

---

# Academic Writing as Discourse Practice in Australian and Indonesian Universities: A Critical Review

Ria Jubhari  
Hasanuddin University, Indonesia

## ABSTRAK

Tulisan ini merupakan sebuah tinjauan kritis tentang tulisan ilmiah sebagai salah satu bagian dari *discourse practice* dan terhadap ciri khas tulisan ilmiah yang dianggap baik di universitas-universitas di Australia dan di Indonesia. Walaupun topik dan rujukan ke sumber lain terdapat pada tradisi tulisan ilmiah di universitas-universitas di Australia dan Indonesia, cara mengembangkan topik dan berargumentasi membedakan keduanya. Demikian pula halnya dengan cara mengembangkan paragraf. Penulis mengusulkan agar guru bahasa Inggris dan bahasa Indonesia khususnya di universitas di Indonesia lebih menekankan pada ketrampilan mengembangkan paragraf tulisan ilmiah dan ketrampilan berpikir kritis.

**Kata kunci:** *discourse practice, characteristics of a good academic writing, Australian universities, Indonesian universities*

Part from its linguistic meaning as communicative events involving language in context, the notion of discourse can be understood as “a socially accepted association among ways of using language, other symbolic expressions, and ‘artifacts’, of thinking, feeling, believing, valuing, and acting that can be used to identify oneself as a member of a socially meaningful group or social network” (Gee 1996:131). This suggests that ‘discourse’ refers to distinctive practices, both oral and written, which are typical of members of a social group, a professional group or an ethnic community within a certain culture, and the practices of the members identify their membership of a group or community; for example, members of the academic community in Australia and Indonesia, English language teachers, doctors and lawyers.

Gee (1986) gives an example from the English language teaching standpoint and argues that English language teachers should teach a set of discourse practices, oral and written, connected with the standard dialect of English. This is because English cultural values, which enable people to function in mainstream English society or to be like native English speakers, are embedded in the discourse practices manifested in the integrated English language skills of speaking, writing,

listening and reading. To acquire spoken and written English, students need to be introduced and socialised into the mainstream ways of using the language, such as in comprehension and making sense of experience. It is clear that discourse practices are meaningful only if they are framed within the particular cultural contexts in which they are used, and they have different effects in different contexts. The values and norms, which in many ways influence the way people think and use their language, are embedded in discourse practices such as teaching English, learning a new language, and in academic writing.

Eggington (1992) reports on a conflict in the relationship between the traditional Aborigines in northern Australia and the literate nonaboriginal culture of Australia. The study shows an attempt to inculcate the values of Australian literate culture into the Aboriginal oral culture. Despite the declining success of the bilingual education program introduced by the Australian government from 1972 and mainly attributed to the “unconscious form of institutionalized cultural insensitivity” (Eggington 1992:84), Yirrkala bilingual school shows success in that the adopted values have helped the Aboriginal people to adjust themselves to the Australian people, whom they call Balanda, and

to gain control over the community's educational processes. Although some teaching was done in an Aboriginal language, the core curriculum was determined by the Northern Territory Department of Education, which reflected the Western notion of education. The Aboriginal people attempted to extend the bilingual education in the sense that they are not only taught how to read and write in English and their aboriginal language but also how to function in both Yolngu and Balanda ways at school. Aboriginal leaders express their concerns that the English their children learn is not the same as the English used by Australian people, which for them are 'secret' English. The secret English refers to the written English which does not typify the kind of English the aborigines speak and learn at school (Martin 1990). The difficulty with understanding written English lies in, for instance, its heavy nominalisation which makes the relationship between meaning and wording incongruent. For example, process and qualities are coded as abstract nouns instead of verbs.

Thus, despite the fact that Aboriginal leaders have experienced the discourse practice of basic reading and writing skills through an education program, it has not enabled them to fully function in Australian society. The reason is that the Aborigines have not yet been introduced to Australian literate cultural values which are embedded in the use of written English. In other words, writing in English needs to be introduced and socialised in order to avoid the conflict in the Aboriginal acculturation into Australian literate culture, and to lead Australian Aborigines into the mainstream Australian society.

### **Academic writing as discourse practice**

In terms of the meaningful social context, discourse practice is similar to Hymes's (1974) definition of the use of language in a particular community, despite its focus on spoken language. It implies a sharing of the same form in the community which is based on the members' assumptions, practices and traditions. Thus, to become a member of a community we have to accept these practices and traditions. As a consequence of subscription to the practices and traditions, these members of a community are not only defined by the use of the same language and culture but also characterised by its communicative functions.

According to Swales (1990), in a sociorhetorical discourse community, the

primary determinants of linguistic behaviour are functional, since a discourse community consists of a group of people who link up in order to pursue objectives that are prior to those of socialization and solidarity, the communicative needs of the goals tend to predominate in the development and maintenance of its discourse characteristics. One type of membership indicated in Swales (1990) is academic community. This academic community suggests a complex interaction between the culture of the larger community, to which the academic community belongs, and the culture of the academic community itself, which tends to be characterised based on its goals. Consequently, the cultural values of the larger communities may shape the academic culture, including the patterns of its practices, and on the other hand, the culture of academic communities may extend to the culture of the larger community, changing the patterns of the larger communities' practices.

Therefore, we can say that the academic community is characterised by the discourse practices performed by members of the academic community. Some of these discourse practices, which mark academic life, are citation, collaboration, networking, peer review and gate keeping. While these practices significantly constitute an academic community, the most important discourse practice is concerned with communication among members, which is basically conducted in print. It is this written communication rather than its specific manifestations, which has the status of 'core' in an academic culture. Hoadley-Maidment (2000) affirms that all academic communities use written communication a great deal as a result of the tradition of academic publishing, and also partly because the communities are very wide-spread geographically.

Assuming that an academic community belongs to literate people who are characterised by their communicative needs, and following Biber's (1988) linguistic and situational characteristics of spoken and written language, lectures and conference papers show the typicalities of written language, despite the fact that they are read aloud and communicated to students or colleagues. The contents of orally delivered papers reflect the type of autonomous language of academic writing as one example of discourse practice or "academic literacy" (Lea & Street 2000) in the academic community. Thus, the cultural values in the academic community within its larger community are visibly organised

in this written discourse, called “academic prose” (Brodkey 1981). These values are also reflected in university students’ academic writing because it shows the typical written nature of students’ written assignments within the scope of university education as formal writing done in universities by students and includes essays, research reports, major projects, and dissertations.

The use of academic writing within a university implies the use of a certain language by all members of the community by which all members can communicate with one another. Some studies have confirmed that English is the international language for academic communities. English is therefore the dominant language used in academic literature (Swales 1987, Maher 1986). Baldauf & Jernudd (1983) report that four-fifths of English language articles originate in countries where English is the national language or the official language. We can argue two things from this dominance of English. First, following Smolicz (1981), English can be considered the core value of academic culture since English is self-evidently intrinsic to scholarship, research, teaching and learning (Taylor 1978) none of which can be performed without talking, reading and writing. In short, irrespective of linguistic differences within the international academic communities, we can say that, to a great extent, English plays a role in the intellectual life of the academic community.

