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Abstract

The conclusion section of the article is an essential part as it is the last chance and to conclude the article. But this very essential part of the article was usually considered a part of the Discussion section of a research article, the one exception being Yang and Allison's (2003) study of the final section where they found conclusion as part-genre. For current research, the researcher randomly chose 15 high impact factor research articles across three different disciplines from social sciences. All the conclusion sections were selected from high impact factor research articles, published between 2008 and 2013. A Four-move model adapted from Yang and Allison (2003) and Bunton (2005) models are used to analyze the selected corpus for the current research. The analysis shows that there is an agreement between both corpora in classifying the moves as obligatory or optional. While Move 1, summarizing, and Move 2, evaluating, are obligatory, Move 4, future research is conventional; however, there is a difference in Move 3. M3, practical implications are optional in social sciences research articles. However, there are also several variations between the conclusion section in the corpus and the suggested model of analysis. The study concludes that these variations between the conclusion and the proposed model indicate that writers should choose the moves that best serve their purposes rather than including all the moves.
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Introduction

The term "Genre" has gained much attention and developed interest from different spheres in the last decade, and is continued to expand in scope and frequency from its original uses in art, history, and literary criticism and by now it is commonly used and applied to music, programs, novels, magazines, etc. The extensive use of genre analysis to different fictional and non-fictional texts made it complex, especially in the last few decades (Maher, 2017).

Genre is a term overburdened with definitions. Different scholars and linguists define genre from their point of view as some gave importance to purpose (Swales, 1990), some to text (Bhatia, 1993; Swales, 1990), and some to content (Bhatia, 2004). Genre analysis of research articles has gained much of the attention as Zhang and Zhang (2014) found that 85 of the 448 research articles in the 97 issues of the journals published from 1986 to 2012 were concerned with research articles. Flowerdew (2014) defines genre analysis as Genre Analysis is the study of situated linguistic behavior in institutionalized academic or professional settings (p. 22).

Following Swales and Feak (2009), Ismail & Ahmad Shah (2014) rhetorical structure of the abstracts, Thomas and Hawes (1994), if Abstract is part-genre so is the Conclusion, because Conclusion has also a different communicative purpose. The research articles have gained much interest and focus in genre analysis (Berman, 1988, Swales, 1990, Holmes, 1997 and Yang and Allison, 2003). Their main focus was on finding recursive moves and rhetorical patterns that lead to the organization of research articles. However, their work can be summarized as an advanced step towards a better understanding of rhetorical patterns and moves in overall organization in the field of ESP (English for Specific Purposes). It is not like that scholars working in the field of genre analysis, critical discourse and ESP rejected conclusion as sub-genre, but their focus remained mainly on research articles.
In defining genre, Bhatia (1993) did not contradict Swales (1990); rather he discussed Swales definition in further detail. Bhatia focused more on communicative purpose(s), which further leads to and influenced or shaped the structure of the genre.

To Bhatia genre "is primarily characterized by the communicative purpose(s) that it is intended to fulfill", Bhatia (1993). The purpose(s) greatly influenced and structured genre, if the purpose of the genre is changed, it will automatically lead to the change in structure of that specific genre. For Bhatia, communicative purpose is a strong criterion, ignoring others represented and suggested by Swales, for identifying and distinguishing sub-genres, Bhatia (1993).

Regarding the structure of genre, unlike Swales, Bhatia commented that structure and conventions are acquired. Every discipline has specific norms, values, culture, structure, and conventions, which the scholars of that specific genre know well.

It can be assumed from above that experts of specific field has generic license (the way poets have poetic license), who work in that specific genre, shape genre according to their communicative goals/ purposes. They set constraints of genre for themselves as well as for others, those who want to communicate in that specific genre or to contribute. However, there is a difference between constraints and conventions. Constraints keep the genre as a unit and a distinguishing unit between genres, while conventions are different techniques used by writers to remain within a genre and communicative community and at the same time maintain their individuality in the form of their text and writing style (Bhatia, 2004). Genre and conventions are inevitably belonging notions, for a text to be a sub-genre or belong to a genre must follow conventions of that specific genre.

More it, Bhatia (1993) comments that the scholars of a specific genre or working within know the boundaries and the ways to maintain their creativity within the constraints and keeping conventions. Summarizing Bhatia (1993), to him the most identifying and distinguishing element between genres is the notion of communicative purpose.

