles in each journal in the corpus. The articles published in these journals were the ones written by Indonesian authors and related to Indonesian language teaching. This is intended to see how Indonesian writers present RGS in the introduction section of research articles written in Indonesian.

**Table 1.** The Corpus of the Study

No	Journal	Code	SINTA Rank	Number of Articles
1	KEMBARA: Jurnal Keilmuan Bahasa, Sastra, dan Pengajarannya	KBRA	2	5
2	Indonesian Language Education and Literature	ILEL	2	5
3	Diksa: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia	DKSA	3	5
4	Semantik: Jurnal Ilmiah Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia	SMTK	3	5
5	DIGLOSIA: Jurnal Kajian Bahasa, Sastra dan Pengajarannya	DGLA	3	5
6	Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia	PBSI	3	5
7	J-Symbol: Jurnal Magister Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia	BODY	4	5
8	Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia Metalingua	META	4	5
9	Silampari Bisa: Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan Bahasa Indonesia, Daerah, dan Asing	SBJP	4	5
10	Logat: Jurnal Bahasa Indonesia dan Pembelajaran	LJBI	4	5
			<b>Total</b>	<b>50</b>

### The Analysis of Research Gap Strategy

This research analyzed RGS following the RGS model from Arianto et al. (2021) consists of five types of RGS, each with characteristics that are quite different from each other. This model is quite reliable to distinguish each type of RGS because each type of RGS has its own distinctive features. The five types of Arianto's RGS are:

1. Contradictive/conflicting evidence (RGS 1). This strategy emphasizes contrast or conflict in previous research results. The results and findings from previous research may conflict with each other, indicating that there are things that need to be verified, so further research needs to be carried out.

Example of RGS 1:

... the few studies conducted in L2 writing contexts have produced **contradictory results**. For instance, Meraji (2011) observed a positive effect of pre-task planning on all aspects of L2 writing. Yet, Ojima (2006) and Ellis and Yuan (2004) found that pre-task planning led to increased fluency and syntactic complexity but little change in L2 written accuracy. Johnson, Mercado, and Acevedo (2012) found little effect of pre-task planning on the overall L2 writing performance, except a small significant effect on fluency....

(quoted from Arianto et al., 2021)

2. Limitation in previous studies (RGS 2): This strategy emphasizes the existence of deficiencies, weaknesses, or limitations in previous research, especially in the methods used, so that the results found may not be relevant or may not be as expected.

Example of RGS 2:

However, as implied in Storch (2013), **this model fails** to factor in the fluctuating nature of learners' dyadic interaction. That is, **this model does not capture** the situation in which learners demonstrate various ...

(quoted from Arianto et al., 2021)

3. Inadequate research (RGS 3): This strategy emphasizes previous research that is still insufficient or inadequate, so that it cannot answer current research questions.

Example of RGS 3):

Although students are the key players in pair or group work, **little is known** about their perceptions of or attitudes towards collaborative writing and how these factors influence patterns ...

(quoted from Arianto et al., 2021)

4. Nonexistent research (RGS 4): This strategy explicitly states that there is no research on a particular topic, so that an RG appears that needs further research.

Example of RGS 4:

They **have not**, however, explicitly addressed how wiki-mediated collective production helps individual L2 writing performance. The present study aims to fill this gap ..

(quoted from Arianto et al., 2021)

5. Suggesting Solution (RGS 5): This strategy emphasizes the existence of problems that need to be resolved, so the author offers a solution and suggestion that might be able to resolve the problem.

Example of RGS 5:

Despite this gap in the research literature, many textbooks **suggest** the use of collaborative writing tasks to pre-and in-service teachers ...  
(quoted from Arianto et al., 2021)

### The Analysis of Linguistics Feature

Linguistic features were analyzed to see how the author presents the RGS. The framework is adapted from Lim (2012). which consists of various linguistic features. This analysis is expected to present the features, word choices, or use of grammar used by the author in presenting the RGS in the introduction section. Furthermore, the data were presented quantitatively to see which linguistic features are most frequently used. According to Lim (2012), the linguistic features considered consist of eight types:

