

CHAPTER 4  
Conclusions in  
linguistics and  
applied linguistics  
research articles  
written in Spanish  
as a foreign language:  
An intercultural  
rhetoric study

*Gemma Santiago Alonso and David Heredero Zorzo*

## Abstract

The present work is a contrastive study where we analyse the conclusions of a corpus of 36 Linguistics and Applied Linguistics research articles written in Spanish and Slovene, both by native speakers, as well as research articles written in Spanish by Slovene investigators. We focus on the structure of this section following the moves and steps established by Yang and Allison (2003) and Moritz, Meurer and Dellagnelo (2008), as well as the principles used for this kind of analysis settled by the field of intercultural rhetoric (Connor and Moreno, 2005, Moreno, 2008, Connor 2011). The results of our investigation reveal that there are important differences concerning conclusions in research articles between the two languages, which should be taken into account when teaching Spanish as an academic language.

**Keywords:** intercultural rhetoric, academic writing, corpus study, rhetorical moves, conclusion in research articles.

## Izvleček

V pričujočem prispevku je predstavljena kontrastivna študija, v kateri analiziramo sklepne razdelke v korpusu 36 znanstvenih člankov s področij jezikoslovja in uporabnega jezikoslovja, ki so jih v španščini in slovenščini napisali rojeni govorniki, pa tudi člankov, ki so jih v španščini napisali slovenski raziskovalci. Struktura sklepnega razdelka je razčlenjena po potezah in korakih, kot so jih definirali Yang in Allison (2003) ter Moritz, Meurer in Dellagnelo (2008), ter v skladu z načeli analize, uveljavljene na področju kontrastivne retorike (Connor in Moreno, 2005, Moreno, 2008, Connor 2011). Rezultati raziskave pokažejo pomembne razlike med jezikoma v sklepnih razdelkih znanstvenih člankov, ki bi jih bilo treba upoštevati pri pouku španščine kot akademskega jezika.

**Gljučne besede:** medkulturna retorika, akademsko pisanje, korpusna študija, retorične poteze, sklep znanstvenega članka

# 1 INTRODUCTION

In the last few decades, a large number of studies (Cassany and Morales 2008; Gnutzmann and Oldenburg 1991; Holmes 1997; Hyland 1996; Pérez Ruiz 2001; Swales 1990, 2004) has paid extensive attention to the delimitation of the structure and construction of research articles (henceforth RAs), in order to stimulate an ever more global form of scientific-academic communication. The aforementioned investigations are oriented to identify prototypical rhetorical moves that constitute the different sections of RAs (Introduction, Results and Discussion, Conclusion and Summary).<sup>1</sup> However, we cannot ignore that most of the previous studies are framed within an Anglo-Saxon context, whose impact on the global scene has highlighted the importance of the socio-cultural context within academic-scientific writing<sup>2</sup> (Santiago and Heredero 2018, 272).

Our aim in the present paper is the analysis of the rhetorical conventions in the conclusions section of RAs written in Spanish by Slovene researchers, comparing them with those made by Slovene and Spanish researchers in their native languages. Our work is framed in the same line as other investigations (*inter alia*: Amnuai and Wannaruk 2013; Aslam and Mehmood 2014; Ciapuscio and Otañi 2002; Fuentes Cortés 2013; Moritz, Meurer and Dellagnelo 2008; Reza Adel and Ghorbani Moghadam 2015; Tabatabaei and Azimi 2015; Yang and Allison 2003). All the investigations mentioned above are focused on English as a native language tongue in contrast to English used by non-native speakers. Nevertheless, in our case, although we understand that English is the reference language needed to have visibility in the international scientific community, we believe more studies of intercultural rhetoric focused on other languages are needed, such as Spanish, which it is also increasingly present in the scientific world.<sup>3</sup> Hence, in our research we have been particularly interested in those studies that include Spanish in their corpus, although it is true that they exclusively use texts by authors for whom Spanish is their mother tongue to observe if there are transfers of rhetorical patterns into English.<sup>4</sup> With regard

1 This fact points to the existence of prototypical formalities that the scientific articles have to incorporate to satisfy a series of expectations necessary for their subsequent publication in scientific journals.

2 Connor (2011); Connor and Moreno (2005); Moreno (2008); Mur Dueñas (2018) and Kubota and Lehner (2004) among others.

3 According to the annual report of the Instituto Cervantes for 2018, the growth in the number of Spanish-language texts from Spanish-speaking countries in the world's scientific production was 127.96% for the period 2003-2011. In addition, except for the period 2000-2003, such participation in the world's scientific production has been growing steadily since 1996. Despite the fact that the presence of Spanish as a scientific communication instrument remains scarce on a global scale, the Spanish language, with 103,773 records in 2017, is the third most common language in which journals (not only scientific) are published.