Carol Berkenkotter and Thomas Huckin (1995) added a new dimension to the genre, different from that of Swales (1990) and Bhatia (1993). The addition of norms, values, and ideology is different in this regard. These additions further broaden the concept of genre, which see genre as a social action within a social setting. Genre has a connection with the social setting, surrounding it, and it has a deep relation with discipline and with the ideology, which is a soul of any discipline. From this onward, genre not remained just a communicative structured event, rather a deep-rooted notion in ideology, having less influence of writers, which was later accepted by Bhatia in his later work, Advances in Discourse Studies (2008)

Weissberg and Beker (1990) have commented about the distinction between discussion and conclusion that the last section of Research articles (RA) is “usually titled discussion (but) sometimes is called conclusions”. However, in a study conducted by Yang and Allison (2003, 2004), a conclusion was found in a separate section. Total 20 RAs were analyzed in which 13 RAs had a separate section for conclusion and concluded that these RAs were composed of three moves, which includes Summarizing, Evaluating, and deductions. The conclusion section is as important as the abstract, as later is the beginning and the former is the end, as the well-known abstracts would attract more readers and enhance the opportunity of these abstracts to be indexed and cited in internationally-recognized journals (Marefat & Mohammadzadeh, 2013), same is the conclusion section where the finding is concluded.

**Statement of the Problem**
The conclusion of a research article is to have the last word on the subject. A good and attractive conclusion can make an article worth reading. It is believed that a good and attractive article must follow a specific pattern across different disciplines. The students working on different research projects and articles do not have a sound awareness of writing the conclusion of the research article. The current research is an attempt to handle those problems, how different communicative cultures influence writing and will provide a framework through analysis of those patterns, rhetorical moves, and discursive practices.

**Significance of the Study**
Genre analysis of conclusion research articles will contribute towards making a proper guideline for the people, writing research articles in different fields. Genre analysis, as part of the discursive practices, specifically the conclusion section, because very little attention has been given so far to this genre and is almost new and rare in Pakistan. Genre analysis of research articles has gained much
attention from all fields of study but even then, very little attention has been given to the conclusion section. The conclusion section of RAs in the field of social sciences is yet to be explored. The present research is also significant because it will give some new insights into those rhetorical moves followed in social sciences and will provide a guideline for the students as well as for the professionals in writing conclusions for research articles.

**Research Questions**

1. What is the pattern of moves in the conclusions of the articles in the area of social sciences?
2. What is the frequency of moves in the conclusions of the articles in the area of social sciences?
3. How moves pattern and frequency in the conclusion section affect the comprehensibility of the article?

**Literature Review**

The selection of rhetorical moves is greatly affected by the content, function, culture, and writers' thinking and writing style as concluded by Hyland (2000). Corpus from different disciplines and having impact factor is selected as these RAs published in internationally-accredited journals to present new ideas in that particular field of study (Abarghooeinezhad & Simin, 2015). Apart, English non-native scholars face difficulties and challenges when attempting to present the results and findings of their research work to other international scholars in the same field (Nasseri & Nematollah, 2014, Al-Khasawneh, 2017), but it is not always due to a lack of proficiency in the language but in different parts of the article.

Noorizadeh-Honami and Chalak (2018) also pointed out the cross-linguistic and cross-cultural differences between the RA abstracts. The effect of native language, culture, and field of study is visible in studies not only limited to abstract but also on other sections like introduction, literature review methodology, result, and conclusion as Belyakova (2017) concluded that the Russian authors seem to skip the Results move much more often than their native English colleagues.

Ghasempour and Farnia (2017) concluded that social background and language greatly affect the internal structure and content of the article while comparing articles of native English and Persian. Apart, social context and language, subject or discipline also greatly influence the articles as investigating articles from the field of engineering by English natives and Persian. However, the finding of Farzannia and Farnia (2017) concluded that variation was found only in the purpose move.

Another work by Majid and Omid (2017) study of research articles in agriculture engineering has drawn different findings. In the study, no variation was found while comparing articles in the field of agriculture engineering by Iranian and English. Darabad (2016) study of the multidisciplinary RAs: Applied linguistics, Mathematics, and Chemistry abstracts research between Applied Linguistics, Applied Mathematics, and Applied Chemistry, concluded that there are variations in the use of moves as in linguistics and Mathematics 4 moves were used while in chemistry only 3 moves.