1. Phrases indicating parameters (F1), such as: *limited information, partial perspective, rare knowledge, sporadic evidence, etc.*
2. Phrases indicating author's attention (F2); for example: *little attention/noticing, ignored/neglected, etc.*
3. Negation phrases (F3), such as: *not enough, not considering, not examining, not studying, etc.*
4. Phrases indicating uncertainty or doubt (F4); examples include: *ambiguity, mixed evidence, lack of consensus, conflicting information, inconsistent with, etc.*
5. Phrases indicating suggestions (F5); used to offer solutions, such as: *it is suggested to, important to, the suggestion is, etc.*
6. Phrases indicating the need for further study (F6); for example: *important to study further, to explore more deeply, needs to be investigated, etc.*

### Data Analysis Reliability

An independent coder was participating in the process of analyzing the Data in order to check the reliability of the analysis. The evaluation was based on Cohen's Kappa coefficient analysis which focus on inter-coder reliability of RGS and linguistics featurefound in the introduction section. The independent coder is an alumnus of doctoral program which focused his dissertation in the same field of this research. First, there was a discussion on how to analyze and classify the RGS and linguistics features. Then, he analyzes all the introduction sections using the same instruments. Finally, the results from researcher and independent coder were compared to determine the Kappa coefficient score following Kanoksilapathan (2005) which categorized the score into 4 categories: poor (less than 0.40), fair (0.40-0.59), good (0.60-0.74), and excellent (more than 0.74). The results of inter-coder reliability analysis are presented in Table 2.

**Table 2.** Inter-coder reliability score

No	Type of Analysis	Cohen's Kappa Score
	Research gap strategy analysis	0.90
	Linguistics features analysis	0.85
	<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>0.87</b>

As can be seen from Table 2, the mean score of Cohen's Kappa score is 0.87 which then can be categorized as excellent. Further, after comparing the result of the analysis, researcher and independent coder discuss the differences to make final decisions of the data analysis. Thus, the data presented in this research is reliable.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Results

#### *The Frequency of Research Article Introduction with an RGS*

Analysis of research articles in the field of Indonesian language teaching and literature shows the use of RGS in the introduction section. Apart from that, a number of uses of linguistic features are also found in the presentation of the RGS. However, not all articles present RGS in the introduction. The frequency of presentation of the RG Strategy can be seen in Table 3.

**Table 3.** RGS in the Introduction of the Research Articles

RG Strategy	Frequency	Percentage
Available	33	66%
Not available	17	34%
<b>Total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100%</b>

It can be seen in Table 3, of the total of 50 articles analyzed, there are 33 articles (66%) that present RGS, and there are 17 articles (34%) that do not present RGS in the introduction. This data also explains that the presentation of the RGS is quite dominant in the introduction of research articles. Linguistic features were also found in the presentation of the RGS. The analysis result also shows that from 33 articles there are some articles that present more than one RGS as can be seen in Table 4.

**Table 4.** Frequency of RGS Presentation

Presentation	Number of Articles	Percentage
One RGS	27	81.82%
Two RGS	6	18.18%
<b>Total</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>100%</b>

Table 4 shows that most of the articles only present one type of RGS (27 articles), while the other 6 articles present two types of RGS. It is also important to consider that there are 17 articles that do not present an RGS. The analysis found that authors mainly focus on research problems and then stating their research purposes. The example of research article without a RGS can be seen in Excerpt 1 below.

#### **Excerpt 1**

##### **Article without RGS**

*... Berdasarkan pemaparan, **berbagai macam penelitian** mengenai ironi dan kelakar **sudah banyak dilakukan**. Penelitian mengenai animasi juga dilakukan biasanya digunakan untuk pembelajaran, sedangkan **dalam penelitian ini animasi Tekotok akan diidentifikasi berdasarkan pola sosiopragmatik yakni tindak ironi dan kelakar...***

{... Based on the explanation, **various kinds of research** on irony and humor **have been done**. Research on animation is also done usually used for learning,

while in this study Tekotok animation will be identified based on sociopragmatic patterns, namely acts of irony and humor. ...}  
(KLSA05/p6k1-2)

In Excerpt 1, the author emphasized that there are already various research that has been done. However, the author does not follow up by mentioning the lacks and limitations the previous studies. Instead, the author shows that their research is adding another variation for the research topic. The move in Excerpt 1 is in accordance to the characteristic of establishing a niche from CARS model of Swales (2004) which can be categorized as move 2 step 1B adding to what is known.