4 We refer, among others, to: Moreno (1997), who analyses the use of causal metatext; Ciapuscio and Otañi (2002), which analyses the cultural-rhetorical characteristics in the conclusions of RAs written in English, German and Spanish; Vázquez

to contrastive rhetorical research focused on the Slovene language, Pisanski Peterlin's work on the text-organizing metatext (2005, 2007) and the inclusion of previews and reviews in the text (2002) needs to be mentioned. However, there exist only two investigations (Herederó, Pihler and Santiago 2017; Santiago and Herederó 2018) that have worked with Spanish and Slovene, both focused on differences and similarities of the introductions of Linguistic and Applied Linguistic research articles written in Spanish by Slovene researchers, comparing them with those written in their native languages by Spanish and Slovene researchers. Taking into account all the above, this article attempts to solve this gap and to contribute to the identification and establishment of rhetorical and cultural conclusion patterns, as well as the literature on the distance between both languages, and we consider the results could be useful for future pedagogic purposes for academic writing in Spanish as a foreign language.

In our analysis, the framework of intercultural rhetoric has been considered (see Connor 2011; Connor and Moreno 2005) to establish whether there is a transfer of rhetorical patterns from the mother tongue to the foreign language (in our case, from Slovene to Spanish), using a parallel corpus for this. Regarding the comparability and equivalence of the corpus within intercultural rhetoric, we have based our work here on the contextual factors established by Moreno (2008).

With respect to methodology, a corpus composed of 36 RAs has been designed, of which 12 have been written in Spanish by native speaker experts, 12 in Slovene by native speaker experts and 12 in Spanish by Slovene experts. For the classification and analysis of the rhetorical moves of the corpus, on the basis of the pioneering works of Swales (1990, 2004) and Gnutzmann and Oldenburg (1991), we have taken into account the model in Yang and Allison (2003) (where Results, Discussion, Conclusion and Pedagogic Implications are included), adding two more steps from the model in Moritz, Meurer and Delaguelo (2008).

In summary, this research investigates how conclusions of RAs produced in Spanish by Slovene researchers, and Slovene and Spanish researchers in their native languages, are structurally organized with respect to the moves and steps of the proposed conclusion model. After describing our corpus data and our method of analysis, we present the results and discussion of our research, finishing with a conclusion that summarizes the main findings and takes into account the pedagogical implications of this investigation.

---

(2010), which deals with the use of modal verbs; Fuentes Cortés (2013), who studies the Conclusions section in the discipline of history; or Mur Dueñas (2018), focused on the use of metadiscourse features in Business Management RAs written in English and in Spanish.

## 2 METHODOLOGY

### 2.1 Data selection

This is a corpus-based study using three subcorpora, created for the purposes of our investigation, one including RAs written in Spanish by Spanish investigators (Corpus ESP), one with RAs written in Slovene by Slovene experts (Corpus SLO) and one including RAs written in Spanish by Slovene researchers (Corpus ELE). Each corpus contains 12 RAs, adding up to a total of 36 for the whole corpus. We are aware that 12 is a small number of examples, but it should be taken into account that there are not many RAs written in Spanish by Slovene experts. Besides that, similar previous studies (such as Moritz, Meurer and Dellagnelo 2008 or Mur Dueñas 2010) were carried on with as many RAs as in our investigation. This same corpus was also used in a previous investigation (Santiago and Heredero 2018) analysing Introductions.

In order to create a corpus as comparable as possible, we followed the criteria established by Moreno (2008). Therefore, besides the genre of RA we limited the topic of the texts to Linguistics and Applied Linguistics. The length of the articles goes from 3,750 words to 10,000, and all of them were published between 2010 and 2016. This also explains the small number of texts and authors included in the corpora, since there were not many RAs written in Spanish by Slovene investigators during this period of time. Finally, the research articles for Corpus ESP and Corpus SLO were taken from three different journals, while for Corpus ELE we needed to take them from five journals because of the small number of this kind of RAs, as already noted. However, the main criteria for selecting the articles was that the journals were indexed in the following bases: MLA, ERIH Plus and/or Scopus.<sup>5</sup>

