

Conclusion sections in applied linguistics international journal articles written by Indonesian authors

Muhammad Alkamillah¹, Azwandi², Ira Maisarah³

Universitas Bengkulu^{1,2,3}

³email: iramaisarah@unib.ac.id

Abstract - This research attempts to describe the rhetorical structures of Indonesian author's in the conclusion section of applied linguistics international journals articles. The method employed in this study is descriptive quantitative. Thirty RA conclusion sections were extracted from two international journals; the Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics (IJAL) and TEFLIN journal, and examined based on the rhetorical move following Yang & Allison's proposed model of conclusion section (2003). The result revealed that, first, the majority of RA Conclusion sections (22 [73%] out of 30 conclusion sections) contain all elements of the Conclusion sections outlined by Yang and Allison (2003), namely: obligatory; move 1 (summarizing the study), the conventional moves; move 2 (Evaluating the study) and move 3 (deduction from the research); second, concerning steps features, most Indonesian authors tend to use step 1 in realizing move 2 (evaluating the study) This implies that those authors tend to justify their study by indicating the result of the research in evaluating the study in the conclusion section rather than stating the limitation of the research or evaluating the methodology in the conclusion section. In move 3, the Indonesian author tends to use step 1 (recommending future research) in realizing this move. This implies that the author prefers to state the possible areas for future study of study rather than drawing pedagogic implications. In conclusion, most Indonesian authors fulfilled the rhetorical structure of yang and Allison proposed model in their conclusion section.

Keywords Indonesian authors, research article, rhetorical analysis, writing conclusion

1. Introduction

In Indonesia, as the obligation of the university student and the faculty members to publish the journal article in international journals, the author tends to encounter the problem. The main reason for this problem is revealed in the study conducted by Arsyad (2014) which suggests that Indonesian authors tend to employ the Indonesian rhetorical pattern in writing the research article for international and national journals. Based on Arsyad & Arono (2016) who conducted research in analyzing the rhetorical style of Indonesian RA introductions in multiple disciplines written by Indonesian authors proved that the Indonesian rhetorical style is different from the English one. Regarding that, it's acceptable in Indonesian journals, but this must be a problem for Indonesian authors for publishing their research articles in an international journal.

Furthermore, several studies that focus on the organization of Research articles in Indonesia have been explored such as Abstract (Nur et al., 2021), Introduction (Rochma et al., 2020), Method (Arsyad, 2013), Finding and discussion (Suherdi et al., 2020), and all the four section (Arsyad et al., 2020). This evidence proves that the research article in all major sections has been conducted by the researcher in Indonesian. Moreover, Based on Lakić et al. (2015, p. 86), "Almost all of the attention on research articles focuses on the abstract, introduction, and discussion section".

In IMRD pattern, it has been argued that the conclusion is a part of the discussion section. As the component of the discussion section, the conclusion section is rarely conducted. The main claim of this assumption is that the term of the conclusion section in IMRD pattern is limited. The study conducted by Lin & Evans (2012) revealed that the presence section of C, L, and [RD] which are not accounted for in the framework of IMRD are important in the contemporary RA. Moreover, their studies proved that relatively choices used in scholarly writing are more complex than the traditional ones. Based on Yang and Allison (2003), the framework of IMRD especially for the last three patterns seems to be unresolved until their study revealed that they are different in terms of communicative purpose. Once the result section focuses on reporting the result and the discussion section on commenting on the result, the conclusion section focuses on summarizing the research by highlighting the main finding, evaluating, and giving the possible line for further research.

The term of the conclusion section as a disparate section theoretically is different from the discussion section. Based on Aslam and Mehmood (2014), the boundary between the two sections is supposed to be conceptually distinct in terms of their communicative function, while the discussion section concerns the interpretation of the result, the conclusion section focuses on the value of such findings and explains in what way these findings add something to the research field. Based on Tabatabaei and Azimi (2015), the conclusion section is a part of the RA for the writer to state the concluding remarks of their research while the reader goes to this section before reading all parts of the article whether to save their time or to make a decision in deciding to read all of its parts or not. Moreover, the conclusion section gives the writer the opportunist such as referring to the main topic and variable, reiterating the most important point, summarizing all related research, and presenting the findings of the article. However, it needs to be finished in an effective way so the reader can follow.

Regarding the importance of 'Conclusion' in research articles, the writer should have high capability to write in a way that affects readers' minds to direct their ideas. Based on Sandoval (2010), as one of the difficult parts to write, the research article conclusion section tends to spend a considerable amount of time for the author. The value of being aware of the rhetorical organization of a research article, especially in 'Conclusion', and having the competence to use it, will be a requirement for the authors in writing their conclusion section. Based on Nur et al (2021), the authors are expected to write the journal article with the appropriate rhetorical style which turned out to be problematic for non-native speakers of English such as the Indonesian authors.