Second, this dominant use of English has cultural implications for non-native speakers of English writing in English. They find it difficult to produce acceptable academic writing in English because they are strongly influenced by their previous experience of writing in their first language (L1) (Leki & Carlson 1994, Mohan & Lo 1985). It follows that academic writing is culturally bound.

Recent years have seen increased attention being given to written academic discourse. And, as it is such a wide umbrella term, a number of different approaches to the analysis of academic writing in the context of universities have emerged. According to Baynham (2000), there are three main approaches that dominate the literature on academic writing. First, the ‘skill-based approach,’ such as ‘essay-writing,’ ‘report writing,’ or ‘summarising,’ generally aims to help socialise the basic conventions of academic writing is, for instance, practiced in the writing sessions of the English for Academic Purpose (EAP) course. This approach, however, seems to ignore the

discipline-specificity of writing requirements. This skill-based approach is sometimes called the process approach because in practicing certain skills to produce academic writing, student writers are assumed to go through a number of stages such as prewriting; composing/drafting, revising, and editing (Tribble 1996), or pre-writing, drafting, conferencing, publishing (Martin, Christie, & Rothery 1987). The second, text-based approach, which employs linguistic analysis, is usually applied to a discipline-specific writing task. This approach focuses on the characteristics of the language of the discipline (Halliday & Martin 1993) or other text-types in the disciplines (Swales 1990), such as a letter of recommendation from an academic. The last, practice-based approach, draws on the more specific and detailed aspect through which a discipline constitutes itself (Bazerman 1988). This approach assumes that an understanding of the discourse of any discipline requires a detailed knowledge of that discipline, which is more than just its content, including the “knowledge of its everyday practices” (Myers 1990:4). From this perspective, we can see student writers as novices are brought into the typical practices of disciplines such as medicine, engineering and economics.

While it is acknowledged that the practice-based approach and the text-based approach are important in specific academic disciplines, this present study views academic writing in terms of the first approach. That is, academic writing is considered as one of the accepted norms for reasoned intellectual debate in higher education institutions. In this approach academic writing has two primary functions: the first being to legitimise the work of the student within the conventions of the academic, largely text-based institution; the second to demonstrate, or to argue, for the newness of something which is distinctively derived from some established knowledge (Mitchell et al 2000). The latter, however, does not suggest a transformation and creation of knowledge as would be expected from, for example, the academic writings of teaching staff.

These functions of academic writing imply that there are a number of criteria that establish a good example of academic writing. Many authors have offered criteria for good academic writing or essays that are applicable in the university context such as the balance between dialectical interpretation, style and conventions (Peer 1990), and the three main components, namely: articulation of

one's argument, organisation and data (Hounsell (1988:171). Meanwhile, based on the expectation of lecturers in Australian universities, Ballard & Clanchy (1991) emphasise two major skills that establish good academic writing: the reproduction of ideas, evidence, and arguments of other writers; and the reshaping of these into the new fabric of the student's own model. These various criteria show that there is no neat formula for academic writing that can be judged as the best one. This is partly because of the individual style of the well-reasoned arguments reflected in academic writing, and partly due to the fact that there are many other factors that influence students' writing such as differences in language and cultural backgrounds can reflect different ways of organising arguments and providing reasoned arguments.

### **Academic writing in Australian universities**

The Australian English used by Australians in their daily life – which is practically also the English language used by other native English peoples such as the British and the Americans – is principally the same as the English language used by members of academic communities. This is because the English cultural values which are associated with the typical characteristics of literate culture are reflected in the academic community in Australia. This is not to deny that the English language of the academic community, which is a distinctive discourse, has its own characteristics.

Bush (1997) surveys academic writing in four universities in Australia and finds that the content of discipline is more important than the aspect of form features in students' writing. The most important aspect for the academics surveyed is the understanding of the main concepts of the subject area under consideration, and the relevance of the content to the topic. They look for how well an essay fulfills the requirements of the topic. Ballard (1987:115) argues that "the command of language required at tertiary level is intimately related to the demands of the discipline being taught." It can therefore be inferred that language skills cannot be divorced from the specialised content and intellectual strategies which arise in the context of the actual course of studies. Presumably because the content cannot be separated from the language and mechanical skills, academic writing is not one of the subjects offered at any Australian university. This is despite the fact that many students have problems with their writing which are not really

content-related but, according to Taylor (1988) result from uncertainties about themselves as scholars, their ignorance of important epistemological issues of science and scholarship as a whole as well as of those in specific disciplines, and how to structure the discourse and discourses of academic inquiry.

Most studies on academic writing in Australian universities tend to draw attention to the cultural variation in academic writing by overseas students studying in Australia focusing on their cultural variation, for instance Davies (1997), Hird (1997), and Ferguson (1997). Yet, it should be mentioned that "to a degree Australian students [being native speakers of English] have similar difficulties with academic English" especially "with their writing assignments" (Ballard 1987:115). This view is similarly expressed in Nagata (1999:22) who quotes her supervisor's comment on Australian native student writers of English "Some of them used the university's remedial English service, not for grammar checking, but for sentence organization, clarity etc."

Despite the fact that there are some differences in expectations of essays at some universities in Australia, and that to some extent the expectations are discipline-based (Vardi 2000), most studies of academic writing in Australian universities, such as Crosling (1993), Nevile (1996), and Ballard & Clanchy (1991), agree on factors that significantly contribute to students' academic writing in Australian universities. Essays as perceived by Australian lecturers are clearly focused on the set topic and deal fully with its central concerns, be the result of wide and critical reading, present a reasoned argument, and be competently presented. While it is difficult to define good academic writing, this present study discusses these four criteria: the topic, well-reasoned argument, evidence and reference to previous works, and organisation.

### **Topic**

The focus on topic implies the notion of relevance (Ballard & Clanchy 1991), in the sense that the content of the essay, as seen from the themes and subthemes, should be relevant to the topic. The purpose of the topic is to set the frame for discussion in the text. Just as the topic should be clearly presented in the introductory paragraph, so also should a student's approach to an essay be immediately identifiable from the introduction. The importance of topic is also reflected in Swales'

(1990) CARS model of research article introductions which emphasises the need to establish the field of study as the first move in the introduction, from which the themes and subthemes follow.