### 2.2 Data analysis

Regarding the classification and analysis of the conclusions of each research article included in the corpora, we followed the model of moves and steps established by Yang and Allison (2003). The mentioned research analysed all rhetorical choices among the various sections, from Results to Conclusions (i.e. Results, Results and Discussion, Discussion, Conclusion or Pedagogic Implications sections). Nevertheless, we have only taken into account the structure of the Conclusion section due to our interest in the fact that this summarizes “the research

---

<sup>5</sup> For full details of each research article included in the corpora, check the Appendix.

by highlighting the findings, evaluating and pointing out possible lines of future research as well as suggesting implications for teaching and learning” (Yang and Allison 2003, 380). However, we found that some important steps were missing in this model for the purposes of our investigation. Thus, we decided to add a few modifications that were present in the model proposed by Moritz, Meurer and Dellagelo (2008), itself based on Gnutzmann and Oldenburg 1991. As result of this combination, the model that we used in our analysis was as follows:

Move 1.	Summarizing the study
Move 2.	Evaluating the study
Step 1.	Indicating significance/advantage
Step 2.	Indicating limitations
Step 3.	Evaluating methodology
Move 3.	Deductions from the research
Step 1.	Making reference to previous research <sup>6</sup>
Step 2.	Recommending further research
Step 3.	Drawing pedagogic implications/applications <sup>7</sup>

**Figure 1. Moves and steps in conclusion sections based on Yang and Allison (2003), Moritz, Meurer and Dellagelo (2008) and Gnutzmann and Oldenburg (1991)**

Following this model of moves and steps, each RA included in the corpora was manually analysed twice by each of the investigators, since our goal was “to identify the rhetorical steps in a genre and the most salient signals leading to their interpretation” (Moreno and Swales, 2018, 42). There was a period of two months between the two analyses, so that the validity and reliability of the results were higher. Regarding Corpus SLO, since it is written in a foreign language for both of the investigators, an extra investigator, a native speaker of Slovene, analysed it. The level of analysis was usually the sentence, but we took into account even smaller units if we considered that they were realizing a certain step, since “we were aware that a segment of text might have more than one function” (Yang and Allison 2003, 371). We restricted the analysis to the presence of certain structures that realize a move or a step. Examples of every fulfilled move and step for each of the corpus are presented below, with the structures realizing the step shown in bold:

6 Step added from Moritz, Meurer and Dellagelo (2008) and Gnutzmann and Oldenburg (1991).

7 Step modified from Moritz, Meurer and Dellagelo (2008) and Gnutzmann and Oldenburg (1991).

*Move 1. Summarizing the study*

“**Se ha llevado a cabo un análisis** lingüístico de nombres de marca españoles.” (ESP 01, 86)

“**El presente trabajo ha presentado** la teoría de la cooperación e implicaturas conversacionales de Grice [...]” (ELE 06, 84)

“**V naši raziskavi [...] smo preverili**, kako se polprofesionalni prevajalci znajdejo pri [...]” (SLO 05, 60)

*Move 2. Evaluating the study**Step 1. Indicating significance/advantage*

“**La acumulación de evidencias** de la validez que se ha descrito hasta aquí **viene a demostrar que** [...]” (ESP 11, 108)

“**El análisis** del léxico disponible de los estudiantes eslovenos **pone de relieve** el grado de convergencia [...]” (ELE 09, 75)

“**Ugotavljamo, da** čeprav se starši [...]” (SLO 02, 202)

*Step 2. Indicating limitations*

“**Algunas limitaciones que presenta este estudio pueden hallarse en** la población sobre la que [...]” (ESP 02, 26)

“Además, el hecho de que la lengua española ofrezca tantas posibilidades de expresión **no facilita la tarea de** delimitar conceptos y funciones sintácticas” (ELE 10, 159)

“**Vzorec je sicer premajhen, da bi lahko** delal posplošitve, saj je le 4 CIU-TI anketirancev navedlo, da se ukvarja s tolmačenjem.” (SLO 04, 19)

*Step 3. Evaluating methodology*

“Asimismo, y **con vistas a obtener unos datos más completos** que puedan servir para [...] **al análisis cuantitativo se añadirá otro** de corte cualitativo” (ESP 10, 149)

“[...] **los problemas** que pueden tener los jueces a la hora de tomar la decisión sobre los puntos de corte [...] **[lo] hemos experimentado en nuestro proceso de calibración.**” (ELE 04, 320)

“**Model je nastal na podlagi dolgoletnih prevajalskih izkušenj avtorice** in njenega raziskovalnega dela [...]” (SLO 06, 122)

### *Move 3. Deductions from the research*

#### *Step 1. Making reference to previous research*

“**En Ruiz (2014) y Ruiz (en prensa) se ofrece** una completa presentación de este modelo [...]” (ESP 03, 49)