As pioneering, the study of Yang and Allison (2003) especially in the conclusion section of the article serves as a bridge for researchers around the world in the related field. The relevant

study related to the present research has been conducted by several researchers such as Moritz et al (2008). This study used the hybrid model of the conclusion section which combined Bunton's (2005) model of Ph.D. dissertation with Yang and Allison's (2003) model for the article conclusion section in the field of applied linguistics. Their study revealed the occurrence of complex sequences of movements and steps that exhibit a cyclical structure but with differences in the three investigated languages. Even though this study include the hybrids model to account for all their purpose, this study also reveals that

Yang and Allison's (2003) model for the conclusion research article is more linear.

Another study of the conclusion section in the field of applied linguistics was conducted by Morales (2012). This study aimed to identify organizational and compulsory moves from cultures both Filipino and Japanese. This study reported that Filipino authors indicated the significance of their research as a way of indicating their contribution to the body of knowledge. Meanwhile, the Japanese author employed in their conclusions a brief account of the main points from the perspective of the overall study, which is characterized by “Ketsu” of their cultural rhetorical pattern. In the same field, the study conducted by Amnuai & Wannaruk (2013) attempted to analyze the conclusion sections of English research articles both in Thai and international journals. The significant finding in their research proved that there were significant differences in the rhetorical in the conclusion section between Thai and international corpus.

As can be seen from the literature, all of the previous studies above focused on the field of applied linguistics. Moreover, Yang and Allison's (2003) model of the conclusion section seems to be applicable in another field, such as Adel and Ghorbani Moghadam (2015) which conducted to analyze the rhetorical move structure of the conclusion section of Persian article in applied linguistics, psychology, and Persian literature. Moreover, this study revealed that there were more variations used in Persian literature articles, which, in turn, may suggest that in Persian articles, writers follow a standard of their own for writing the conclusion section. Another study in the field of social studies conducts by Tabatabaei and Azimi (2015) which aimed to investigate the rhetorical conventions both of English and Persian article. This study revealed that there were differences between English and Persian article moves in their frequency and sequences. Another study was conducted by Zamani and Ebadi (2016) in the conclusion section in the field of civil engineering and applied linguistics. This research revealed that there was no significant difference in the use of the move in both fields.

It has been argued that the major structure of the research article such as Lin and Evans (2012), and Katz (2006) might be different in each field. Moreover, it is supposed to be noticed that the research evidence in the literature revealed that Yang and Allison's model appears to be applicable not only to apply linguistics but also in other disciplines (e.g. civil engineering, social studies, psychology). Another point of the evidence also proved that rhetorical use by native English and non-native English is different.

Regarding the importance of the conclusion section in a research article, to the best of the researcher's knowledge, no research focuses on the conclusion section of the research article in Indonesian. Based on this gap, the present study aims to research to investigate rhetorical moves and step in the conclusion section research article on applied linguistics written by the Indonesian author in an Indonesian international journal.

2. Method

This study used a descriptive quantitative method. Based on Loeb et al (2017), the purpose of the quantitative descriptive method is just a general understanding of patterns in the population of interest not a deep understanding of the personal perspective of the phenomenon. It is mean that the phenomenon of quantitative descriptive analysis is characterized by the pattern identified in the data to answer the question about who, what where, and to what extent.

This research was designed as descriptive but also used quantitative as well as qualitative data. Quantitative data has been shown to show the percentage of occurrences, whereas

qualitative data has been shown to describe, explain, and illustrate the findings in detail. The data was mostly descriptive. It is all collected, analyzed, identified, and discussed. Moreover, this research only focused on rhetorical moves or structure in the conclusion part of the Indonesian international journal article.

The Corpus of the Study

The corpus of this study was thirty research articles from published research articles in two International Journals: Indonesian Journal of Applied Sciences (IJAL) and Teaching of English as a Foreign Language in Indonesia (TEFLIN). The number of articles is not immense because it only focuses on English language education in Applied Linguistics. So, the number of these articles can be representative.

Each journal represents fifteen samples of the RA Conclusion section in which a total of thirty RA conclusions were considerably adequate (enough) as samples for this study according to the author. However, Evans (retrieved in Deveci, 2019) argued that a small corpus could generate large amounts of useful data when investigating high-frequency items.