### ***RGS Types in the Article Introduction Sections***

Based on the results of the analysis that has been carried out, there are 33 articles (66%) that present RGS in the introduction section, but not all types of RGS are found to be used. Apart from that, variations in the frequency of use of RGS types are also quite varied. The distribution of RGS presentations in the introduction section can be seen in Table 5.

**Table 5.** RGS Distribution in the Introduction Sections

Strategy	f	%
RGS-5 suggesting solution	17	51.5%
RGS-4 nonexistent research	8	24.2%
RGS-2 limitation in previous studies	5	15.2%
RGS-3 inadequate research	3	9.1%
RGS-1 contradictive/conflicting evidence	-	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>100%</b>

In Table 5, it can be seen that all types of RGS were found to be used in the introduction of research articles and only contradictory or conflicting evidence or RGS-1 is not found in the introduction of research articles. Inadequate research found in 3 articles (9.1%), limitation in previous studies found in 5 articles (15.2%), nonexistent research was found in 8 articles (24.2%). Meanwhile, RG Strategy's suggesting solution was the strategy most frequently used, namely in 17 articles (51.5%).

The presentation of the RGS in the introduction section of a research article can be seen in the following excerpts.

#### **Excerpt 2**

##### **RGS 5 – Suggesting Solution**

... *Penelitian ini* sangat penting untuk mengaji pemanfaatan materi ajar bermuatan kearifan lokal **sebagai solusi mengatasi permasalahan** yang terjadi dalam pembelajaran bahasa Indonesia di SMA Negeri 1 Karanganyar ...

{... **This research** is very important to study the use of teaching materials containing local wisdom **as a solution to overcome problems** what happened in Indonesian language learning at SMA Negeri 1 Karanganyar. ...}

(KBRA01/p6s1)

In Excerpt 2, the author uses strategy of suggesting solution. The author shows that there is a problem found in a group and then offers a technique or method that can be applied as a solution to solve the problem. Furthermore, these techniques and methods need to be tested in the form of further research which provides evidence of their relevance to the existing problem.

### Excerpt 3

#### RGS 4 – Nonexistent research

... Selain itu, **penelitian tentang** penerapan aplikasi Google Classroom yang mengkhususkan pada literasi menulis anekdot pembelajaran bahasa Indonesia **belum pernah dilakukan.** ...

{... Besides that, **research about** implementation of the Google Classroom application which specializes in literacy writing anecdotes for Indonesian language learning **has never been done.** ...}

(DIGL02/p8s2)

In Excerpt 3, the strategy used by the author is nonexistent research or RGS 4 which puts pressure on previous research that does not exist or has never been carried out. The author points out that no previous research has addressed this particular topic or subtopic. This becomes the basis for writers to conduct research that discusses these topics or subtopics in order to fill in the research gap.

### Excerpt 4

#### RGS 2 – Limitation in previous studies

... Namun, dalam **penelitian terdahulu** kajiannya **belum fokus pada** analisis kebutuhan yang diperlukan oleh mahasiswa atau peserta didik khususnya dalam mengikuti pembelajaran menulis puisi. ...

... However, deep **previous research** the study **haven't focused on** analysis of the needs required by students or learners, especially in participating in learning to write poetry. ...

(PBSI02/p7s4)

In Excerpt 4, the author uses a strategy of limitation in previous studies or RGS 2. The author emphasizes the limitations of previous research by stating that previous research has not focused on certain aspects. Based on this, the author indicates that the research he conducted is quite important to fill the gaps in previous research.

### Excerpt 5

#### RGS 3 – Insufficient research

**Berdasarkan hasil penelitian sebelumnya** dapat disimpulkan bahwa implementasi pembelajaran keterampilan memirsa **perlu diteliti secara mendetail**, khususnya terhadap dokumen Capaian Pembelajaran Kurikulum Prototipe Bahasa Indonesia ...

{**Based on the results of previous research** it can be concluded that the implementation of learning viewing skills **needs to be researched in detail**, especially regarding the Indonesian Language Prototype Curriculum Learning Outcomes document...}

(SMTK01/p18s1)

In Excerpt 5, the author presents the RGS type of insufficient research or RGS 3. This quote shows how the author emphasizes the existence of certain things that have not been explained adequately. This shows that previous research has not sufficiently explained certain aspects, so further research needs to be carried out.