“Con esto se confirman las características de los prototipos **según Kleiber (1995) [...]**” (ELE 08, 161)

“Različnih izrazov sloganov ter njihovih variant in modifikacij ne najdemo samo v časopisnih naslovih, **kot to obravnavata Korošec (1978) ter Kalin Golobova (2008) [...]**” (SLO 08, 17)

#### *Step 2. Recommending further research*

“Con respecto a la fraseología también **debería ser objeto de futuros estudios** el papel que desempeña [...]” (ESP 05, 107)

“**Sería interesante investigar** la recepción de la literatura traducida entre los lectores eslovenos [...]” (ELE 07, 64)

“**Vsekakor bi v zvezi z manjšalnostjo potrebovali več kvantitativnih in statističnih analiz**, zasnovanih na [...]” (SLO 07, 112)

#### *Step 3. Drawing pedagogic implications/applications*

“Con la descripción detallada de la sección 3, **se ha posibilitado que** una persona conocedora de la estructura de una PL pueda interpretarlas sin necesidad [...]” (ESP 06, 68)

“De este modo, esta investigación revela las palabras más disponibles entre los españoles y que los estudiantes eslovenos desconocen y que **deben ser enseñadas en la clase de ELE** en Eslovenia.” (ELE 12, 17)

“[...] **je nujno, da se** dejstva, da slovenščina v prevodih ni enaka slovenščini v izvorniki, **zavedamo, in da ga upoštevamo** tako **pri pouku** prevajanja kot pri pouku materinščine.” (SLO 10, 40)

## 3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In Table 1 it can be noticed that both the interval and average length of the articles are similar in the corpora, despite Corpus ESP being the longest, followed by Corpus ELE and then Corpus SLO. Even so, although Corpus SLO is the shortest, it does not have a relevant influence in Corpus ELE. Referring to Conclusions, these are much longer in Corpus ESP or ELE (in addition to having a much wider range) than in Corpus SLO: in Corpus ELE or ESP Conclusions



account for an average of 6.96% or 6.31% of the total length of the articles, respectively, with 5.11% for Corpus SLO. In any case, in terms of RAs and Conclusion size, we can conclude that Slovene specialists in Spanish prefer to make more extensive Conclusions than their colleagues in their native language, which we interpret as a rhetorical influence from Spanish.

**Table 1: Length of the RAs and the Conclusions**

	CORPUS ESP	CORPUS ELE	CORPUS SLO
<b>RAs number</b>	N=12	N=12	N=12
<b>Interval number of words in the RAs</b>	4,803–9,794	3,771–9,541	5,252–8,122
<b>Average number of words in the RAs</b>	6,869.25	6,477.16	6,280.58
<b>Interval number of words in the Conclusion</b>	206–1,172	146–1216	102–587
<b>Average number of words in the Conclusion</b>	434.08 (6.31%)	451.33 (6.96%)	321.41 (5.11%)

With respect to Table 2, it illustrates the results and distribution of moves and steps for the Conclusion sections in relation to the presence of rhetorical moves in each of the RAs, i.e., it shows percentage of RAs in which moves and steps were used as well as total percentage of all moves together with the total number. The first thing that attracts our attention is that although Table 1 showed that Conclusion sections were much longer in Corpus ESP, Corpus ELE is the one that has the least moves (58.33%) and steps (34.52%), considering total moves and steps. Likewise, the total number of steps in Corpus ESP is higher than in Corpus SLO or Corpus ELE, what indicates that Spanish authors are more used to the moves and steps of the Conclusion section, or at least their rhetorical strategies are closer to Anglo-Saxon standards.

**Table 2: Results and distribution of moves and steps**

	CORPUS ESP	CORPUS ELE	CORPUS SLO
<b>Move 1</b>			
<b>Summarizing the study</b>	5 (41.6%)	1 (8.3%)	4 (33.3%)
<b>Move 2</b>			
<b>Evaluating the study</b>	12 (100%)	11 (91.6%)	12 (100%)
<b>Move 3</b>			
<b>Deductions from the research</b>	11 (91.6%)	9 (75%)	12 (100%)
<b>Total number of moves</b>	28 (77.77%)	21 (58.33%)	28 (77.77%)
<b>Average number of steps in RAs</b>	4.08	2.5	3.416
<b>Total number of steps</b>	49 (58.33%)	29 (34.52%)	41 (48.8%)

On the other side, Move 1 (*Summarizing the study*) is the least favoured move in all corpora: Corpus ESP (41.6%), SLO (33.3%) or ELE (8.3%). Its function is “to provide a brief account of the main points from the perspective of the overall study” (Yang and Allison 2003, 382) and it does not have any steps. Our results coincide with Moritz, Meurer and Dellagnelo (2008) or Amnuai and Wannaruk (2013), and we can interpret this as the writer’s reluctance to repeat what has been already included in the RA summary. However, this shared finding is limited to the mentioned studies (all three in the field of Applied Linguistic). In other fields (i.e. Natural and Social Sciences), the results have been completely different (Aslam and Mehmood 2014 or Tabatabaei and Azimi 2015), and the use of this pattern is more settled.