The idea of choosing these two journals; IJAL and TEFLIN were due to their recognition as international journals as well as having a good reputation (Indexed by SCOPUS). Next, in the linguistic and language categories based on Scimago journal rank in Indonesian, the top list journals in these categories were IJAL and TEFLIN. Moreover, Davies (2007) stated that there is a more applied linguistic specialist in the field of language teaching and learning. Furthermore, he stated that “There is a view, held by some linguists and applied linguists, that language teaching and language-teacher education are the only proper concerns of applied linguistics

Instruments

The instrument of this research was text analysis by using a checklist of moves and steps in the research article conclusion by following the model purposed by Yang & Allison (2003). In the checklist, each move and step from the data has been put in a column and each article only had one checklist.

Data analysis procedures

The data analysis procedure in this study consisted of (1) collecting the research article (2) reading the research articles and the format or structures of the research articles to decide the main sections (3) identifying the move by looking at the paragraph in the Conclusion section and analyzing the steps by looking at the sentences of each paragraph of the Conclusion section (4) analyzed the move and steps of rhetorical styles in Indonesian journal in education area research articles (5) validated the analysis results by including one independent rater in the process of text analysis to validate the analysis results (6) displaying the data into a table with examples (7) described the moves and steps found in the two Journals (Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics and TEFLIN journal)

This study used an independent rater to validate the result of the data analysis. The independent rater of this study was a graduate student from the Magister of English Language Teaching Training and Education of Bengkulu University. The independent rater is trained to identify the move and step based on the instrument. Furthermore, an independent rater has been assigned to analyze 20% of the total number of articles taken randomly. If there were errors and code errors occurred in the sample of articles in the training so discussion, negotiation, and clarification would be held to reach an agreement between the researchers . To measure the reliability and accuracy of the data, Cohen’s Kappa statistic has been applied.

3. Results and Discussion

Move Usage in Conclusion Sections

In analyzing the conclusion section from the both of journal (IJAL and TEFLIN Journal), the total number of moves used from the both of journal was calculated. The frequency of move used in both of journal are presented in table 1.

Table 1 Frequency and percentage of the number of all moves

Number of Move Used	IJAL	TEFLIN	Frequency	Percentage
One Move	0	0	0	0%
Two Moves	4	4	8	27%
Three Moves	11	11	22	73%
Total	15	15	30	

From table 1, the article which used three moves (Summarizing the study, Evaluating the study, Deduction from the research) in the conclusion section is 73% with a total frequency of 22 articles. The articles which only used two moves in the conclusion section are lower than the three moves. The percentage of the two moves is 27% with a total frequency of 8 articles. Moreover, no article used one move.

Next, the frequency of moves found in this study showed various frequencies. The frequency move used by the authors in thirty articles in this study can be seen in table 2.

Table 2 Frequency of move in RA conclusion

No.	Moves	IJAL n=15	TEFLIN n=15	Total n=30	%
1	Move 1	15	15	30	100%
2	Move 2	14	14	28	93%
3	Move 3	12	12	24	80%

Table 2 shows the frequency and percentage of moves found in the RAs in the corpus of the study. As can be seen from the table, the total move from 30 articles was 82. The moves used in the conclusion section article of the Indonesian International journal of applied Linguistics based on the corpus were; Move 1 (Summarizing the Study) which is found in all the corpus (100%), and Move 2 (Evaluating the study) used by 28 authors (93%) and move 3 used by 25 authors (80%). The examples of three moves from the extracted data are in an instant.

Extract 1:

The results *suggest* that the Indonesian lexical bundles in research articles have their own characteristics. They include frequency, structure, and discourse function. In terms of frequency, there are 197 lexical bundles consisting of three to six words with a total occurrence of 51,813 times. A three-word bundle is the most common bundle, while a six-word bundle is the least one. From the corpus consisting of six academic disciplines, it is found that there are 19 core lexical bundles, i.e., bundles that appear in all six disciplines (IJAL-13).

This extract belongs to the Move 1. This is the Move that RA authors use to provide a brief account of the main points from the perspective of the overall study and the keyword of this move included results and observation and coupled with suggest, show and indicate. The word *suggest* indicates that the author summarizes the study by summarizing the result and highlighting the finding. This move has no steps. Moreover, the researcher claimed it as move 1.

Furthermore, Move 2 (Evaluating the study) in conclusion section aims to justify the study. This move can be identified by three steps, indicating significant or advantage, indicating limitation and evaluating the methodology. The example of move 2 can be seen in the following extract.

Extract 2:

{Move 2} **The findings of this study revealed** that morphological awareness **has the potential** to be used as a strategy in reading comprehension. The correlation, which was categorized as moderate, showed that morphological awareness might contribute to reading comprehension. Teachers, therefore, should provide students with knowledge and instructions related to

morphological awareness so that students can apply these skills while reading and when they find new words that might require a morphological analysis (TEFLIN-24).