Ballard & Clanchy (1991) point out that, in addition to the topic, the introduction needs to set out the key issues to be discussed and to define the key concepts in order to limit the proposed discussions. In investigating Australian lecturers' expectations in first year essay writing tasks, Vardi (2000:8) finds that lecturers in the business faculty "generally want students to provide a definition or an overview of a concept which can then be enhanced in a number of ways" such as by hypothetical examples and detailed real life case studies. However, the expectation of how content is to be related to topics and how topics are developed and clearly presented in the introduction is particularised by conditions that have been forged not only by the specific disciplines but also the wider cultural context. For instance, the development of topics in academic writing in English follows the linear pattern which Kaplan (1966) claims that English begins with a topic statement, and then, followed by a series of subdivisions of that topic statement, each supported by example and illustrations, proceeds to develop that central idea and relate that idea to all the other ideas in the whole essay, and to employ that idea in its proper relationship with the other ideas, to prove something, or perhaps to argue something. The topic set out in the introduction must be linearly developed throughout the text. This linear topic development suggests that the continuity from one topic to another should establish a coherent piece of academic writing in English. Kaplan (1966) contrasts the linearity in English with four other typical patterns of topic development – circular, zigzag, broken zigzag and parallelism – representing other groups of languages. Kaplan (1987) further argues that there are important differences between languages in the way in which discourse topic is identified in a text and in the way in which discourse topic is developed. Yet, many critics of Kaplan argue that all of these patterns are possible in any language. While it is undoubtedly untrue to claim for the demarcation of the pattern of topic development, it is right to suggest that topic development vary across cultures. And, from the point of view of English cultural background, Crossling (1993) and Ballard & Clanchy (1991) claim that the non-linear topic development commonly found in the writings of students of non-

English cultural backgrounds is not regarded as fulfilling the expectations of academic writing in Anglo-Saxon based universities. The implication is that there is a negative transfer of this non-linear pattern of topic development from students' native culture.

### Well-Reasoned Argument

To be able to state a position on an issue in an academic text requires wide and critical reading. It means that the writer should critically offer a wide range of alternative views, interpret them and establish an argument on the issue. Hounsell (1984) points out that interpretation, which is the essential character of an essay, lies in the distinctive point of view conveyed. As the name essay suggests, it highlights its experimental characteristic: to test the intellectual power on a specific issue aiming for originality in the ideas presented. The focus of original ideas is not necessarily on new items of knowledge but on the individual styles of thinking and language. This major characteristic of the essay, which requires persuasively convincing arguments, indicates that we need to involve both subjective and objective aspects (Peer 1990). While interpretation, proposing ideas or speculating tend to be subjective, this subjectivity can be checked by comparing the writer's opinions with the established facts, references to other works, or general truths. In short, every assertion should be supported by evidence, and needs to be explicit and well argued. However, disciplines may be perceived to require different structures to an essay: history essays tend to provide more scope for interpretation while psychology essays tend to focus on the relevance of the discussion to the topic (Hounsell 1988).

The fact that the writer needs to be explicit in taking a position on an issue and in setting opposing views in counterpoint means that the straightforward exposition of opinions and facts must be supported by an appropriate style of language (Peer 1990). The selection of syntactic structures and lexical items must balance between conciseness and elaboration, and the crafting of subtle distinctions, the versatile use of explicit logical structure relating clauses and sentences, the symmetry of arguments, and whether the relevant arguments are put under the same groups or headings. As the purpose of analysis and arguments is to reach some conclusion about the relative merits of differing theories or points of view, the style of the language must suit the diversity

of viewpoints or controversy that converge in the essay. Linguistic meticulousness is crucially shown in presenting new claims for ratification by using hedges which, according to Hyland (1998), is one of the principle features which shapes academic writing, especially when explaining the qualification and the strength of the claim.

With regard to providing critical argument, the discourse practice of academic writing in Australian universities follows the cultural beliefs of the literate tradition which according to Goody & Watt (1968) leaves more to its members, gives more free play to individuals, and particularly to the intellectual. They argue that so far as an individual participates in the literate, such coherence as a person achieves is the result of his personal selection, adjustment and elimination of items influenced by all the various social pressures, but they are so numerous that the pattern finally comes out as an individual one. It means that the literate tradition allows people to make decisions from among various alternatives, and the choice made will ultimately indicate what differentiates this essay from other essays.

However, writing in English as second or foreign language may pose a problem if students' cultural backgrounds are not compatible with the aspect of critical argument in academic writing in English. Atkinson (1997) claims that critical thinking is one of those norms that constitutes academic writing and seems to be culturally loaded in the literate tradition in that it primarily resorts to the analytical skills familiar in Western thought, and does not appear to transfer effectively beyond a Western context of instruction.

### **Evidence and References to Previous Works**

Evidence is required to substantiate the position taken on an issue, which can be data from findings or, primarily, from references to scholars already in the academy. The evidence should be demonstrated by explicitly mentioning the source. There are two basic motivations for referencing in academic writing (Nevile 1996). First, by referencing, which is also known as citation, a student writer acknowledges the source of a quotation or idea. This function serves the purpose of academic writing to show the knowledge that has grown out of long experience in the discipline. In this sense, the acknowledgement reflects "the value placed on intellectual property in academic

life" (Nevile 1996), and demonstrates a student's appreciation of the significance of the academic culture on the ownership of ideas, which according to Becher (1989) is one of the de jure rules of conduct in the academic community. It means that, to indicate specific ownership, the evidence must be correctly and appropriately referred to. In addition, being an acknowledgment, referencing allows a follow-up for interest or verification, or as a pursuit of more discussion based on the evidence, such as 'For more detail see Allan (2001).'

Second, as claimed by Nevile (1996), referencing also supports a claim being made to strengthen one's argument by contextualising academic writing in terms of what has been written before by those who have similar or different opinions regarding the issue. In this way, referencing is similar to defining terms as it tells us that the academic writing is viewed from an informed position and, by giving explicit evidences from a scholarly source, the student writer has positioned him or herself within an academic community. In other words, the reference puts the argument within the continuum of debate in a particular field of knowledge. Inherent to this view is that referencing can control the reader's engagement with other researchers' ideas and the writer's own ideas (Buckingham & Nevile 1997). It is more in this function of referencing rather than as an acknowledgement that we can see the dialogic nature of a piece of academic writing within the academic community. Peer (1990) claims that this textually dialogic communication requires particular forms of social knowledge shared by an academic writer and his or her readers. Such a dialogic nature is more clearly illustrated in, for example, Swales' (1990) second move in research article introduction comprising four steps which aim to establish a position within a community. The first step is to counter some previous argument; the second is to show the reason for conducting the study by indicating a knowledge gap; the third is to raise a question based on the gap; and fourth, to continue the tradition within a specific discipline. The use of reference to show the dialogic nature of academic writing does not only imply that it is important to indicate the source of reference, but also to clearly signal the switch from expressing one's own views to reporting others' to prevent, as Groom (2000) suggests, student writers are accused of being ambiguous or plagiarising.