Research articles are compared from different angles, as mentioned from having different linguistic backgrounds, different disciplines, but El-Dakhs (2018) study corpus is different in a way that the corpus was selected from more and less prestigious journals. The study concluded that in more prestigious journals the focus remained on the finding section while in less prestigious journals the much importance was given to the introduction section.

The literature mentioned, reveals that for the last few decades Research Articles remained a focal point for the researcher in the field of Discourse and Genre Analysis. Genre is a term overburdened with definitions; in this regard, Swales and Bhatia's views, along with others were briefly discussed. In nutshell, it can be put that Genre is a kind of text or spoken, having a specific communicative function. Applying this to other parts of Research Articles, the conclusion section, can be a sub-genre that has been not been focused on like Abstract, Introduction, and Discussion. The main reason is that until 2003, the conclusion section was considered as a part of the Discussion section. In 2003, Yang and Allison, in the article "Research articles in applied linguistics: Moving from results to conclusions" found it a separate section, which was later, in 2005, further developed by Bunton.

**Methodology**

The current research aims to do genre analysis of the conclusion section of published research articles having impact factors in the area of social sciences. A mixed research methodology: both quantitative and qualitative research methodology was adopted for the research to meet the requirements and
demands of the research. The analysis has been done in two parts; the first part is comprised of quantitative analysis, which is known as macro-level analysis. In this first part, the quantification of different moves in the conclusion section of selected published research articles was made to check the frequency of occurrence of different moves by applying Yang and Allison (2003) and Bunton's (2005) model for genre analysis of conclusion section. While the second stage of analysis, the micro-level focuses on the qualitative nature of different moves, which include the identification of moves and steps, major words in moves and steps, and overall comprehensibility of moves in the specific context in the selected sample. At this stage of analysis, the rhetoric use of different moves and steps along with structure, length, and lexical verbs were analyzed.

**Theoretical Framework**

The current research is guided by Yang and Allison's (2003) and Bunton's (2005) framework for genre analysis. As discussed above, before Yang and Allison (2003) model for genre analysis, the conclusion was considered as a part of the Discussion section, a total of 20 RAs were analyzed where 13 had separate conclusion sections composed of three moves and five steps, but their framework as discussed was the outcome of the analysis of conclusion section only in the field of applied linguistics. Therefore, it cannot be applied to disciplines, other than applied linguistics or it may not give the same result in other disciplines. To have a balanced model, applicable to all disciplines, the current proposed model for the study is a combination of both Yang and Allison (2003) and Bunton (2005) model. Where first two moves, summarizing the study and evaluation of the study is from Yang and Allison model and the last two moves, 3rd and 4th, implication and recommendation and future research is from Bunton (2005) model, based on which he pointed out in *The structure of Ph.D. conclusion chapters*, (207-224).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOVE 1.</th>
<th>Summarizing the study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOVE 2.</td>
<td>Evaluating the study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step i. Indicating significance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step ii. Indicating limitations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step iii. Evaluating methodology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOVE 3.</td>
<td>Practical implication and Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step i. Implication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step ii. Recommendation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOVE 4.</td>
<td>Future Research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yang and Allison (2003) and Bunton (2005) (proposed model for current research)

**Sampling**

The current research was expanded and applied to the original corpus of fifteen (15) research articles published in journals, having an impact factor in the area of social sciences. Fifteen (15) research articles from different online free journals, five from each journal were collected randomly from 2008 to 2013.

1. Communication Studies (Taylor and Francis Online) (Impact Factor 4.651)
2. Australian Journal of Linguistics (Taylor and Francis Online) (Impact Factor 1.071)
3. Prose Studies (Taylor and Francis Online) (Impact Factor 2.676)

**Analysis Procedure**

The analysis of the conclusion section in the selected corpus of fifteen research articles in the field of social science was done in two stages, Macro, and Micro level.

At the macro level, the conclusion sections were divided into sentences. The identification of moves and move boundaries is determined by various criteria Swales (2004), as each move has its role and communicative purpose, which, together with other moves, contributes to the general purpose of the text (Pho, 2009)
At this stage, these sentences were analyzed under the proposed framework for the study. The sentences were placed in different moves according to their purpose in the conclusion. Multipurpose sentences were placed according to the most prominent purpose. After identification and classification, the schematic structure of each article conclusion section along with the frequency of occurrences of moves, length/space of conclusion section in the article though finding out the percentage of words used for the conclusion section in the total words of the article were taken into account.