This extract belongs to move 2 where the authors justified the study by indicating significant or advantage of the research. The phrase *The finding of this study revealed* and *has the potential* showed that the author stated the usefulness and the important of the study's application and implication. Moreover, the researcher claimed this as move 2.

Next, the last move on conclusion section is move 3 (Deduction from the research). This move has a purpose to state keeping in view the overall study, what the research adds to existing knowledge in the relevant area and can be indicated by two step: Recommending the further research and Drawing pedagogic Implications. The example of move 3 found in the article is as follows.

Extract 3:

{Move 3} The findings of this study have a number of important implications for future practice, especially for EFL teachers and researchers. First, this current study examined the role of technology in the development of teachers' creativity. The implementation of technology as described by teachers in this study provides examples of how EFL teachers could build their creativity through the use of technology in their practice. The findings revealed that teachers are aware of the importance of technology in creativity. However, there is no clear evidence about how these teachers use technology in their actual classrooms. Thus, **future research need** to investigate the creative pedagogy of technology use in the classroom by doing classroom observations, and identify how the teachers integrate technology into creative classroom activities (TEFLIN-28).

This extract belongs to move 3 (Deduction from the research) where the authors adds to existing knowledge of the research. The word *future research need*, showed that the authors indicated this move by using step which called Recommending the further research.

Features of Steps in Conclusion Sections

Regarding that the first move of conclusion section from yang and Allison (2003) has no step, step analysis just carried out on move 2 and move 3. The result can be seen as follow:

Table 3 Frequency of step in RA conclusion section

Move	Step	Conclusion Section	
		IJAL	TEFLIN
Summarizing the study	-	-	-
Evaluating the study	Indicating significant	12	11
	Indicating Limitation	4	1
	Evaluating Methodology	5	7
Deduction from the research	Recommending future research	11	11
	Drawing pedagogic Implication	5	4

In detail, the frequency of step in each move on conclusion section in both of journal can be seen as follows.

Table 4 Frequency of step of move 2 in RA conclusion section

Evaluating the study	Conclusion section			
	IJAL n=15	TEFLIN n=15	Total n=30	%
Indicating significant	12	11	23	77%
Indicating Limitation	4	1	5	17%
Evaluating Methodology	5	7	12	40%

Table 4 shows the frequency and percentage of steps in Move 2 found in the RAs. From the result, Step 1 is found in 22 articles (77%), steps 2 only found in 5 articles (17%) and steps 3 is found in 12 articles (40%). This clearly proved that the most dominantly steps used by the author of the two journals in conclusion section is step 1 (indicating significant / advantage) with totally 23 articles (77%). Below are the example of each steps.

Extract 4:

{M2S1} This paper discussed the necessary steps for establishing a successful extensive reading program at Indonesian schools and the factors that contribute to the success of extensive reading program. **The findings revealed** that getting the support of the school, especially when planning a library, was an **important** first step to setting up a **successful** extensive reading program. The next step was setting up the library, which required teachers to be able to help students determine the book levels and topics. It was found that when students chose books appropriately for their levels and interests, their enthusiasm for reading increased. Therefore, book availability was crucial to support the success of this extensive reading program in the long run (TEFLIN-21).

The extract above belongs to M2S1 (indicating significant /advantage). This step aims to state the usefulness and the importance of the study regarding the study’s applications or implications. Prominent words which are used to indicate this step include discovers, helpful, useful etc. The word *the findings revealed*, *important* and *successful* in the extract 1 proved that the author states the usefulness and importance of the study regarding the study’s applications or implications

Extract 5:

{M2S2} This research entails **some limitations**, and, for that reason, recommendations are presented for researchers who are interested in conducting a similar study in the future. First, **there is the limitation** of students’ self-rated anxiety level division in the research. Future researchers can further investigate the level of students’ language anxiety using a more reliable scale, such as FLCAS (Horwitz et al., 1986; Trang et al., 2013).... (TEFLIN-19).

The extract above belongs to M2S2 (Indicating Limitation). This step aims to state the weak point and the limitations of the study. This step sometimes can be single out by the key word ‘limitation’ or ‘constrains’. The word *some limitations* and *there is the limitation* in the extract 2, used by the author to state the weak point or the limitation of the study. Moreover, researcher claimed this as M2S2.

Extract 6:

{M2S2} Related to our findings of the students’ perceptions, there are **some issues** that need emphasising. First, from our interview and questionnaire data we found that all students felt positive toward the course. We might have expected different results had we also evaluated the perceptions of the students who withdrew from the course. Second, as this was an autoethnography study, that is, it was the teacher himself who acted as the researcher and conducted the interviews, the students might have provided positive comments that they think the teacher wanted to hear. Thus, our findings **need careful adaptation** for practical use. Further research investigating students’ perception of an online flipped course needs to address all the limitations of the current study for more credible results (IJAL-8).