## Organisation

The structure of an academic text concerns the logical organisation of ideas which should be integrated and coherent (Hounsell 1988). There are two major studies regarding the organisation of arguments (Swales 1990). The first view is the universalists' view such as Widdowson (1979), Swales (1990) and Bhatia (1993) who argue that there are specific patterns of text organisation. The variation of structure within this trend seems to be based on the conventions of the discipline. While disciplinary practices and thinking have long been acknowledged as impacting upon writing through the way that arguments are organised (Vardi 2000) it has been generally accepted that introductions and conclusions tend to be viewed as conventions for all writing genres. For example, Swales (1990) outlines the four moves in the structure of research article introductions which can be extended to the introductions of all types of academic writing including dissertations and undergraduate Honours theses. The necessity to find certain patterns of structure is strongly contended by Widdowson (1979) who claims that scientific exposition is structured according to certain patterns of rhetorical organization which, with some tolerance for individual stylistic variation, imposes a conformity no matter what language they happen to use. It indicates that despite individual differences of style that are reflected in academic writing the pattern helps establish the general characteristics of the discourse practice in the academic community.

Bush (1996) finds that the organisation of an academic text is perceived as important by all faculties in one Australian university; and the need for a pattern of essay structure is clearly captured in the following comment from an Australian lecturer of statistics regarding students' essays which do not follow the logic of the discipline.

"it doesn't flow [...] so instead of working out your statistics, putting your hypothesis down, putting your critical value down, working out your test value, your decision rule and then your conclusion or interpretation, they have things all over the place."

(Vardi 2000:6)

The second view, of the relativists who argue for cultural variation within the academic community, questions whether there is a certainty of what underlies a well-structured piece of academic writing. For instance, it has been argued that the linear rhetorical structure of English

expository prose consists of a clearly defined topic, introduction, body which explicates all but nothing more than the static topic, paragraphs which chain from one to the next, and a conclusion which tells the reader what has been discussed no digression, no matter how interesting, is permitted on the grounds that it would violate unity (Kaplan 1987). Thus relativists would argue that linearity is reflected in the Anglo-Saxon's way of viewing the world in terms of keeping "both speaker and hearer on the track" (Ong 1982:40).

Inherent to this relativists' view are the cultural values which to some extent determine the structure of academic writing. The relativist's view is reflected in Ballard & Clanchy (1984), Hawkey & Nakornchai (1980) and Houghton (1980), who look at academic writing in various parts of the world where English is not the native or official language. In these countries the structure of arguments in academic writing tends to follow local traditions. For instance, the sudden topic shift in the Japanese academic expository reflects the traditional Japanese pattern of *ki-sho-ten-ketsu* (begin-development-abruption-conclusion, Hinds 1987). While the lack of coherence in Middle Eastern students' academic writing, according to Dudley-Evans & Swales (1980), is influenced by the tradition of reading-reciting and repeated copying techniques in learning which are still preserved even at university level. The instances of the redundant phrases which repeat the previous idea in Middle Eastern students' essays indicates that there is interference from native rhetorical patterns in writing. The accumulated evidence points to the conclusion that we need both the universalist and relativist views to account for the rhetorical structure of arguments in academic writing. While it is important to have language and culture specific explanations for the structure of academic writing, the universalist argument is also necessary. Thus, what constitutes successful academic writing in Australian universities are not merely linguistic factors, as these linguistic factors are culturally influenced. The implication is that academic writing in non-English speaking academic communities does not necessarily exhibit the same characteristics, as discussed in the following section on academic writing in Indonesian universities.

## Academic writing in Indonesia universities

Despite the recognition of Bahasa Indonesia (BI) for inter-ethnic communication and as the

language of bureaucracy and education, one of the core values of Indonesian culture is the various ethnic languages in Indonesia spoken by the majority of Indonesia's population in daily communication. The use of BI in all levels of education in Indonesia means that it is also used in academic communities. The use of BI in all academic activities in Indonesian universities which is stated in government regulation article seven which deals with higher education in Indonesia explicitly states that ethnic languages and foreign languages can be used as a medium of instruction when necessary (PP 30 1990). Ethnic languages can be used especially in teaching the cultures and skills using those languages. Yet, the use of English as the international language of the academic community has the effect that members of the Indonesian academic community tend to mix up their use of BI and English in their academic interaction. Thus English, to some extent, shapes the Indonesian culture which further influences language use in the academic community including the perceptions of what constitutes academic writing in the context of Indonesian universities.

Although there have been numerous academic writings by Indonesians in BI and English such as Pabotinggi (1991), Buchori (1998), Oetomo (1991), studies of Indonesian university students' writing seem to be very few. Studying the use of BI in skripsi written by students in the faculties in one teacher training institution in Java, Sadtono (1976) finds various inappropriate uses of sentence structures as the most frequent mistakes found in skripsi, along with illogicality, incoherent paragraph development, spelling and word formation errors.

Academic writing as a subject in Indonesian universities seems to be relatively new. In the context of Indonesian universities the term itself became popular when there were various efforts to enhance Indonesian lecturers' successes in their overseas studies with special reference to their writing skills. Despite its importance, this is given little emphasis in the Indonesian national university curriculum. For instance, as stated in the current syllabus of this subject, it is a two-credit subject which aims to help students compare various texts and to write a simple and coherent academic text. It focuses on basic forms of discourse such as narration, instruction, and process, and the fundamentals of academic writing such as stating the objective, creating topic sentences, and outlines. Before taking this subject, English Department students need to pass the required four-credit subject *writing* which aims

to help students write expository, argumentative and analytical texts in English. It covers general writing skills, such as how to write topic sentences, supporting sentences and a concluding sentence, and includes an introduction to other types of writing genres in English such as business letters. Obviously, the contents of these two subjects *writing* and *academic writing* overlap, and the distinctive characteristics of academic writing skill, such as critical thinking are not emphasised in the subject *academic writing* as they should be.

The most similar subject to academic writing offered to students from other departments in the Faculty of Letters, Hasanuddin University is the compulsory Bahasa Indonesia II, which aims to help students to write academic texts (GBPP 1995). The subject, which covers the following topics: characteristics and types of academic writing, forms of writing such as narration, description, and argumentation, text conventions, and report writing, seems to give little emphasis on students' practicing and producing academic writing. Meanwhile, all first year Indonesian university students are introduced to academic writing when they take the subject Bahasa Indonesia I which aims to help the students use BI correctly and appropriately in composing an academic text (Tim Pengajar Bahasa Indonesia UNHAS 2000)

Here academic writing is viewed from the standpoint that by following the rules of BI in accordance with the rules of the language, and attending to the context of use of the language, students can produce an academic text. This emphasis is implemented in the following topics covered by the subject Bahasa Indonesia I: improved Indonesian spelling, diction, sentence structure, sentences that can effectively express the argument, logic in academic writing, paragraph development, topic and title, objectives and topic sentence, outline, quotation, footnoting and bibliography. Half of these topics deal with the use of BI and the rest focus on what seems to constitute students' academic writing in Indonesian universities. The textbook itself has been revised six times since the 1985 edition, which did not specifically aim to improve academic writing of Indonesian but to help students use BI correctly and appropriately in both spoken and written form.