At the micro-level, the qualitative study which included the description of moves and steps and how these moves influence the overall comprehensibility and schematic structure of these conclusion sections. Apart from this flexo-grammatical features of each move were analyzed, based on swales (1990) categorization including verb, adjective, noun, and tenses. However, for current research, only 'hedges', 'objectivity', and 'precision' were taken into account from 'features of academic writing' to find out how disciplines influence the use of these features of academic writing.

**Analysis and Discussion**

**Length and Weightage of Conclusion Section in the Field of Social Science.**

The selected data proposed that writers in the field of social science do not give much weightage to the conclusion section, except SSRA 13. The conclusion section of SSRA 13 has 2.93 % of the article, which is also an average length/percentage for the conclusion section. Hence, the data is collected from a high impact factor research article, the average percentage, for the conclusion section of the article in the field of social science, which is 2.93 % can be taken as a standard. Taking 2.93 % as a standard percentage, only SSRA 13 has an accurate percentage, while SSRA 5, SSRA 6, SSRA 12, SSRA 14, SSRA 15 have a high percentage, however, SSRA 8, SSRA 10, SSRA 11 have percentage near to the standard. In Conclusion sections from the area of social science, article SSRA 12 has the highest percentage that is 6.52 where SSRA 4 with 0.76 % has the lowest percentage in the present corpora.

**Percentage = \( \frac{\text{words of conclusion}}{\text{Total words of article}} \times 100 \)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Total words</th>
<th>Conclusion section</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SSRA 1</td>
<td>9,273</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.830368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSRA 2</td>
<td>9,179</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>2.353198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSRA 3</td>
<td>8,206</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1.096758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSRA 4</td>
<td>10,024</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.768156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSRA 5</td>
<td>6,048</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.306878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSRA 6</td>
<td>9,447</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>6.234784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSRA 7</td>
<td>14,156</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>2.369799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSRA 8</td>
<td>11,383</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>2.890275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSRA 9</td>
<td>11,236</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1.156995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSRA 10</td>
<td>11,241</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>2.731074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSRA 11</td>
<td>9,061</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>2.670787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSRA 12</td>
<td>6,144</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>6.526693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSRA 13</td>
<td>10,822</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>2.938459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSRA 14</td>
<td>8,578</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>4.348333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSRA 15</td>
<td>7,333</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>3.804718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>9,596</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>2.935152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Qualitative Analysis.**

Before moving to qualitative analysis, where moves and steps are analyzed under the proposed framework for the study, it is noteworthy to have the percentage and frequency of moves and steps.

This portion of analysis deals with the occurrences of moves, where the percentage and frequency of moves and steps are highlighted. 100 or above percentage and frequency of Moves and steps, shown in table 4.1.2 are placed as obligatory, below 100 to 80 percent are placed as conventional while moves having frequency below 80 % are labeled as optional moves. The data from selected research articles revealed that M1 and M2 have high percentage and frequency of occurrences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moves and Steps</th>
<th>Numbers of occurrences</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Move 1. Summarizing the study</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move 2. Evaluating the study</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>126.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Move 1: Summarizing the Study

Based on the data from the conclusion section in the field of social science high impact factor research article, prescribed in table 4.1.2 shows that M1 is an obligatory move, which percentage and frequency of occurrence is 100 %. The basic aim of using this move is to summarize the study. Through this move writer gives an overview of the whole process, especially findings. It is used in the beginning of the conclusion section, as the proposed framework suggests, but in the selected corpus for the study confronted the framework as far as its position is concerned. SSRA 11 and SSRA 14 started with M2, offering justification through three available options, by giving the significance of the study, limitation of the study, and evaluating methodology. In both the cases, writers start with M2 step one, which suggests the significance of the study, however, in the rest of the corpus, all articles' conclusion section started with M1.

Move 2: Evaluating the Study

After presenting the findings of the study, next comes the justification. Through this move, writers try to fix the finding in the larger context of knowledge in the concerned field. The writers in this move urge to rationalize the findings by three available options, which include step 1, indicating significance/advantages of the study, step 2, indicating limitations, and step 3, evaluating methodology. The data collected for current research in the field of social science shows that after move 1, move 2 is having a high percentage of frequency, which is 126 % as a whole, including all three steps. Among the steps, M2 step 1 has a high frequency of occurrence which is 53 %.