The extract above belong to M2S3 (Evaluating Methodology). In this step, the author used the word *some issues* and *need careful adaptation* in order to explain and evaluated the methodology by it weakness.

Table 5 Frequency of step of move 3 in RA conclusion section

Deduction from the Research	Conclusion section			
	IJAL n=15	TEFLIN n=15	Total n=30	%
Recommending future research	11	11	22	73%
Drawing pedagogic Implication	5	4	9	30%

Table 5 shows the frequency and percentage of steps in Move 3 found in the RAs. From the result, Step 1 is found in 22 articles (73%) and steps 2 only found in 9 articles (30%). Based on the table, the most dominantly steps used by the author of the two journals in conclusion section on move 3 is step 1 (Recommending future research) with totally 22 articles (73%). Below are the example of each steps.

Extract 7

{M3S1} As conclusion, this research can be considered as a teaching framework to fulfill the demand of classroom practices in the industrial revolution of 4.0. Collaborative learning is proved to be applicable as a learning model that can improve student's argument quality taping to lower thinking skills (remember, understand and apply) and a higher order thinking skill (analyze) in the learning process. However, students did not achieve to tap into a more higher order thinking skill from analyze, which are evaluate and create. **Further research may be conducted** for a deeper study on students' reasons on their preference patterns when stating an argumentation (IJAL-12).

The extract above belongs to M3S1 (recommending the future research). The author used the word *Further research may be conducted* in order to link the present research and the future research which is to be conducted.

Extract 8

{M3S2} The findings in this study contribute to a better understanding of the characteristics of written academic discourse. From the **pedagogical point of view**, the findings **can be used** as learning material, for both native and non-native speakers. For many Indonesian language learners, one of the difficulties faced is collocation. By studying lexical bundles, it means that they are also studying collocations because lexical bundles are extended collocations. (IJAL-13)

The extract above showed that the author used M3S2 (Drawing pedagogic implication). The key word of this step can be single out by pedagogic and teaching. On the extract 2 above, the word *pedagogical point of view* and *can be used*, used by the author to state the pedagogical implication of the research finding.

Discussion

The Rhetorical Structures of Conclusion Sections

Based on the finding, it is found that the rhetorical move used by Indonesian authors in international journals of conclusion sections were Summarizing the study, Evaluating the study and Deduction from the research. The result showed that the highest frequency move found was Move 1 (summarizing the study). Based on the finding, Move 1 labelled as the obligatory move considering the occurrence of this move in all of the article (100%) while Move 2 (93%) and Move 3(80%) as the conventional. Based on the frequency of the occurrence, obligatory move was the move which occurred most frequently followed by conventional which frequently occurred and the optional move which occur lees than 70% (Thumvichit & Gampper, 2019).

The objective of Move 1 is to summarize the research or study by highlighting the finding. In this study, this move was found in the beginning of conclusion section. Based on the corpus, purpose of the study, method and result are also found in this move. As the obligatory move, this finding seem to be in line with Aslam & Mehmood (2014) which found that the Pakistani authors tend to compulsory this move in reviewing and restate their study in the beginning of a conclusion section.

Another study conducted by Amnuai and Wannaruk (2013) also find Move 1 was the most dominant move found in conclusion section in Thai journal both in international and national journals. This move also found along with the restating the objective of the research and reviewing the result of the study.

The study conducted by Adel and Moghadam (2015) also found the higher frequency of occurrences of this move. Their research found that Move 1 (summarizing the study) are different in both corpora. In the applied linguistics, summarizing the study is focus more on purpose of the research, research question and hypothesis while in physiology journal just focus as the result of the research carried out.

The highest frequency of this move in this study might occurred based on the statement of Zamani and Ebadi (2016), which stated that stating the main point or the overall study in the conclusion section would lead the reader easily to follow the authors idea and enables them to understand the main content without perusing the entire article.

Features of Steps in Conclusion Sections

Regarding that move 1 or summarizing the study had no step, so the analysis of step was just carried out on move 2 and move 3. In evaluating the study or move 2, three features of step (indicating significant, indicating limitation and evaluating the methodology) has been found in the corpora. In deduction from the research or move 3, two features of this step (recommending the future research and drawing pedagogic implication) are also found in this study. Nevertheless, even all the step features of move 2 and 3 were found in the corpora, the tendency of the occurrence of step in realizing each move was significant.