**Table 3: Results and distribution of steps from move 2**

MOVE 2	CORPUS ESP	CORPUS ELE	CORPUS SLO
Evaluating the study			
Step 2.1 Indicating significance/ advantage	12 (100%)	10 (83.3%)	12 (100%)
Step 2.2 Indicating limitations	4 (33.3%)	2 (16.6%)	2 (16.6%)
Step 2.3 Evaluating methodology	5 (41.6%)	1 (8.3%)	4 (33.3%)
Total number of steps	21	13	18

Unlike Move 1, Move 2 (*Evaluating the study*) is the rhetorical move with the most frequency, as we can observe in Table 3. Its objective is to evaluate the overall study. The analysis distinguishes between three steps. The first step, *Indicating significance/advantage* (Step 2.1), is the most favoured in all corpora, given that one of the goals of any research is to point out its strengths and highlight its findings. These results seem to confirm previous investigations in contrastive rhetoric (*inter alia*: Amnuai and Wannaruk 2013; Aslam and Mehmood 2014; Ciapuscio and Otañi 2002; Fuentes Cortés 2013; Moritz, Meurer and Dellagnelo 2008; Reza Adel and Ghorbani Moghadam 2015; Tabatabaei and Azimi 2015; Yang and Allison 2003). The second and the third steps, *Indicating limitations* (Step 2.2) and *Evaluating methodology* (Step 2.3), are more problematic due to the low frequency (especially in Corpus ELE, with only two and one occurrences, respectively). Surprisingly, if we just focus on the total steps of move 2, corpus ELE is the one with the least frequency (13 steps) compared to corpus ESP (21 steps) and corpus SLO (18 steps). It is striking that although corpus ELE has the longest Conclusions, there is no correlation with the number of moves and

steps included, which it could imply that Slovene authors who write in Spanish do not use these rhetorical patterns as much in their RAs. Nevertheless, we have to consider the number of different authors as a problem when establishing the corpora: Corpus ESP has 18 different authors, SLO 12, while corpus ELE has only seven, due to the lack of Slovene authors<sup>8</sup> who publish in Spanish. In view of this context, the disparity concerning Corpus ELE is understandable, albeit a research limitation of the present investigation. On the other hand, a previous investigation focusing on Introduction sections carried out with the same corpora as in the present research (Santiago and Heredero 2018, 278–79), revealed that step 3.4 (*Summarising methods*) had a higher frequency in Corpus ELE (91.6%) and Corpus SLO (75%) in contrast to Corpus ESP (50%). If we compare this with the results obtained in the step 2.3 (*Evaluating methodology*) of the Conclusion section, where Corpus ELE had the lowest frequency (8.3%) followed by Corpus SLO (33.3%), we find an inverse relationship that we could interpret as a reluctance by the Slovene authors to refer back to methodology.

However, our results do not differ from Yang and Allison 2003, Amnuai and Wannaruk 2013, Aslam and Mehmood 2014 or Reza Adel and Ghorbani Moghadam 2015, which suggests that this reluctance should be taken into account in teaching/learning academic writing, as well as by future investigators, since authors should distinguish methodology presentation from methodology evaluation. There are enough studies that have already verified the adequacy and pedagogic utility of Yang and Allison's model, and steps like 2.2 or 2.3 are indispensable to achieve investigations capable of questioning their own validity and/or reliability.

**Table 4: Results and distribution of steps from move 3**

MOVE 3 Deductions from the research	CORPUS ESP	CORPUS ELE	CORPUS SLO
Step 3.1 Making reference to previous research	6 (50%)	6 (50%)	7 (58.3%)
Step 3.2 Recommending further research	6 (50%)	5 (41.6%)	4 (33.3%)
Step 3.3 Drawing pedagogic implications/applications	11 (91.6%)	4 (33.3%)	8 (66.6%)
<b>Total number of steps</b>	23	15	19

<sup>8</sup> The population of Slovenia is estimated at 2.08 million, according to the Statistical Office of the Republic of Slovenia (<https://www.stat.si/StatWeb/en>, 26.2.2019).

