CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSIONS

In this chapter, the study's main findings are summarized according to the results of the present study. Next, the implications of the present study are presented. Finally, suggestions for further study are described in detail.

6.1 A Summary of the Findings

Generally speaking, 16 rhetorical moves were found in Agricultural Science RAs, including 3 for the Introduction section, 5 for the Methods section, 4 for the Results section and 4 for the Discussion section.

Compared with previous studies, some differences were found. For instance, Move 2: *Indicating a research gap* contained only one variation in the present study. But this move was found to have two variations in Kanoksilapatham's (2005) study, including *Indicating a gap* and *Raising a question*. Move 4, Step 4: *Describing location where the study was conducted* and Move 8: *Describing the mathematical modeling of the system* were found to be new moves. It is common to state the location of farms or experimental fields in Agricultural Science RAs, but this step was not found in the fields of Biochemistry, Medicine, Computer Science or Management. Move 8 covered two variations, including *Detailing math method* and *Detailing assumptions for the model*. Move 13, Step 3: *Restating the aims of the study* was not

identified in Kanoksilapatham's (2005) framework but it was found in Dudley-Evans's (1994) study. And also, Move 15, Step 4: *Limitations about the review of literature* was found to be a new step only in the present study.

In addition, the frequency of some moves identified in the present study was different from that of moves identified in Kanoksilapatham's (2005) investigation. For instance, Move 6: *Detailing equipment* and Move 7: *Detailing mathematical modeling of system* were optional in Kanoksilapatham's (2005) investigation, but they were conventional in the present study. Meanwhile, Move 15: *Stating limitations of the present study* was optional but this move was conventional in Kanoksilapatham's (2005) investigation.

Furthermore, the linguistic features of each move were also investigated. The passive voice or active voice with the 3rd person inanimate subject predominated in Agricultural Science RAs. The first person pronoun *we* was found to be common in Move 3, Move 9, Steps1 & 3 and Move 11. The past tense and the present perfect tense were employed in all the IMRD sections.

In the present study, the extended collocations, sequences of more than 3-word combinations were defined as lexical bundles. The context of lexical bundles has given us some insights into the nature of language patterns. Each move realized different communicative functions and language content and lexical bundles were identified from each move. Therefore, all the lexical bundles were grouped into different categories according to their communicative purpose.

It should be noted that lexical bundles differ from other linguistics features and many of them are not complete structural units. Examination of these multi-word sequences in textual contexts shows that they are important building blocks of discourse, associated with basic communicative functions. In general, these lexical bundles serve as discourse framing devices: they provide a kind of frame signaling discourse organization associated with the expression of new information relative to that frame.

6.2 Implications of the Present Study

The present study provides a comprehensive list of lexical bundles used in academic writing in Agricultural Science. It is believed that direct explicit learning and teaching of the frequently-used lexical bundles will help students in their development of academic reading and writing ability. Learners would have a better understanding of these multi-word expressions, if we provide them with ready-made language without need for further processing, which will save them a lot of effort. As lexical bundles are very frequent in academic writing, it is necessary for the learners to have a good mastery of these multi-word expressions and use them appropriately. Teachers should look very carefully at these lexical bundles which can help learners read and write better. Any teacher who is interested in developing teaching materials can even create a reliable field-specific word list.

6.3 Suggestions for Further Study

The present study aims to facilitate reading and writing in the field of hard science. However, due to the limitations of the present study, some recommendations are suggested for further study.

Future researchers may want to expand their corpus size to be as large as possible in order to increase representativeness of their corpus which may influence the final result of the study. It is recommended that more RAs should be analyzed in order to increase generalization of the move analysis. The rhetorical moves of Agricultural Science RAs were analyzed on the basis of 30 RAs; all the key words were used to identify lexical bundles from CASA. Therefore, some lexical bundles might not have been investigated in this study because of corpus size limitation or sample size limitation.

In addition, Paltridge (1994) indicated that decisions on move boundaries reflect the subjectivity of the judgment, so we must be cautious of the reliability and empirical validity of the analysis. To ensure the reliability of move identification, an English speaker with expertise in a specific discipline was employed to be an intercoder in this study. First, the researcher identified the moves in the 30 articles independently, then submitted the analysis work of the first 10 RAs to the expert to check the reliability. Any difference in move identification was resolved through discussion. In the present study, only two raters coded the research articles. Further research is needed where three raters can perform the coding procedure independently.

If two raters can not agree on some move boundaries, they can ask the third rater. This issue needs further consideration. In further research, statistical analysis is needed to asses the inter-coder reliability of the move coding in each section of each RA. Only percentage agreement might not be sufficiently accurate.