Move 2 Step 1: Indicating Significance/Advantages

Step of move 2, highlights the significance of the study and presents the advantages or positive aspects of the study. Through this move, writers not only provide the objective of the study but also highlights the links with other disciplines or areas of knowledge. In the selected corpus for the study in the field of social science, the parentage or frequency of occurrence of M2 step 1 is 53 %, which is the highest frequency among all the steps.

Move 2 Step 2: Indicating Limitations

Step 2 of move 3 indicates the limitation of the study. The frequency of occurrence of move 2, step 2 is 46 % in the selected research articles in the area of social science, which can be interpreted that most of the research articles are of qualitative nature, where a very limited topic is chosen, obvious in the title of the article. One of the possible interpretations is that a limited area for study, often seen in the title of social science research articles does not need further limitation. For example, the titles of the following articles in the selected corpus show the limitation in the very title.

Move 2 Step 3: Evaluating Methodology

Move 2, step 3, which suggests evaluation of methodology has a minimum percentage and frequency of occurrences. M2 step 3 occurred only four (04) times, which is only 26 %. It can be concluded and generalized, since the data is obtained from high impact factor journals that researchers in the field of social science do not give much importance to the evaluation of methodology in the conclusion section of research articles. Furthermore, through this step, writers try to justify the mean / methodology for the findings drawn in the article.
Move 3: Practical Implication and Recommendation
The function of this move is to state, based on findings, how much current research adds to the existing knowledge to a specific field of study, what are the practical implications of the study and how it can guide researchers in the future. Bunton's (2005) study, suggests that natural sciences focus more on this aspect than social sciences. It does not mean that in social science researches, there is no practical aspect, but comparing to natural science, it shows its practicality in long term. Furthermore, the nature of social science research is more fluid, there are no hard and fast rules, involving a touch of subjectivity as compare to natural sciences. As discussed, the notion of focus on practical aspects in social science is less than natural science can be supported from the data prescribed in table 4.1.2, where the percentage and frequency of M3 is 60 % and labeled as an optional move. Move 3, which suggests practical implication and recommendation, is divided into two steps; step 1 states the practical aspect whereas step 2 is about recommendations and guidance for research in the future.

Move 3 Step 1: Implications
Step 1 of move 3 focuses on the practical implication of the study. It is used only four times in the current corpus, selected for the study, which is only 33 % in terms of percentage and frequency of occurrence.

Move 3 Step 2: Recommendations
Step 2 of move 3 suggests a recommendation, drawn from the findings of the research study. It is used four (04) times in the current corpus for research. Its percentage and frequency of occurrence is 26 %, which can be interpreted that same like practical implication, in social science research there is also very little attention that has been given to recommendation.

Move 4: Future Research
Move 4 representing a guideline for future research, to promote knowledge and highlight the leftover areas in the field, current issues in the field which must be addressed and to be researched, has a minimum percentage and frequency of occurrence among the moves. It is used six (6) times in total in the current corpus, which is 40 % in terms of frequency of occurrence.

New Move / Unidentified Move
Besides the proposed framework for the research, adopted from Yang and Allison's (2003) model and Bunton's (2005) model, there found a new/ unidentified move. Based on function, these moves do not fit the criteria for moves in the framework. The function of this move, as observed in the corpus of current research, is to rationale not only the findings but also the whole research. The rationalization and validity of research is done through this move by providing a reference to previous research.

Features of Academic Writing.
This part of the analysis provides features of academic writing in the area of social science high impact factors research articles conclusion section. There are many features of writing namely, hedging, boosters, precision, objectivity, explicitness, formality, complexity, accuracy, etc., but in the current research only hedging, precision, objectivity and explicitness are taken into account.

Hedging.
Hedging is words or phrases like perhaps, may, might, can, etc. which are used by the writers to have a statement that is noncommittal, ambiguous, and when the writers are uncertain and try to avoid answering questions. Hedging is used when there is a certain degree of probability. However, the basic reason for using hedges is to minimize the degree of opposition and when there is not a strong argument to claim.