With regard to move 3 (*Deductions from the research*), the results reveal a high frequency in all corpora (SLO with 19, ESP with 23 and ELE with 15), as shown in Table 4. This is understandable, since authors use this move to elaborate suggestions from their research results in order to “solve the problems identified by the research, pointing out the line of further study or drawing pedagogic implications” (Yang and Allison 2003, 383). Nonetheless, taking into consideration the total number of steps, Corpus ELE has the least steps of all (ESP has 23 steps, SLO 19 and ELE 15), which agrees with what we already mentioned for move 2.

Three steps build move 3. The results in step 3.1 (*Making reference to previous research*) do not show large differences among corpora (Corpus SLO 7 steps, ESP and ELE 6), although the percentage is just around 50%. However, we could explain the low number by the fact that some authors prefer to make such references in other sections of the paper, such as the Results section. Anyway, we consider it relevant to compare a study’s results with those of other investigations in the Conclusion section, as a way to highlight the significance of the work, framing it within international research lines as another of the possible findings from the research.

Something similar to the results for step 3.1 occurs with 3.2 (*Recommending further research*) in all corpora (ESP 6 steps, ELE 5 and SLO 4). Once again, this demonstrates a partial implantation of the Anglo-Saxon model in these academic cultures, a fact that is extrapolated to the whole model analysed in this work. Nonetheless, our case is comparable with previous investigations (such as Amnuai and Wannaruk 2013, Aslam and Mehmood 2014 or Reza Adel and Ghorbani Moghadam 2015), which considered this step optional.

Finally, step 3.3 (*Drawing pedagogic implications/applications*) was partially modified on the basis of the Moritz, Meurer and Dellagnelo model (2008) and Gnutzmann and Oldenburg (1991), adding ‘applications’ to the Yang and Allison model (2003). The goal of this step is to “allow authors to state the pedagogical significance of the study or indicate necessity for pedagogic changes” (Amnuai and Wannaruk 2013, 7). For this step Corpus ESP has 11 out of 12 occurrences, representing 91.6%, in contrast with SLO (8 out of 12, 66.6%) or ELE (4 out of 12, 33.3%). This last step reveals cultural and rhetorical specific variations: while Spanish authors evaluate this step as almost indispensable, the Slovene ones consider it nonessential (as well as Persian authors in Tabatabaei and Azimi 2015 and Reza Adel and Ghorbani Moghadam 2015, Pakistani researchers in Aslam and Mehmood 2014, or Thai investigators in Amnuai and Wannaruk 2013). This fact reveals again that Spanish authors of RAs are more familiar with these rhetorical patterns than Slovene authors, although we cannot forget the very small number of Slovene authors publishing in Spanish, a fact that is responsible for the disparity concerning Corpus ELE and a research limitation of the present investigation, as mentioned before.

## 4 CONCLUSION

The main purpose of the present study was to identify the rhetorical organization of the Conclusion sections of RAs written in Spanish and Slovene by native speakers, as well as RAs written in Spanish by Slovene authors. For the analysis of the different patterns of the Conclusion section, we followed the model established by Yang and Allison (2003), Moritz, Meurer and Dellagnelo (2008) and Gnutzmann and Oldenburg (1991), as well as the principles used for this kind of analysis settled by the field of intercultural rhetoric (Connor and Moreno, 2005; Moreno, 2008; Connor 2011; Moreno and Swales 2018).

The empirical data was based on comparable corpora compiled *ad hoc* for our research aim. However, we are aware of some limitations, especially the low number of RAs in the corpora and especially the low number of Slovene authors in the corpus ELE, due to the scarcity of Slovene authors writing in Spanish, all of which makes our study difficult to generalize. For this reason, further investigations are necessary to replicate and confirm the results presented here. Even so, we agree with Tabatabaei and Azimi (2015) regarding further investigations. These authors suggested there is a need to analyse all sections included within RAs in order to establish “the structural relation of each section to other sections”, and thus be able to “determine how sections are related to each other” (Tabatabaei and Azimi 2015, 378).

In defiance of all its limitations, this study confirmed previous research based on the field of intercultural rhetoric (cf. Amnuai and Wannaruk 2013; Aslam and Mehmood 2014; Moritz, Meurer and Dellagnelo 2008; Reza Adel and Ghorbani Moghadam 2015; Tabatabaei and Azimi 2015; Yang and Allison 2003). Despite evidence of the adequacy and the pedagogic utility of Yang and Allison model, our results also present an unbalanced distribution of rhetoric patterns, which shows that writers still maintain their differences during the process of writing their concluding sections.

