CHAPTER V
CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

This chapter delivers the conclusion drawn from the results of the analyses in this study as well as suggestions for related future studies.

5.1 Conclusion

This study has discovered that LBs are manifested variously in the introduction sections of applied linguistic RAs that are accepted and rejected by a Scopus-indexed journal. The structural and functional analyses of LBs have led to the findings of substantial similarities and disparities in the two datasets used in this study. On the whole, they are summarized in this conclusion section.

In nearly all categories, LBs in ARAIs show a far greater amount of frequency and variation of forms which can imply that the authors have a more mutual familiarity with the typical expressions in the introduction sections. A closer examination of LBs structures finds that noun phrase-based bundles are broadly used due to the high tendency of nominalization to wrap the background knowledge in RAIs as densely as possible. However, a notable difference is displayed by the ratio of bundles with passive and non-passive verbs. ARAIs manifest more passive verbs to conceal the presence of the doer and rather guide the readers to focus on the result of a certain action. Meanwhile, bundles with non-passive verbs are more apparent in RRAIs, in which any entity is often put as the subject of mentioned propositions. Taken together, LBs in ARAIs reflect more linguistic features that according to relevant literature are the typical characteristics of academic texts in conveying propositional content, i.e. frequent use of noun and prepositional phrases as well as highly varied vocabulary to integrate compact information, and passive verb constructions to maintain the air of detached or impersonal discourse.

Regarding the functions, research-oriented bundles take the most portion in both groups which indicates the authors' awareness to place more burden on the explanation of their research context in RAIs. The most noticeable difference lies in the manifestation of description and procedure subfunctions. ARAIs employ

more description bundles to illuminate the attributes of the research topic, while RRAIs manifest more procedure bundles to define events or actions related to it. On the other hand, framing bundles and stance features become the most prevalent text- and participant-oriented subfunctions. Both data groups adopt framing bundles to specify the context and stance features to hedge authors' assertiveness in statements.

5.2 Suggestions

Despite utilizing small corpora, this study is expected to raise the awareness and provide fruitful guidance for effective RAIs construction to increase the chance of RAs acceptance in targeted journals, particularly through the use of LBs as a part of discourse building blocks. However, it should be remembered that there is an open variability of LBs forms, structures, and functions depending on the conventions of discourse and its community. The bundles portrayed as more favored in RRAIs in this study can somehow be more acceptable in other cases. Therefore, future studies are highly suggested to accumulate more data or perhaps, enhance the instrument and data analysis procedure to shape a better representation and understanding of LBs use in RAIs.