On move 2, the highest frequency of step used by the author in both of journal is Step 1 (indicating the significances/ advantages) with the frequency 77% followed by step 3 (Evaluating the methodology) 40% and Step 2 (Indicating Limitation) 17%. On move 3, the highest frequency of steps found in the both of journal is step 1 (Recommending the future research) with the occurrence 73% followed by Step 2 (Drawing pedagogic Implication) 30%. Based on this data, it claimed that Step 1 on Move 2 and Step 1 on Move 3 are conventional step and the others steps on move 2 and move 3 are optional.

In evaluating the study or move 2 in conclusion section based on Yang & Allison (2003) purposed model, there has been three features of steps which can be used by the author to evaluate the study. In other hand, there were three available steps which can be used by the author in realizing this move. As the highest occurrence of step in move 2 based on the data, indicating significances / advantages or S1 seem to be the most step used by Indonesian international authors in evaluating their research. This step has a purposed to justify their study by indicating the result.

The study conducted by Morales (2012) in analyzing Filipino and Japanese research article conclusion section assumed that the tendency of the authors from different culture in evaluating the study affected the preferences of steps in realizing this move. Indicating significant/advantages has been the obligatory step used by Filipino authors in their research article conclusion section while in Japanese, the highest frequency of step in realizing Move 2 is indicating limitation. The only claimed of the significant differences on both of corpora were caused by the culture. In general, Japanese refrained of being personal compliments because they tend to be polite all the time.

Another study in analyzing conclusion sections of Persians and English papers was conducted by Zamani and Ebadi (2016). This study found that the tendency of the authors in realizing this move by step 1 or indicating the significant or advantages of the study while two others step were left to be optional. It supposed to be noticed that in their research, the occurrence of step 2 and step 3 in move 2 was just found in English paper while there was no occurrence of these steps in Persian paper. To the link of the previous study, the research which conduct by Jahangard et al (2014) corporate their finding which implied that the Persian authors considers that evaluating the study might not be very important section so they tend to left this less significant step out.

The study conducted by Aslam & Mehmood (2014) in the research of conclusion section in natural and social sciences found the differences about how the different field of study effecting the realization of this move. This study reported that the occurrence of indicating

significant or advantages in realizing move 2 or evaluating the study in social science is three times higher than in natural science. Based on their study, the less occurrence of move 2 in social science might be caused by the authors tend to jump into move 3 after realizing move 1 by ignoring the significant of move 2. They also added that the tendency of the authors in following the demand in the study might effect the move pattern in their conclusion section.

Another study conducted by Amnuai & Wannaruk (2013) which compared the conclusion section of Thai and international corpus also revealed the high frequency of step 1 (indicating significant / advantages) in realizing move 2 (evaluating the methodology). Nevertheless, the finding of this study also revealed the significant differences of the frequency of the occurrence of the others two steps (indicating limitation and evaluating the methodology) in move 2. It supposed to be noticed that the occurrence of all the three steps in international corpus found in their study had a similar frequency whereas in Thai corpus, there were a few of steps found or they might be claimed prefer not to evaluate the study.

Based on this study, the finding revealed that all the three steps of Move 2 were found in the corpus. The highest frequency of indicating significant of the study in realizing move 2 which found in this research might had a connection to the statement of Sandoval (2010) which said that indicating the significance of the study is the attempt for the researcher in a way to establish credibility which making them credible researcher in their own discipline.

Furthermore, the occurrence of the other steps in Move 2 (indicating limitation and evaluating the methodology) in this study could not be underestimated. Referring to the finding of Amnuai & Wannaruk (2013), the occurrence of the three steps in the international corpus were even. Considering that the corpus involved in this study were international journal, the frequency of step 2 (indicating limitation) and step 3 (evaluating the methodology) in move 2 were low. This might imply that the Indonesian authors prefer to evaluate their study by indicating the significant of their finding without inclination of explaining the limitation of their research or evaluate the methodology in the conclusion section. The only presumption based on the literature (Morales (2012), Amnuai & Wannaruk (2013), Jahangard et al (2014), Zamani & Ebadi (2016)) due to the preferences of steps by the author in evaluating the study was on the effect of the culture to writing.

Referring to the study conducted by Arsyad and Arono (2016), they argued that the differences of Indonesian and English authors in justifying their study was based on the tendency of Indonesian authors in using the affective appeals while the English authors tend to exploit the rational appeal. This statement might give insight of how the culture of Indonesian authors affected the way they justified their study. The noticeable finding based on this argument were also used by Morales (2012) in explained how argumentative strategies used by Japanese and American authors. This study also argued that the Japanese authors tend to exploit the affective appeal while the American prefer on rational appeal in justified their study.