Although there is limited instruction on how to write academic prose in the Indonesian university context, in general we can say that the focus of academic writing in Indonesian universities



nowadays is more on formal aspects of the language than the content or new ideas offered. This is indicated from the following discussion of what constitutes students' academic writing in Indonesian universities including the influence from the oral tradition in Indonesia.

### Language Structure

Six out of fourteen chapters in the first year textbook of *Bahasa Indonesia I* (Tim Pengajar Bahasa Indonesia UNHAS 2000) deal with how to use Indonesian spellings and loan words in BI, aspects of Indonesian sentence structure such as words, phrases, sentences, and 'effective sentences.' The latter is meant to help university students write down their ideas with the correct sentence structure following the rules in BI.

While there is an injunction to use standardised words in academic writing, there is a greater emphasis on the aspect of language structure. It does not mean, however, that by including this topic of BI language structure in teaching academic writing such mistakes will be eradicated. Alwasilah (1999) mentions that the boringly-presented subject and the incompetent lecturers of BI to some extent also influence Indonesian students' interest and performance in writing. Very minimum interest in the subject of BI is implied from a longitudinal study of the writing process involving 29 graduate students (Alwasilah 1999). The study, which implies that in the Indonesian education system, the improvement of students' ability to write is considered to be part of the subject of BI, shows that 62.1 percent of the respondents believe that Indonesian education – from primary to tertiary – has failed to provide them with writing skills. Alwasilah (1999) signals an alarm at Indonesian students' inability to write academic texts, and indicates that university students' academic writing needs more recognition than simply following the rules of BI.

The prominence given to the formal aspects of BI in the teaching of Bahasa Indonesia I also implies that the current teaching of BI is still mostly associated with the relatively basic literacy skills of being able to write names and numbers (Nababan 1982). The mandatory use of BI as a language of education is constrained by the fact that most Indonesian elementary students cannot continue their schooling due to a lack of funding. The progress of literacy is also constrained by a shortage of books in schools (Soedijarto et al 1980)

and of high standard textbooks (Sumardi 2000) which could be further attributed to the general lack of reading interest (Diah 1982).

### Paragraph Development

Logic, which is considered to be a Western concept of analytical thought, is explained as a process to obtain a conclusion based on relevant evidence (Tim Pengajar Bahasa Indonesia UNHAS 2000:62). The use of logic is closely related to paragraph development because it is used to logically develop ideas coherently in paragraphs. Although BI can express most Western concepts of analytical thought and abstraction, in reality, the residual oral tradition, which seems to persist in the everyday life of Indonesians, makes it difficult to put those concepts to use, for example, in developing ideas in paragraphs. Consequently, ideas in paragraphs look like bits of information which are illogically or inappropriately connected. Sadtono (1976) shows the following example of illogical processed argument taken from a student's *skripsi*.

*Dalam buku Kemarau tidak didapati hal-hal –kata dan kalimat– yang bukan porno. Jadi buku ini mungkin dapat dibaca oleh anak didik.*

(Sadtono 1976:18)

In the book *Drought* there are no things – words and sentences – which are not indecent. Thus, the book can possibly be read by children.

As we can see, the sentence is illogically constructed from two negatives *tidak didapati* (not found) and *bukan porno* (not indecent). Consequently, it implies the positive meaning of the sentence, i.e. the book *Drought* does contain indecent words. A better way of expressing this argument is *Buku Kemarau tidak memuat kata-kata atau kalimat porno. Karena itu buku tersebut dapat dibaca oleh anak-anak.* (The book *Drought* contains no indecent words or sentences; therefore, children can read it).

Indiscussing the problems of distance education in Indonesia, Dunbar (1991) argues that the strong oral tradition in Indonesian education has affected students' writing skills, in that students normally write only perfunctory sentences. It suggests that Indonesian students are not accustomed to writing actual compositions. Those perfunctory sentences are reflected in Diah (1982:131) which

shows the kinds of writing activities the Indonesian elementary and secondary school students have to do in school subjects other than BI such as filling in blank spaces in worksheets and workbooks, making lists by extracting from reading materials, labeling diagrams, making notes, and writing memorised definitions and formulas etc. In this study of writing curriculum in Indonesia, as perceived by teaching staff from teacher training colleges, Diah (1982:131) shows that certain writing activities such as “writing in own words (three or more paragraphs) and writing a paper or project” are held once a month or never conducted at all. The minimum emphasis given to writing activities indicates that Indonesian tertiary students are not used to practicing actual composition before their university study. It follows that the analytical thoughts which include the various use of transition signals have not been called upon in their writing activities up to and even including their university study, and that academic exercises seem to be limitedly produced, merely as part of the assignment of the course taken. This conclusion is confirmed by Johnson’s argument (1989) that the little actual composing in the L1, as opposed to the workbook exercises, by students has caused them to achieve neither a degree of rhetorical sensitivity in writing, nor develop a sense of writing that can influence real readers.

**Topic and Thesis Statement in the Introduction**

A statement of the thesis in an academic essay is important in that it gives an overview of the whole text (Tim Pengajar Bahasa Indonesia UNHAS 2000). Since the thesis statement is generated from the topic, it is relevant to the topic

and themes in the text which form the structure of the text. Thus, the thesis statement should further be reflected in the rhetorical structure of the text.

Keraf (1980) claims that the topic and thesis statement should be clearly mentioned in the introductory section of the text together with other details, such as the reason for choosing the title, the scope of the problem, the statement of problems, the methodology and definition of key terms; all of these should aim to attract the reader’s attention. Keraf (1980) further argues that do not assume that readers know most of what is going to be discussed in the text. Keraf suggests that even though they already know what the writing is about, it is better to remind them of the background of the topic and other details before coming to the real discussion of the topic. Keraf’s (1980) model introduction is adopted by most guide books for writing skripsi issued by the universities in Indonesia, such as Pedoman Penulisan Skripsi Fakultas Sastra Universitas Airlangga (2000), Penulisan dan Ujian Tesis IKIP Padang (Zainil et al 1996) and Pedoman Penulisan Skripsi dan Pelaksanaan Ujian Skripsi (Kadir et al 1995) .

The introduction to an academic text in BI seems to contain brief information about the whole content of the text. It also indicates the need to explicitly state one’s position on the given topic. However, it does not make clear how much of this brief information, especially in the background section, should be included in the introduction.

Although Keraf (1980) is right in stating that a piece of writing is meaningless if it only quotes other people’s ideas without stating one’s own position, a writer’s thesis statement should be

| SECTIONS                                     | CONTENT  |
|--|--|
| Background                                   | Mention what the title is and explain why it is chosen               |
| The identification of the problem            | Show a number of problems emerging from the title                    |
| The scope of the problem                     | Limit the problems   |
| The statement of the problem                 | State the problems, based on the scope of problems                   |
| Operational definition (if necessary)        | Define the concepts mentioned in the statement of problems           |
| The objectives and significance of the study | State the objectives of the study based on the statement of problems |

Figure 1: The contents of introduction in the skripsi of students from Faculty of Letters Hasanuddin University (adapted from Kadir et al 1995)

based on critical consideration of various other sources that both support and oppose one's argument, and should be stated right at the beginning or in the introductory section of a text. However, the necessity to clearly express one's argument or position in a thesis statement – i.e. to be speculative (Ong 1982) – may be difficult for a society which is still orally oriented. This is because people tend to stick to things they are familiar with and slowly progress to new things. For that reason, without claiming that all Indonesian people are equally orally oriented, we can say that the thesis statement – a clear expression of a student writer's position regarding the essay topic and purpose of writing – in Indonesian students' academic writing is usually stated later in the paragraph or the essay. Student writers tend to start with information that is very general and/or well known and that leads to new ideas relevant to the topic. The implication is that stating one's position on a given topic later rather than sooner in the text may lead to digression from the topic.