### Linguistic Features in RGS Presentation

The results obtained based on data analysis on RGS presented by the author in the introduction section of the research article show that almost all linguistic features found use. The percentage of use is quite varied, although the differences are not too significant. The distribution of the use of these linguistic characteristics can be seen in table 5.

**Table 6.** Distribution of Use of Linguistic Features

Strategy	Linguistics Features						Total
	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	
<b>RGS-5</b> suggesting solution	-	-	-	-	11	6	<b>17</b>
<b>RGS-4</b> nonexistent research	7	-	-	-	1	-	<b>8</b>
<b>RGS-3</b> inadequate research	3	-	-	-	-	-	<b>3</b>
<b>RGS-2</b> limitation in previous studies	-	4	1	-	-	-	<b>5</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>33</b>

*(F1) Phrases denoting parameter; (F2) Phrases denoting author's attention; (F3) Phrases denoting negations; (F4) Phrases denoting uncertainty; (F5) Phrases denoting suggestion; (F6) Phrases denoting a need for further study*

As can be seen in Table 6, the linguistics features found in RGS-5 are 11 phrases denoting suggestion (F5) and 6 phrases denoting a need for further study (F6). In RGS-4, authors mostly used phrases denoting parameter (F1) which is found in 7 RGS, while 1 RGS used F5. In presenting RGS-3, all authors used F1 which is found in 3 RGS. Finally, in RGS-2, authors mainly used phrases denoting attention (F2) in 4 out of 5 RGS found. Further examples of linguistics features found in presenting RGS is shown in Table 7.

**Table 7.** Examples of Linguistics Features

Linguistics Features	Total Frequency	Percentage
<b>F5</b> Phrases denoting suggestion	11	33.3%
<b>F1</b> Phrases denoting parameter	10	30.3%
<b>F6</b> Phrases denoting a need for further study	7	21.2%
<b>F2</b> Phrases denoting author's attention	4	12.2%
<b>F3</b> Phrases denoting negations	1	3.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>100%</b>

In presenting and using these linguistic features, the writers use various choices of words and phrases according to their respective writing styles. These words show indications according to each type of linguistic feature that exists. Further examples of the use of these linguistic features can be seen in the following excerpt.

### Excerpt 6

F5 – Phrases denoting suggestion

... *Penelitian ini dapat dijadikan sebagai alternatif solusi yang bisa ditawarkan untuk sekolah yang memiliki keterbatasan pemanfaatan teknologi sebagai media pembelajaran.*

{... **This research** can be made as an **alternative solution** which can be offered to schools that have limited use of technology as a learning medium.}

(PBSI04/p11s1)

In Excerpt 6 the author emphasizes that the research he conducted was a solution to the problems faced by schools by using the expression "as an alternative solution". Other phrases that indicate suggestions found from the research corpus are: "providing solutions to problems", "as one solution", "an innovation is proposed", "this research offers", and "appropriate treatment".

### Excerpt 7

F1 – Phrases denoting parameter

... *Di Indonesia, penelitian tentang AaL untuk pembelajaran bahasa masih jarang digunakan. Penelitian-penelitian mengenai asesmen yang berkembang kebanyakan mengusung tema ...*

{... In Indonesia, research on AaL for language learning **still rarely used**. **Researches** regarding the developing assessment **most** carries the theme ...}

(KBRA05/p2s1-2)

In Excerpt 7, the words chosen by the author to indicate the parameters (*denoting parameter*) are to use the phrases "still rarely used" and "mostly". Further analysis of the research corpus also showed similar phrases such as "not much has been done", and "research is still limited".

### Excerpt 8

F6 – Phrases denoting a need for further study

... *Oleh karena itu, penelitian ini harus dilakukan supaya dapat mengetahui problematika pembelajaran daring.*

{... Therefore, **this research must be carried out** in order to know the problems of online learning.}

(PBSI05/p4s6)

In Excerpt 8, the author presents a phrase that indicates the need for further study (denoting the need for further study) by stating "this research must be carried out". There are several similar phrases found from the analysis of the research corpus such as: "this research is needed", "a study of ... needs to be carried out", "analysis is needed", and "needs to be studied in more depth".