The data suggests that writers use hedges in the conclusion section of high impact factor research articles in the field of social sciences to have vague language and they do not claim as the very discipline and titles of articles and data are having multiple interpretations. In the present corpus, SSRA 6 and SSRA 15 are having a high frequency of hedging, which shows the indecisive nature or position of writers, whereas, on the other hand in SSRA 1, SSRA 2, SSRA4, and SSRA 11 hedging is used only once.

Objectivity
This feature is the very soul of research study. The use of pronouns is a mean of subjective approach. This feature of academic writing is found less in the area of social science research articles, as it is known that most research studies are of qualitative nature and very close to personal interpretations. In SSRA 8, a high frequency of words was found which shows the subjective nature of research,
where "we" is used eight (08) times. However, SSRA 4 is different from all the articles, in SSRA 4 there is not any word found related to objectivity.

**Precision**

This feature of academic writing is very important as it is concerned with giving/providing facts and figures. Writers often use a lot, many, several etc. instead of exact figure, which make the study vague and less the degree of reliability. In research, taking things for granted or not proving exact numbers weaken the reliability of data and findings of the research study. The data prescribed in table 4.1.5, suggests that in the conclusion section of high impact factor research articles, instead of exact number/facts, words are used which do not provide exact numbers. In present data, SSRA 2, SSRA 8, SSRA 13, SSRA 14 are having a high frequency of words, showing quantity

**Conclusion**

The conclusion section is a part genre/ sub-genre of research article, like abstract, introduction, literature review, methodology, result, and discussion. The conclusion section, as an essential part of the research article and therefore it was aimed to have a clear understanding of the conclusion section in the area of social science. The present study is a genre analysis of the conclusion section to find out the generic structure of the conclusion section by applying Yang and Allison's (2003) and Bunton's (2005) model as a theatrical framework.

Having a narrow focus on the thematic units of the text, in the context of the conclusion section, keeping the schema of the rhetoric in mind, as mentioned above, several questions came to the surface. For instance which rhetorical moves occur in the conclusion of the articles in the area of social sciences? What are the frequencies of use of the rhetorical moves in the conclusion of social sciences? How does the use of the rhetorical moves affect the overall comprehensibility of the content of the study?

Consequent upon the findings of the study, it can be postulated that the conclusion section bears the same rhetoric pattern as was suggested in the proposed framework, adopted from the Yang and Allison (2003) and Bunton (2005) study, former about the conclusion section of research articles in the field of applied linguistics and later about the structure of Ph.D. conclusion chapters, as both the areas share the same rhetoric purposes. Almost all the moves and steps, in the proposed framework for the study, were found in the conclusion section in selected articles.

A general and brief overview of the study verifies the hypothesis that the proposed framework is not followed by the writers in the conclusion section in terms of move sequence. Most of the writers touched all the moves but not in the same sequence as suggested in the proposed framework. The move sequence observed in the current research was mostly repetitive and cyclic.

Another important point is the preponderance of Move one as compared to Move two, Move three and Move four. As mentioned and discussed earlier, most of the writers have relied on Move one only, as giving more attention to summarizing the study than evaluation, implication and recommendation, and future research.

The scarcity of Move 3 and Move 4 in most of the research articles' conclusion section in social sciences implies that specifically in social sciences the writers did not give importance to the practical aspect of the study.

The length and space of the conclusion section in a research article are also worth noting. It was found that the conclusion section in the area of social science in the selected corpus is 2.93 %.

Giving or defining Moves is another important aspect of the study. In the selected corpus, it was found that Move one, is obligatory. Move 2, with 126 % is an obligatory Move. However, it must be noted that if steps of Move 2 are analyzed individually then there was not any step that fulfilled the criteria for an obligatory step or Move and can be easily labeled as an optional Move. Move 3 was found as an optional Move in the area of social science with a sixty (60) percentage and frequency of occurrence. Move 4, was found as a conventional Move, with a 40 % occurrence in the area of social science.

Hedging, objectivity, and precision in features of academic writing were applied to a selected corpus of fifteen research articles. It was found that the conclusion sections in the area have more hedging, which implies that writers used vague language to minimize the degree of opposition.

Furthermore, current research has implications in the form of incorporation of mentioned points while writing the conclusion section and can be proved useful for researchers in the area. It also highlighted a new dimension for research in the future in genre analysis.
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