#### Quotation and References to Sources

One aspect of academic writing that is taught in *Bahasa Indonesia I* is the use of the quotation in academic writing. The quotation, which is used to support one's argument, needs to be supplied with its source in order that readers can check the quoted words with the original (Tim Pengajar Bahasa Indonesia UNHAS 2000). It looks as if the quotation is provided only if it agrees with the student's argument. Keraf (1980) explains that to quote other people's opinion means that the writer agrees with the quoted reference. It further means that the writer is responsible for the truth of the opinion and is able to show some proofs for using the quoted reference. Keraf's explanation, thus, perspicuously supports the fact that Indonesian students are not trained, and therefore not accustomed, to be critical of another's opinion. Instead, they only refer to sources which are consistent with the student's argument and copy the exact wording of the reference. We can argue that, presumably partly for this reason, there have been very few references, if any, to sources conveying contrary points of view in students' academic texts. Sweeney (1987) points out that this tendency of using only references which support the writer's argument, or of agreeing uncritically to other people's opinion, is encouraged by the complexity of Western analytical thought embedded in the

lecturer's words. Showing uncritical acceptance of his/her lecturer's ideas, the orally oriented student writer stores and reproduces the quotation as a whole, word for word.

Furthermore, assuming that a teacher is a source of authority whose conduct needs emulating, Sweeney is right to argue that students' prefer to copy their lecturer's words as chunks. But, as texts themselves can be regarded as a source of authority (Olson 1989, Luke et al 1989), it follows that students may also copy from books for the purpose of providing support for their academic writing. In this case, it is clear that the motivation can be attributed to both books as a source of authority and to the difficulty of understanding the analytical thoughts embedded in the text. In the former case, when the quotation is copied verbatim from the book to be used in students' academic writing, often without appropriately acknowledging the source, this plagiarism demonstrates that the student's academic writing contains some authorised knowledge.

The fact that students resort to books as a source of authority is not only for the purpose of providing some support for their argument. They also help in expressing their argument. For example, for all institutions of higher education in Indonesia it is customary for students to be provided with books used in teaching the subjects. The books can be textbooks written by external authors not authorised by the institution, or books written under the authority of the institution. The guide book for writing *skripsi* is an example of the latter type. It prescribes clearly the structure of the introductory chapter of *skripsi*. It provides details of the outline such as the background, reason for choosing the title, objectives of writing the *skripsi*, and the sequence of presentation for the *skripsi* (Kadir et al 1995). The use of the guide book demonstrates a dilemma for anyone wishing to improve Indonesian students' academic writing. On one hand, students' difficulty in expressing themselves clearly can be helped by this guidebook in that they can follow the steps given in the book. On the other hand, as Steenbrink (1994:196) observes on the evidence of repetitive statements in Indonesian *skripsi*, the guidebook offers a collection of ceremonial paragraphs to be copied. The latter indicates that Indonesian students' academic writing is paradoxically influenced by the oral-oriented culture embedded in the books used by the students as a guide.

According to Halide, a senior Professor of Economics, Indonesian university students' writing *skripsi* is like an assembling project, taking pieces of information from here and there, and merely copying from different sources (Kompas 1997). Even worse, there has been a service where students can pay for a *skripsi*. This implicitly tells us that Indonesian students are weak in making critical analysis of references used in their academic work. It suggests that students seem to put these references all together without analysing their relationship with the topic of the text. The fact that it is possible to pay for a *skripsi* and that the *skripsi* is just like a collection of other people's ideas tells us that Indonesian students have a serious difficulty in writing a *skripsi*.

The practice of assembling ideas in one's *skripsi* may result in a kind of 'interrupted' flow of ideas from the inclusion of irrelevant ideas, and create difficulty for readers. However, the fact that the *skripsi* has been examined means that they have been read by a number of people especially consultants and examiners. Unless there is a request for editing or revision, the flow of ideas in these *skripsi* has been accepted, at least by the Indonesian consultants and examiners as readers. It means that the ideas in the text are judged coherent by Indonesian consultants.

These four criteria of academic writing in Indonesian universities show that, despite the similarity with the criteria of academic writing in Australian universities, these characteristics tend to be shaped by the orally-shaped tradition in Indonesia. The influence is also reflected in the limited practice of composing written texts that students carry out during their study.

### Conclusion and Pedagogical Implications

The article has sought to contribute to discussions concerning the role of academic writing in discourse practice of a community. The characteristics of academic writing as discourse practice are reflected in the four main aspects that constitute students' academic writing in Australian universities, namely the topic, well-reasoned argument, evidence and reference, and organization. Similarly the characteristics of academic writing in Indonesian universities can be seen from the four important aspects that establish students' academic writing in Indonesian universities, namely language structure, logic and paragraph development, topic

and thesis statement, and quotation and references. Although these characteristics are similar in both Australian and Indonesian universities, the ways the topics and paragraphs are developed and they way references from other sources are exploited differ them.

Teachers of Bahasa Indonesia and English in Indonesian universities should shift their focus in teaching the languages from language structure to paragraph development and critical reasoning. Thus, in particular, learners should be familiar with the genre of academic writing which is crucial in organizing and developing their ideas or in recognizing the ideas from reading or listening. These learners should also be equipped with reasoning skills both in speaking and writing, which are essential in interpreting, analyzing and synthesizing data, and also in speculating about the data. One final pedagogical consideration relates to teachers' ability in making these skills a practice in daily academic activities

### References

- Alwasilah, A. C. 1999. "Writing Needs More Recognition." In *The Jakarta Post*. 07 October, p. 4.
- Atkinson, D. 1997. "A Critical Approach to Critical Thinking in TESOL." In *TESOL Quarterly* 31: 71-94.
- Baldauf, R. B., & Jernudd, B.H. 1983. "Language of Publications as a Variable in Scientific Communication." In *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics* 6: 97-108.
- Ballard, B. 1987. "Academic Adjustment: The Other Side of the Export Dollar." In *Higher Education Research and Development* 6: 110-119.
- Ballard, B., & Clanchy, J. 1984. *Study Abroad – a Manual for Asian Students*. Kuala Lumpur: Longman.
- Ballard, B., & Clanchy, J. 1991. Assessment by Misconception: Cultural Influences and Intellectual Traditions. In Hamp-Lyons, L. ed. pp. 19-35.
- Baynham, M. 2000. Academic Writing in New and Emergent Discipline Areas. In Lea, M.R. & Stierer, B. ed. pp. 17-31.
- Bazerman, C. 1988. *Shaping Written Knowledge: The Genre and Activity of the Experimental Article in Science*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