### Excerpt 9

F4 – Phrases denoting author's attention

... *Sementara itu, Inayatullah et al., (2016) dan Pratiwi & Hapsari, P. (2020) hanya menekankan pada media pembelajaran berupa penggunaan video Youtube dalam pembelajaran. Hal tersebut tentu saja belum memerinci secara mendetail implementasi pembelajaran keterampilan ...*

{... Meanwhile, Inayatullah et al., (2016) and Pratiwi & Hapsari, P. (2020) **just emphasizing** in learning media in the form of using YouTube videos in learning. That is of course **not yet detailed in detail** implementation of skills learning ...}  
(SMTK01/p19s1-2)

In Excerpt 9, the author uses phrases such as “only emphasized” and “has not gone into detail” to show his attention to previous studies (*denoting the attention*). Other phrases found in the research corpus were "previous research has not focused on", "has not focused on", "has not linked", "has not included", and "only focused on".

### Excerpt 10

F5 – Negation Phrases

... *Penelitian sebelumnya tidak meneliti modalitas epistemik hazu da.*  
{... **Previous Study did not researching** about *hazu da* epistemic modality.}  
(DIGL04/p10s2)

Only one negation was found based on the analysis carried out on the research corpus as shown in Excerpt 10. The author uses the phrase “did not researching” to indicate that there are gaps in previous research results that indicate the need for further research.

## Discussion

The first research question is focusing on the frequency of RGS presentation. The findings revealed that, although the presentation of the RGS is quite dominant in the introduction of research articles, there were many articles which do not present RGS in the introduction. The results show that most of the articles present RGS in the introduction section. Most of the articles presents only one type of RGS while there are also some articles that present two types of RGS. This finding indicates that the use of RGS is quite a common but not compulsory thing to do which also simultaneously confirms previous studies on RGS presentation in research articles (Keshavarz et al., 2007; Loi, 2010; del Saz Rubio, 2011; Lim, 2012; Rahman et al., 2017; Ankomah & Afful, 2019). The five RGS types are regarded as optional strategies, reflecting that the choice of writing style and emphasis on RGS focus vary among authors according to their cultural backgrounds (Adnan, 2014). Moreover, only four of the five RGS types were found in the data; the contradictive/conflicting evidence RGS was not found. This absence aligns with earlier research showing a low frequency of the contradictive/conflicting evidence strategy (Arianto et al., 2021; Arsyad et al., 2023). According to Arianto et al. (2021), Indonesian authors tend to avoid criticizing previous findings and instead emphasize the necessity of their own research. This tendency may stem from the authors’ cultural values, which highly respect others and thus avoid negative judgments of others’ work (Adnan, 2014).

Further notable finding that cannot be ignored is that there are some articles which are not showing any presentation of RGS. This finding is important because research gap is considered as principal aspect in doing research to emphasizes novelty. The assumption can be taken is that the authors might not be aware of the importance of research gap or the believe research can be done without any research gap. However, the finding also show that authors still using move establishing a niche from CARS model (Swales, 2004) which is adding to what is known. The authors mostly focusing on what things they can add up to the previous findings and aim to give variations in

research results. This finding can also be related to author's writing style where they prefer different move rather than presenting research gap (del Saz Rubio, 2011; Lim, 2012; Rahman et al., 2017; Ankomah & Afful, 2019).

The second research question is focusing on strategies that are predominantly used by Indonesian authors. The findings show that most of the authors present the RGS of suggesting solution in the introduction section of research articles. This strategy is quite dominant because authors tend to emphasize the need to fill gaps by offering recommendations. Similar findings that were discovered by Arianto et al. (2021), which shows that most Indonesian writers use the RGS of suggesting solutions, in contrast to international authors who are more varied in their choice of RGS to use. According to Arianto et al. (2021), this is closely related to the self-confidence of Indonesian writers and also their reluctance to provide criticism and evaluation of previous research, so that the RGS rhetoric of providing suggestions or solutions is the right choice. In line with this, writers who are not native English speakers, for example, writers from Indonesia, tend to avoid evaluating the results of previous research (Arsyad, 2013; Adnan, 2014; Arsyad & Arono, 2016; Arono & Arsyad, 2019). As discovered by Arsyad & Zainil (2023) dan Arianto & Basthomi (2021), there are indeed differences between Indonesian writers and international writers, especially in the rhetoric of evaluating previous research results.