Nonetheless, there were some very notable differences in the frequency of moves and steps in the three corpora of this analysis. Spanish writers proved to be more familiar with these rhetorical patterns, since corpus ESP had the most number of steps, followed by corpus SLO and corpus ELE (it is notable that corpus ELE has the lowest number of steps, although it has the longest conclusions). We cannot forget as a possible reason for this the influence of the journals’ and reviewers’ policies and views on the articles published in individual journals, since some editors/reviewers might demand a certain structure, while others are perhaps more flexible. However, all corpora (ESP, SLO and ELE) showed steps 2.2 (*Indicating limitations*), 2.3 (*Evaluating methodology*) and move 1 (*Summarizing the study*) were the least favoured. These results may persuade Spanish and Slovene authors

of the importance of Conclusion section when writing RAs, considering it is an essential part of the research in which writers can show the importance, significance and benefits of their findings, although we cannot forget the fact that all these articles were indeed published and thus successfully passed the editorial procedure. Therefore, we think it would be useful for writers to be more familiar the different patterns in the rhetorical organization of the Conclusion section. This fact underlines the need for specific investigations to focus on the teaching/ learning of rhetorical patterns within the context of Academic Writing classes.

## References

- Amnuai, Wirada and Anchalee Wannaruk. 2013. "Investigating Move Structure of English Applied Linguistics Research Article Discussions Published in International and Thai Journals". *English Language Teaching* 5 (2): 1-13.
- Aslam, Insaf and Asim Mehmood. 2014. "Genre Analysis of Conclusion Sections of Pakistani Research Articles in Natural and Social Sciences". *Journal of Natural Sciences Research* 4 (22): 106-12.
- Cassany, Daniel and Óscar Morales. 2008. "Leer y escribir en la universidad: Hacia la lectura y la escritura crítica de géneros científicos". *Revista Memorialia* 5: 69-82.
- Ciapuscio, Guiomar E. and Isabel Otañi. 2002. "Las conclusiones de los artículos de investigación desde una perspectiva contrastiva". *R.I.L.L.* 15: 117-33.
- Connor, Ulla. 2011. *Intercultural Rhetoric in the Writing Classroom*. Michigan: Universidad de Michigan.
- Connor, Ulla and Ana Isabel Moreno. 2005. "Tertium comparationis: A vital component in contrastive research methodology". In *Directions in Applied Linguistics: Essays in Honour of Robert B. Kaplan*, edited by Paul Bruthiaux, Dwight Atkinson, William Eggington, 153-64. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Fuentes Cortés, Miguel. 2013. "Las conclusiones de los artículos de investigación en historia". *Literatura y Lingüística* 28: 215-32.
- Gnutzmann, Claus and Hermann Oldenburg. 1991. "Contrastive Text Linguistics in LSP Research: Theoretical Considerations and some Preliminary Findings". In *Subject oriented Texts: Language for Special Purposes and Text Theory*, edited by Hartmut Schröder, 101-36. New York/Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Herederó Zorzo, David, Barbara Pihler Ciglič and Gemma Santiago Alonso. 2017. "Retórica intercultural y discurso académico: análisis contrastivo de las introducciones en los artículos de investigación escritas en español por investigadores eslovenos". *Vestnik za tuje jezike* 9: 83-106.
- Holmes, Richard. 1997. "Genre Analysis, and the Social Sciences: An Investigation of the Structure of Research Article Discussion Sections in Three Disciplines". *English for Specific Purposes* 16 (4): 321-37.