- Bhatia, V. K. 1993. *Analysing Genre: Language Use in Professional Settings*. London: Longman.
- Becher, T. 1989. *Academic Tribes and Territories*. Milton Keynes: The Society for Research into Higher Education and the Open University Press.
- Biber, D. 1988. *Variations Across Speech and Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Braddock, R. 1974. "The Frequency and Placement of Topic Sentences in Expository Prose." In *Research in the Teaching of English* 8: 287-302.
- Brodkey, L. 1981. "Making Sense out of Academic Prose." In *Papers in International Journal of Human Communication* 14, 519-535.
- Buchori, M. 1998. "Academic Culture Seems Absent From Our Schools." In *The Jakarta Post* 3 January, p. 5.
- Buckingham, J., & Nevile, M. 1997. Comparing the Citation of Experienced Academic Writers and First Year Students. In Golebiowski, Z & Borland, H. ed. vol 1, pp. 96-107
- Bush, D. 1996. "Writing at University: What Faculty Require." In *EA Journal* 13: 16-28.
- Bush, D. 1997. Expectations of Academic Writing at Australian Universities: Work in Progress. In Golebiowski, Z & Borland, H. ed. vol 1, pp. 108-116
- Connor, U & Kaplan, R.B. 1987. eds. *Writing Across Languages: An Analysis of L2 Text*. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Crosling, G. 1993. "Straight or Circular? Academic Writing and the Non-Traditional Student." In *HERSDA News* 15: 10-13.
- Davies, R. L. 1997. Language Characteristics of the Examination Essays by Dental Students. In Golebiowski, Z & Borland, H. ed. vol 2, pp. 179-197
- Day, R. A. 1998. *How to Write & Publish a Scientific Paper* 5th ed. Arizona: The Oryx Press.
- de Castell, S., Luke, A., & Luke, C. eds. 1989. *Language, Authority and Criticism: Readings on the School Textbook*. London: The Falmer Press.
- Diah, M. 1982. National Language Policy and the Writing Curriculum in Indonesia. Unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of Illinois, Urbana.
- Dubin, F & N. A. Kuhlman, N.A. ed. 1992. *Cross-Cultural Literacy*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Regents/Prentice Hall.
- Dudley-Evans, T & Swales, J. 1980. Study Modes and Students from the Middle East. In Greenall, G.M. & Price, J.E. ed. pp. 91-101.
- Dunbar, R. 1991. "Adapting Distance Education for Indonesians: Problems with Learner Heteronomy and a Strong Oral Tradition." In *Distance Education* 12: 163-174.
- Eggington, W. 1992. From Oral to Literate Culture: An Australian Aboriginal Experience. In Dubin, F & N. A. Kuhlman, N.A. eds. pp. 81-98.
- Ferguson, G. 1997. Cultural Differences in Academic Essay Orientations. In Golebiowski, Z & Borland, H. ed. vol 2, pp. 32-37.
- Gee, J. P. 1986. "Orality and Literacy: From the Savage Mind to Ways With Words." In *TESOL Quarterly* 20: 719-745.
- Gee, J. P. 1996. *Social Linguistics and Literacies*. London: Taylor & Francis Ltd.
- Golebiowski, Z & Borland, H, ed. 1997. Selected Proceedings of the First National Conference on Tertiary Literacy: Research and Practice vol. 1: Policy & Practice of Tertiary Literacy. Melbourne: Victoria University of Technology.
- Golebiowski, Z & Borland, H. ed. 1997. Selected Proceedings of the First National Conference on Tertiary Literacy: Research and Practice vol. 2: Academic Communication across Disciplines and Cultures. Melbourne: Victoria University of Technology.
- Goody, J. ed. 1968. *Literacy in Traditional Societies*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Goody, J & Watt, I. 1968. The Consequences of Literacy. In Goody, J. ed. pp. 27-84.
- Greenall, G.M & Price, J.E. 1980. *Study Modes and Academic Development of Overseas Students ELT Documents 109*. London: The British Council.
- Groom, N. 2000. "Attribution and Averal Revisited: Three Perspectives on Manifest Intertextuality in Academic Writing." In P. Thompson (Ed). *Patterns and Perspectives: Insights into EAP Writing Practice* (pp. 14-25). Reading: Centre for Applied Language Studies. University of Reading.
- Halliday, M. A. K & J. R. Martin. 1993. *Writing Science: Literacy & Discursive Power*. London: The Falmer Press.
- Hamp-Lyons, L. ed. 1991. *Assessing Second Language Writing in Academic Context*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Company.
- Hawkey, R & Nakornchai, C. 1980. Thai Students Studying. In Greenall, G. M. & Price, J.E. ed. pp. 70-78.