This research findings on suggesting solution strategy are slightly different from previous research by Oktaviani et al. (2024), who use the RG Strategy from Miles (2017), but in general, the findings obtained are still similar. Results found by Oktaviani et al. (2024) show that the most widely used RGS are knowledge gap and population gap. According to Oktaviani et al. (2024), these two strategies are strategies that do not provide too many reviews or criticize previous research. The study conducted by Hidayat et al. (2023) also found that the knowledge gap is the most widely used strategy. According to Hidayat et al. (2023), this is also because Indonesian writers avoid criticism and negative evaluations of previous works. Statement Oktaviani et al. (2024) and Hidayat et al. (2023) is in accordance with Adnan (2014) which states that Indonesian writers tend to avoid criticism of previous research which may be influenced by local culture, as well Amnuai (2021) which states that the culture of local writers is very influential on writing style. A similar thing was found in this study, which shows strategy suggesting solution as the most widely used strategy. In his presentation, the author does not criticize previous research too much, but only shows what might be done to solve existing problems.

The third research question is focusing on linguistic features often used by Indonesian authors in presenting RGS. Based on the results of the analysis carried out, it was found that the most frequently used linguistic feature is phrases denoting suggestion. This finding is relevant to the previous results where suggesting solution is the mostly used RGS. However, Arsyad & Zainil (2023) did not found the any usage of suggesting solution phrases, thus make this finding contradicts theirs. One possible reason for this contradiction is that Arsyad & Zainil (2023) focused their corpus on international journal from various countries, whereas this research only focused on local journal. This difference may also be caused by differences in different writing styles because the focus of this research is Indonesian writers, while research by Arsyad & Zainil (2023) research international writers from various countries. This may also be related to differences in writing styles between Indonesian writers and international writers, which are quite important to study further. Based on findings Arsyad & Zainil (2023), the authors use more contrastive conjunctions which emphasizes the differences and weaknesses of previous studies. Meanwhile, Indonesian writers tend to

avoid using these linguistic features for cultural reasons and writing styles that are different from international writers (Adnan, 2014; Arianto et al., 2021).

## CONCLUSION

It was found that not all authors present a research gap strategies in their research article journals, some of them do not present a research gap strategie for various reasons. The second finding is that suggesting solution is the most frequently used research gap strategies by Indonesian authors in local journals within the field of Indonesian language teaching. Other strategies were only occasionally found, with the contrastive/conflicting evidence strategy not found at all. Finally, phrases denoting solution is the most frequently used linguistics features while presenting research gap strategies. However, based on the discussion, there are differences in the choice of research gap strategies between Indonesian authors and international authors, which may confirm previous research or even indicate the need for further investigation. It is hoped that this study can contribute and provide insights into the increasingly important topic of academic writing. Further research may also be necessary to complement or evaluate this study.

In conducting this research, several challenges and limitations were encountered that may affect the results. The main limitation was the restricted research corpus. This study focused on research journal articles in the field of Indonesian language teaching written in Indonesian and accredited in the SINTA ranking system. Unfortunately, not all SINTA rankings could be analyzed; for example, SINTA 1 journals are all written in English, which falls outside the scope of this study. Also, this study only examined research journal articles from high-ranking national journals. However, due to the limited availability of suitable journals, the research corpus was expanded to include SINTA rankings 2, 3, and 4. Consequently, there is a possibility that the corpus may not fully represent how authors present rhetorical strategies based on journal ranking, indicating the need for further research. Based on the limitations of this research, it is suggested for the future research to consider the following recommendations: 1) research gap strategies by international and local author; 2) style of writing in different journal rank (national or international ranking system); and 3) local language and international language in presenting research gap.

