CHAPTER V
CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

In this chapter, the first section provides some conclusive points of the present study. The importance of corpus-based discourse analysis particularly on rhetorical moves in the realm of English academic writing is also re-emphasized. The second section unpacks the limitations drawn from the present study. The third section focuses on the provision of some recommendations for future research in the realm of CBDA for EFL academic writing and its pedagogy.

5.1   Conclusion

The present study aims to examine the manifestation of rhetorical moves and their constituent steps in the research articles' iterative findings and discussion section of EFL undergraduate students. Data set has addressed two research questions: *(1) What moves and their constituent steps are manifested in the Indonesian undergraduate students' research articles? and (2) What configurations of the move-step patterns are manifested in the Indonesian undergraduate students' research articles?* Three conclusive points were drawn. First, in the sentence-level, the manifestation of moves and their constituent steps was still focused on the transparency of the findings and elaboration of similarities with the previous studies or literature. However, some of them have been aware of providing background knowledge of the section by applying Move 1 properly and further argumentation by applying Move 4 in a more dialogic fashion (including the cons and limitations). Second, in the text-level, the manifestation of randomized move-step configuration, regardless of the existing variety of patterns within the other configurations was still preferred. Such a preference leads to the third point, which is the low quality of their paragraphing because each paragraph was not constructed by realizing similar patterns every time a particular finding is presented and discussed. They did not attempt to equally provide coherent flow of ideas related to each finding discussed in one paragraph or a combination of more paragraphs.

As mentioned in the earlier section, I highlight two underlying reasons behind such consensus. First, the level of critical thinking of the undergraduate students might be still low considering the low frequency of manifestation of Move 1 and Move 4. It is indirectly related to the level of reasoning presented in the section. Second, they might not comprehensively understand even know the standard format of rhetorical moves in the F&D section of a research article in the field of ELT. Their prior experience in the academic writing course influenced such a tradition to construct the section. The requirement of undergraduate academic writing particularly in accomplishing their thesis (*Skipsi*) does not emphasize on the provision of critical argumentation of the findings as well. In other words, the focus is still on the provision of explicit relationship between their findings and the previous studies or literature, although there were some articles who did not even realize it. On the other hand, the utmost function of an English research article is as the main channel of disseminating and developing scientific knowledge among the international academic discourse community. Its function demands clarity and criticality, which are simultaneously presented in the F&D section as the indicators of higher-level argumentation involving critical thinking and rhetorical competence. Thus, there is a mismatch between what the university facilitates and what the international academic discourse community demands in terms of constructing a research article from *Skripsi* particularly on F&D section.

Thus, the contribution of this study emphasized on the transparency of how EFL undergraduate students rhetorically construct their findings and discussion section of the research articles. It delineated the manifestation of not only the identified moves but also the constituent steps of each move and its structure or pattern respectively, which directly influenced the logical coherence. As a results, this explorative study can provide a portrait of how the pedagogy of discourse patterns of F&D section as the crucial part of a research article can be maintained in academic writing course. Simultaneously, the students' awareness as NNS writers demanded to write a research article can be increased by considering the importance of a research article beyond just an academic requirement and the importance of rhetorical competence as a whole.

5.2 Limitation

This sub-section focuses on some limitations identified from the present study. First, the analysis was only aimed to seek the manifestation of rhetorical moves and structure, without linked to the level of lexical density considering the nature of a research article oriented to international publication (Tankó, 2017). Second, this study cannot capture the manifestation of the same foci from RAs written in another language, e.g., Indonesian language, which might influence the students' tradition in applying the rhetorical moves and structure. Third, although the corpus covers quite large data, i.e. 113 research articles, the affiliation of the students is limited because the source comes from only one affiliation. In addition, although the corpus covers four research methods, i.e. Qualitative, Quantitative, Qualitative and Quantitative, and Mixed Methods, the proportion of research articles employing each research method is not equal. Fourth, the argumentation for the identified limitations on the students' works was still based on the presumptive reasons interlinked to the students' knowledge about rhetorical moves and experience of learning to construct F&D section of a research article in academic writing course. Fifth, this study was only an explorative attempt. It still lacks of methodological rigor to address the pedagogical realm of the present foci through interview and observation in undergraduate academic writing course. In addition, AntMover 1.10 as the tool in analyzing the corpus is firstly designed for move analysis in introduction section in the field of hard sciences. Some of the results are still problematic and therefore need to be re-coded by the researcher. It might be caused by the different nature of soft sciences like ELT from those hard sciences and no built-in training data for findings and discussion section in the software.

5.3 Recommendation

This sub-section focuses on some recommendations for further studies related to corpus-based discourse analysis in the realm of English academic writing, particularly the move analysis on the construction of research article. The recommendations are based on the limitations highlighted in the previous sub-section (see 5.2). First, with the less attention given to the move analysis on F&D section in recent years, further studies might worth to address the transparency of

rhetorical moves and lexical density in expert texts from international reputated journals. It is because the linguistic realization of each move is influenced by the variety of word limit in the available journals. Consequently, the level of density within each move and its constituent steps might contribute to the level of clarity and criticality of the information being conveyed. Thus, it is crucial to examine the relationship between the realization of rhetorical moves and the level of lexical density. Second, contrastive move analysis involving corpora that contain international authors across affiliations or countries might inform a more comprehensive portrait of the manifestation of rhetorical moves and their constituent steps because previous studies only concern the former (Basturkmen, 2012). The results of such studies will meaningfully benefit the higher education students to be more rhetoric-sensitive in constructing F&D section. Third, software development and evaluation can be conducted to provide more accurate results of the rhetorical moves in findings and discussion section across soft and hard sciences. Fourth, because the corpus was composed of undergraduate students from one state university in the area of West Java Province and the proportion of the number of RAs employing each of the four research methods was not equal, further studies might analyze a more compehensive and representative corpus. Fourth, further studies might be worth to explore the undergraduate students' cognition about rhetorical moves and F&D section of a research article and the contributing factors influencing such cognition. Fifth, related to the implications discussed in the earlier section, the higher education students need to revisit the argumentation skill involving critical thinking and various reasoning strategies to construct the F&D section. Thus, further studies can explore the students' cognition about the construction of F&D section of a research article, which is interlinked to the level of their argumentation skill. The last but not least recommendation relates to the teachers' instructional strategies to maximize the learning of rhetorical moves in academic writing course. Further studies might address the teaching orientation, materials development, and teaching approaches. Thus, they might conduct an explorative about either the teachers' cognition of move analysis and corpus-based language learning or the implementation process of the combination of both approaches.