- Hinds, J. 1987. Reader versus Writer Responsibility: A New Typology. In Connor, U & Kaplan, R.B. ed. pp. 141-152.
- Hird, B. 1997. EAP: Making Risk-Taking in Academic Writing Less Risky for International Students. In Golebiowski, Z & Borland, H. ed. vol 2, pp. 120-126.
- Hoadley-Maidment, E. 2000. From Personal Experience to Reflective Practitioner: Academic Literacies and Professional Education. In Lea, M.R. & Stierer, B. ed. pp. 165-178.
- Houghton, D. 1980. Writing Problems of Iranian Students. In Greenall, G.M. & Price, J.E. ed. pp. 71-90.
- Hounsell, D. 1984. "Essay Planning and Essay Writing." In *Higher Education Research and Development* 3: 13-31.
- Hounsell, D. 1988. Towards an Anatomy of Academic Discourse: Meaning and Context in the Undergraduate Essay. In Säljö, R. ed. pp. 161-177.
- Hyland, K. 1998. *Hedging in Scientific Research Articles*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hymes, D. 1974. *Foundations in Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Johnson, D. M. 1989. Enriching Task Contexts for Second Language Writing: Power Through Interpersonal Roles. In Johnson, D.M & Roen, D eds. pp. 39-54.
- Johnson, D.M & D. Roen, D. ed. 1989. *Richness in Writing*. New York: Longman.
- Kadir B., Ali, H., Wehantouw, O.J, Poli, S. & Rachman, A. ed. 1995. *Pedoman Pelaksanaan Ujian Skripsi*. Ujung Pandang: Fakultas Sastra Universitas Hasanuddin.
- Kaplan, R. B. 1966. "Cultural Thought Patterns in Intercultural Education." In *Language Learning* 16: 1-20.
- Kaplan, R. B. 1987. Cultural Thought Patterns Revisited. In Connor, U & Kaplan, R.B. ed. pp. 7-21
- Keraf, G. 1980. *Komposisi: Sebuah Pengantar Kemahiran Bahasa*. 2nd ed. Ende: Nusa Indah.
- Lea, M.R & Stierer, B, ed. 2000. *Student Writing in Higher Education: New Contexts*. Buckingham: SRHE & Open University Press.
- Lea, M R & Street, B. V. 2000. Student Writing and Staff Feedback in Higher Education: An Academic Approach. In Lea, M.R. & Stierer, B. ed. pp. 32-46.
- Leki, I., & Carlson, J.G. 1994. "Students' Perceptions of EAP Writing Instruction and Writing Needs Across the Disciplines." In *TESOL Quarterly* 28: 81-101.
- Luke, C., de Castell, S., & Luke, A. 1989. Beyond Criticism: The Authority of the School Textbook. In de Castell, S et al. eds. pp. 245-260. London: The Falmer Press.
- Maher, J. 1986. "The Development of English as the International Language of Medicine." In *Applied Linguistics* 7: 206-18.
- Marschall, W. ed. 1994. *Texts from the Islands: Oral and Written Traditions of Indonesia and the Malay World*. Berne: The University of Berne Institute of Ethnology.
- Martin, J.R., Christie, F., & Rothery, J. 1987. Social Processes in Education: A Reply to Sawyer and Watson (and others). In Reid, I. ed. pp. 58-82.
- Martin, J. 1990. Language and Control: Fighting with Words. In Walton, C & Eggington, W. eds. pp. 12-43.
- Mitchell, S, Marks-Fisher, V, Lynne-Hale & Harding, J. 2000. Making Dances, Making Essays: Academic Writing in the Study of Dance. In Lea, M.R. & Stierer, B. ed. pp. 86-96
- Mohan, B. & Lo, W. Au-Yeung. 1985. "Academic Writing and Chinese Students: Transfer and Developmental Factors." In *TESOL Quarterly* 19: 515-34.
- Myers, G. 1990. *Writing Biology: Texts in the Construction of Scientific Knowledge*. Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Nababan, P.W.J. 1982. Indonesia. In Noss, R.B. ed. pp. 1-47.
- Nagata, Y. 1999. 'Once I Couldn't Even Spell "PhD Student", But Now I Are One!' Personal Experiences of an NESB Student. In Ryan, R & Zuber-Skerritt, O ed. pp. 15-24.
- Nash, W. ed. 1991. *The Writing Scholar Studies in Academic Discourse*. London: Sage.
- Nevile, M. 1996. "Literacy Culture Shock: Developing Academic Literacy at University." In *The Australian Journal of Language and Literacy* 19: 38-51.
- Noss, R.B. ed. 1982. *Language Teaching Issues in Multilingual Environments in Southeast Asia*. Singapore: Regional Language Centre.
- Olson, D. R. 1989. On the Language and Authority of Textbooks. In de Castell, S et al. eds. pp. 233-244. London: The Falmer Press.

- Ong, W. J. 1982. *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word*. London: Routledge.
- Pabotinggi, M. 1991. "Bahasa, Kramanisasi dan Kerakyatan." In *Prisma* 20, 17-26.
- Pedoman Penulisan Skripsi Fakultas Sastra Universitas Airlangga*. 2000. Surabaya: Fakultas Sastra, Universitas Airlangga.
- Peer, W. van. 1991. Writing as an Institutional Practice. In Nash, W. ed. pp. 192-204).
- Peraturan Pemerintah (PP) Nomor 30 Tahun 1990 tentang Pendidikan Tinggi. 1995. In *Undang-Undang Sistem Pendidikan Nasional dan Peraturan Pelaksanaannya*. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika.
- Postlethwaite, T. N. & R. M. Thomas, R.M. 1980. *Schooling in the ASEAN Region*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Reid, I. ed. 1987 *The Place of Genre in Learning*. Victoria: Deakin University: Centre for Studies in Literary Education.
- Ryan, Y. & Zuber-Skerritt, O. ed. 1999. *Supervising Postgraduates from Non-English Backgrounds*. Buckingham: The Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.
- Sadtono, E. 1976. "Bahasa Indonesia Tertulis Golongan Terdidik (Sarjana) di Indonesia." In *Pengajaran Bahasa dan Sastra* 1: 12-27.
- Säljö, R. ed. 1988. *The Written World: Studies in Literate Thought and Action*. Berlin: Springer-Verlag.
- Smolicz, J. J. 1981. "Core Values and Cultural Identity." In *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 4: 75-90.
- Soedijarto et al. 1980. Indonesia. In Postlethwaite, T.N. & Thomas, R.M. ed. pp. 48-96.
- Steenbrink, K. A. 1994. On Structure and Sources of the Bustanul Arifin. In Marschall, W. ed. pp. 183-203.
- Sumardi. 2000. "Buku Pelajaran dan Otonomi Daerah." In *Kompas* January 18. p. 9.
- Swales, J. 1987. "Utilizing the Literatures in Teaching the Research Paper." In *TESOL Quarterly* 21: 41-67.
- Swales, J. 1990. *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sweeney, A. 1987. *A Full Hearing: Orality and Literacy in Malay World*. London: University of California Press, Ltd.
- "Tajuk Rencana." In *Kompas* April 9, 1996, p. 4.
- Taylor, G. 1978. "Coming to Terms with English Expressions in the University." In *Vestes* 21: 14-17.
- Taylor, G., Brigid, B., Beasley, V., Bock, H. & Clanchy, J. eds. 1988. *Literacy by Degrees*. Milton Kenyes: SRHE and Open University Press
- Taylor, G. 1988. The Literacy of Knowing: Content and Form in Students' English. In Taylor, G et al. eds. pp. 53-87.
- Thompson, P. ed. 2000. *Patterns and Perspectives: Insights into EAP Writing Practice*. Reading: Centre for Applied Language Studies. University of Reading.
- Tim Pengajar Bahasa Indonesia UNHAS. 2000. *Himpunan Materi Kuliah Bahasa Indonesia (MKU)*. Makassar: Fakultas Sastra Universitas Hasanuddin.
- Tradisi Akademik Cenderung Jadi Slogan. December 30, 1997. *kompas.com*. Available: <http://www.kompas.com/9712/30/dikbud/trad.html> (Accessed: November 8, 2000).
- Tribble, C. 1996. *Writing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Vardi, I. (2000). "What Lecturers Want: An Investigation of Lecturers' Expectations in First Year Essay Writing Tasks." In *The Fourth Pacific Rim- First Year In Higher Education Conference: Creating Features For A New Millennium*. Queensland University of Technology. Brisbane: 5-7 July 2000.
- Walton, C & W. Eggington, W eds. 1990. *Language: Maintenance, Power and Education in Australian Aboriginal Education Contexts*. Darwin: Northern Territory University.
- Zainil et. al. 1996. *Buku Panduan Penulisan dan Ujian Tesis IKIP Padang*. Padang: IKIP Padang