## REFERENCES

- Adnan, Z. (2014). Prospects of Indonesian Research Articles (RAs) Being Considered for Publication in ‘Center’ Journals: A Comparative Study of Rhetorical Patterns of RAs in Selected Humanities and Hard Science Disciplines. In *Lyda, A., & Warchal, K. Occupying niches: Interculturality, cross-culturality and aculturality in academic research* (pp. 79–99). Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-02526-1\\_6](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-02526-1_6)
- 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>
- Ankomah, C., & Afful, J. B. A. (2019). Establishing a Niche in Research: Rhetorical Strategies in Undergraduate and Postgraduate Writings in the Department of English, University of Cape Coast. *The Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes, 7*(3), 359–374.
- Arianto, M. A., & Basthomi, Y. (2021). The authors’ research gap strategies in ELT research article introductions: Does Scopus journal quartile matter? *Journal of*

- Language and Linguistic Studies*, 17(4), 1743–1759. <https://doi.org/10.52462/jlls.127>
- Arianto, M. A., Saukah, A., Basthomi, Y., & Wulyani, A. N. (2021). Previous studies have several limitations ...: Indonesian Doctoral Students', Indonesian Academics', and International Authors' Research Gap Strategies in ELT Research Article Abstracts and Introductions. *Journal of Language and Education*, 7(2), 25–44. <https://doi.org/10.17323/jle.2021.11735>
- Arono, & Arsyad, S. (2019). The Effect of Genre-Based Mentoring on Rhetorical Quality of Research Article Drafts by Indonesian Lecturers in Social Sciences and Humanities. *International Journal of Instruction*, 12(3), 35–50. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2019.1233a>
- Arsyad, S. (2013). A Genre-based Analysis on the Introductions of Research Articles Written by Indonesian Academics. *TEFLIN*, 24(2), 180–200. <https://doi.org/doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v24i2/180-200>
- 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., Madani, Pratiwi, V. A., An-Nashir, A. A., Erviona, L., Hasiyanti, & Marjelina, O. (2023). The Rhetorical Structure and Research Gap Strategies of Journal Article Abstracts in Language-Related Fields Published in High-impact International Journals. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, 16(1), 703–725.
- Arsyad, S., & Zainil, Y. (2023). Research gap strategies in article introductions of different rank applied linguistics journals. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 10(1), 216–234. <https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v10i1.25302>
- del Saz Rubio, M. M. (2011). A pragmatic approach to the macro-structure and metadiscoursal features of research article introductions in the field of Agricultural Sciences. *English for Specific Purposes*, 30(4), 258–271. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2011.03.002>
- Drisko, J. W., & Maschi, T. (2016). *Content Analysis*. Oxford University Press.
- Hidayat, A., Safnil, & Arono. (2023). Hard and Soft Sciences: How Both Fields Differ in Presenting Research Gaps. *Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan IPA*, 9(SpecialIssue), 88–94. <https://doi.org/10.29303/jppipa.v9iSpecialIssue.6214>
- Keshavarz, M. H., Atai, M. R., & Berzegar, V. (2007). A Contrastive Study of Generic Organization of Research Article Introductions Written by Iranian and Non-Iranian Writers in Applied Linguistics. *TELL*, 1(2), 13–33.
- 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. (2010). Research article introductions in Chinese and English: A comparative genre-based study. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 9(4), 267–279. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2010.09.004>
- Miles, D. A. (2017). A taxonomy of research gaps: Identifying and defining the seven research gaps. *Doctoral Student Workshop: Finding Research Gaps-Research Methods and Strategies*, 1–15.
- Oktaviani, D., Wardhana, D. E. C., Diani, I., & Jamalludin. (2024). Writing Research Gap Strategies in Indonesian Articles Abstracts and Introductions in Accredited National Journals towards International Indexed Publications. *International*

- Journal of Social Science and Human Research*, 7(07), 5656–5665.  
<https://doi.org/10.47191/ijsshr/v7-i07-118>
- Rahman, M., Darus, S., & Amir, Z. (2017). Rhetorical Structure of Introduction in Applied Linguistics Research Articles. *EDUCARE: International Journal for Educational Studies*, 9(2), 69–84.
- Safnil. (2013). A genre-based analysis on the introduction of research articles written by Indoensian academics. *TEFLIN Journal*, 24(2), 180–200.
- Suryani, I., Yacob, A., & Aziz, N. H. A. (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.
- Zein, T. T., Sinar, T. S., Nurlela, N., Lubis, T., & Rosa, R. N. (2023). Theme structure in an introduction section of articles published in Indonesian national journals. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 10(1), 251–265.  
<https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v10i1.25181>