Even though that the assumption toward the Indonesian and Japanese authors were lied on the “affective appeal” in justifying their study, the finding of the present study to the study conducted by Morales (2012) was significantly different. The study conducted by Morales (2012) reported that the Japanese authors tend to evaluate their study or realizing move 2 in their conclusion sections by using step 2 (indicating limitation) and step 3 (evaluating the methodology) while step 1 (indicating the significant/advantages) was left to be optional. Meanwhile, the result finding of this present study was contrasted. Low occurrence of step 2 (indicating limitation) and step 3 (evaluating the methodology) in this study might occurred caused by there was no detail requirement for the conclusion section explicitly imposed by the two journals (IJAL and TEFLIN).

Referring to Yang and Allison (2003), the purpose of conclusion section were lied on highlighting the findings, evaluating and pointing out possible lines of future research as well as suggesting implications for teaching and learning. Meanwhile, based on its official website (IJAL and TEFLIN), the only requirement imposed for the conclusion section were Summary and Restating the Main Finding (IJAL 2021) and the heading of Conclusion and Suggestion

(TEFLIN 2021). Regarding that, both of the journals did not impose a detail criteria for the conclusion section. The term of “Summary and Restating the Main Finding which imposed by the journal (IJAL 2021) might refer to “highlighting the finding” while the heading of suggestion (TEFLIN 2021) might refer to “pointing out possible lines of future research and suggesting the implications of the study”. Based on this presumption, all journals included do not require authors to include an evaluating research section as a mandatory part of the conclusion section.

In deduction from the research or move 3, two features of this step (recommending the future research and drawing pedagogic implication) were also found in this study. The occurrence of step 1 (Recommending the future research) was 73% followed by Step 2 (Drawing pedagogic Implication) 30%.

The finding of this study seem to be in line with the study conducted by Annuai & Wannaruk (2013) which found the international authors in their study prefer on step 1 (recommending future research) in realizing Move 3 rather than move 2 (Drawing pedagogic implication). Furthermore, the study conducted by Aslam & Mehmood (2014) revealed that Future research is recommended to encourage knowledge growth. Therefore, it is logical to suggest that this step should be included in the Conclusions section as it is almost a necessary feature in conclusion section for the next researcher to conduct possible research in the future.

Based on the finding, the occurrence of the S1 (Recommending the future research) is the highest occurrence step. Based on the data, it implies the Indonesian authors prefer to state the possible areas for future study of the study rather than drawing pedagogic implication in deduction of their research.

Apart from the discussion of the finding above, it might imply that it was affordable if the article just only includes M1 and M2 or M1 and M3 considering that M1 is the only obligatory move found in this study. The tendency move usage by the Indonesian author might be caused by there were no requirement or criteria that each journal has imposed for the conclusion section. It should be note that neither IJAL nor TEFLIN established specific requirement or standard for the conclusion section. What was required explicitly is conclusion section just consist of Summary and Restating the Main Finding (IJAL 2021) and the heading of Conclusion and Suggestion (TEFLIN 2021).

4. Conclusion

To sum up, this research aims to find out the rhetorical structure of conclusion sections in applied linguistic article written by Indonesian authors in international journal. The result revealed that the rhetorical structures of conclusion sections in applied linguistics international journal articles written by Indonesian authors are summarizing the study, evaluating the study and deduction from the research. This result implies that most Indonesian author in applied linguistic fulfilled the rhetorical structure of yang and Allison proposed model in their conclusion section. In move 2 (evaluating the study) and move 3 (deduction from the research), all features of steps in realizing these moves were found. The significant finding of this study revealed that Indonesian authors prefer to indicate the significant/advantages of the result in evaluating their study rather than stating the limitation or evaluating the methodology. In deduction of the research, the Indonesian author prefers to state the possible areas for future study of the study rather than drawing pedagogic implications.

This study is limited due to the small corpus involved. The result of this study gathered from 30 articles written by Indonesian in two journals. Considering that each journal has a different requirement to be followed, further research with a larger corpus may provide a clearer insight of the rhetorical structure of conclusion section.

References

- Adel, S. M. R., & Ghorbani Moghadam, R. (2015). A Comparison of Moves in Conclusion Sections of Research Articles in Psychology, Persian Literature and Applied Linguistics. *Teaching English Language*, 9(2), 167–191. <https://doi.org/10.22132/tel.2015.53729>
- Amnuai, W., & Wannaruk, A. (2013). A Move-Based Analysis of the Conclusion Sections of Research Articles Published in International and Thai Journals. *The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*, 19(2), 56–53.
- Arsyad, S. (2013). A genre-based analysis of Indonesian research articles in the social sciences and humanities written by Indonesian speakers. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, 8(3), 234–254. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17447143.2013.849711>
- Arsyad, S. (2014). *Menulis Artikel Jurnal dengan Gaya Retorika Bahasa Inggris*. Halaman Moeka Publishing.
- 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., Arono, Ramadhan, S., & Iramaisarah. (2020). The rhetorical problems experienced by Indonesian lecturers in social sciences and humanities in writing research articles for international journals. *The Asian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 7(1), 116–129.
- Aslam, I., & Mehmood, D. A. (2014). Genre Analysis of Conclusion Sections of Pakistani Research Articles in Natural and Social Sciences. *Journal of Natural Sciences Research*, 4(22), 106–112.
- Bunton, D. (2005). The structure of PhD conclusion chapters. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 4(3), 207–224. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2005.03.004>
- Cargill, M., & O'Connor, P. (2009). *Writing scientific research articles: Strategy and steps*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Davies, A. (2007). *An introduction to applied linguistics: From practice to theory* (2nd ed). Edinburgh University Press.
- Deveci. (2019). Sentence Length in Education Research Articles: A Comparison between Anglophone and Turkish Authors. *The Linguistics Journal*, 13(1), 74–101.
- Kanoksilapatham, B. (2005). Rhetorical structure of biochemistry research articles. *English for Specific Purposes*, 24(3), 269–292. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2004.08.003>
- Katz, M. J. (2006). *From research to manuscript: A guide to scientific writing*. Springer.
- Lakić, I., Živković, B., Vuković, M., & Lakić, I. (Eds.). (2015). *Academic discourse across cultures*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Lin, L., & Evans, S. (2012). Structural patterns in empirical research articles: A cross-disciplinary study. *English for Specific Purposes*, 31(3), 150–160. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2011.10.002>
- Loeb, S., Dynarski, S., McFarland, D., Morris, P., Reardon, S., & Reber, S. (2017). *Descriptive Analysis in Education: A Guide for Researchers*. NCEE 2017-4023. National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance.
- Morales, R. C. (2012). Conclusions in Research Articles: A Filipino-Japanese Contrastive Rhetoric Study. *Philippine ESL Journal*, 8, 13.
- Moritz, M. E., & et al. (2008). Conclusions as components of research articles across Portuguese as a native language, English as a native language and English as a foreign language: A contrastive genre study. *The ESPecialist*, 29(2), 233–253.
- Musa, N. F., & Khamis, N. (2015). Research Article Writing: A Review of a Complete Rhetorical Organisation. *Pertanika Journal of Science and Technology*, 23(S), 111–122.
- Nur, S., Arsyad, S., Zaim, M., & Ramadhan, S. (2021). Interacting with readers: How non-native authors of English use meta-discourse markers in their research article abstracts published in English medium journals. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 17(1), 239–255. <https://doi.org/10.52462/jlls.14>
- Rochma, A. F., Triastuti, A., & Ashadi, A. (2020). Rhetorical styles of Introduction in English language teaching (ELT) research articles. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10(2), 304–314. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v10i2.28593>
- Sandoval, M. (2010). Stance-taking strategies in the written discourse of research papers conclusion sections [Abstract]. Paper presented at the First International TESOL Convention, Clark Freeport Zone, Philippines Retrieved July 20, 2020 from <http://independent.academia.edu/MarlowieSandoval/Papers>.
- Suherdi, D., Kurniawan, E., & Lubis, A. H. (2020). A genre analysis of research article ‘findings and discussion’ sections written by Indonesian undergraduate EFL students. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10(1), 59–72. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v10i1.24989>
- Suryani, I., Kamaruddin, H., Hashima, N., Yaacob, A., Rashid, S. A., & Desa, H. (2014). Rhetorical Structures in Academic Research Writing by Non- Native Writers. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 3(1), 10.
- Swales, J. (2004). *Research genres: Explorations and applications*. Cambridge University Press.
- Tabatabaei, O., & Azimi, L. (2015). Rhetorical Conventions in the Conclusion Genre: Comparing English and Persian Research Articles in the Field of Social Studies. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(6), 372–379. <https://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2015.v6n6s1p372>
- Thumvichit, A., & Gampper, C. (2019). Composing responses to negative hotel reviews: A genre analysis. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, 6(1), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2019.1629154>

- Yang, R., & Allison, D. (2003). Research articles in applied linguistics: Moving from results to conclusions. *English for Specific Purposes*, 22(4), 365–385. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906\(02\)00026-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(02)00026-1)
- Zamani, G., & Ebadi, S. (2016). Move analysis of the conclusion sections of research papers in Persian and English. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Sciences*, 11(1), 09–20.