- Hyland, Ken. 1996. "Writing without conviction? Helping in scientific research articles". *Applied Linguistics* 17 (4): 433–54.
- Instituto Cervantes. 2018. "El español en la ciencia y la cultura". In *El español: una lengua viva. Informe 2018*, edited by Instituto Cervantes, 49–51. Madrid: Instituto Cervantes.
- Kubota, Ryuko and Al Lehner. 2004. "Toward Critical Contrastive Rhetoric". *Journal of Second Language Writing* 13: 7–27.
- Moreno, Ana Isabel. 1997. "Genre Constraints across Languages: Causal Metatext in Spanish and English RAs". *English for Specific Purposes* 16 (3): 161–79.
- Moreno, Ana Isabel. 2008. "The Importance of Comparable Corpora in Cross-Cultural Studies". In *Contrastive Rhetoric: Reaching to Intercultural Rhetoric*, edited by Ulla Connor, Ed Nagelhout and William Rozycki, 25–41. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Moreno, Ana Isabel and John Swales. 2018 "Strengthening Move Analysis Methodology towards Bridging the Function-Form Gap". *English for Specific Purposes* 50: 40–63.
- Moritz, Maria Ester, José Luiz Meurer and Adriana Kuerten Dellagnelo. 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 Specialist* 29: 233–53.
- Mur Dueñas, Pilar. 2018. "Promotional Strategies in Academic Writing: Statements of Contribution in Spanish and ELF Research Articles". In *Persuasion in Public Discourse*, edited by Jana Pelclová and Wei-Lun Lu, 259–78. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Pérez Ruiz, Leonor. 2001. "Análisis retórico contrastivo: el resumen lingüístico y médico en inglés y español." PhD diss., University of Valladolid.
- Pisanski Peterlin, Agnes. 2002. "Analiza nekaterih metabesedilnih elementov v slovenskih znanstvenih člankih v dveh časovnih obdobjih". *Slavistična revija* 50 (2): 183–97.
- Pisanski Peterlin, Agnes. 2005. "Text-Organising Metatext in Research Articles: an English-Slovene Contrastive Analysis". *English for Specific Purposes* 24 (2): 307–19.
- Pisanski Peterlin, Agnes. 2007. "Grammatical Forms of Text-Organising Metatext: A Slovene English Contrastive Analysis". *Slovene Linguistic Studies* 6: 251–65.
- Reza Adel, Seyyed Mohammad and Rokhsareh Ghorbani Moghadam. 2015. "A Comparison of Moves in Conclusion Sections of Research Articles in Psychology, Persian Literature and Applied Linguistics". *Teaching English Language* 9 (2): 167–91.
- Santiago Alonso, Gemma and David Heredero Zorzo. 2018. "Las introducciones de artículos de investigación de lingüística y lingüística aplicada escritas por eslovenos y sus aplicaciones didácticas para la clase de español con fines académicos". *Colindancias*, 9: 271–91.

- Swales, John. 1990. *Genre Analysis: English in Academic Research Settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Swales, John. 2004. *Research Genres: Exploration and Applications*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Tabatabaei, Omid and Leila Azimi. 2015. "Rhetorical Conventions in the Conclusion Genre: Comparing English and Persian Research Articles in the Field of Social Studies". *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences* 16 (6): 372–79.
- Vázquez, Ignacio. 2010. "A Contrastive Analysis of the Use of Modal Verbs in the Expression of Epistemic Stance in Business Management Research Articles in English and Spanish". *Ibérica* 19: 77–96.
- Yang, Ruiying and Desmond Allison. 2003. "Research articles in applied linguistics: moving from results to conclusions". *English for Specific Purposes* 22: 365–85.

## Appendix

### Corpus ESP

- (ESP 01) Jordá-Albiñana, Begoña, Ampuero-Canellas, Olga, González-Del-Río, Jimena and Magal-Royo, Teresa. 2010. "Análisis lingüístico de los nombres de marca españoles". *Revista de Lingüística y Lenguas Aplicadas* 5: 77–88.
- (ESP 02) Falero Parra, Francisco Javier. 2016. "La ansiedad ante las destrezas orales en la clase de español lengua extranjera: una propuesta blended-learning con sinohablantes". *Revista de Lingüística y Lenguas Aplicadas* 11: 19–33.
- (ESP 03) Ruiz Campillo, José Plácido. 2017. "El verbo como espacio. Seis nuevos temas de gramática del español". *Revista Nebrija de Lingüística Aplicada a la Enseñanza de Lenguas* 22: 31–51.
- (ESP 04) Ortego Antón, María Teresa and Fernández Nistal, Purificación. 2015. "Aproximación a las unidades con significado en el campo de la informática adquirido por extensión metafórica en los diccionarios generales de inglés y español". *Revista de Lingüística y Lenguas Aplicadas* 10: 44–54.
- (ESP 05) Recio Ariza, María Ángeles. 2013. "El enfoque cognitivista en la fraseología". *Revista de Lingüística y Lenguas Aplicadas* 8: 103–09.
- (ESP 06) Bernardos Galindo, María del Socorro, Jiménez Briones, Rocío and Pérez Cabello de Alba, María Beatriz. 2011. "Una aplicación informática para la gestión de las plantillas léxicas del modelo léxico construccional". *Revista de Lingüística y Lenguas Aplicadas* 6: 53–69.
- (ESP 07) Elena, Pilar. 2011. "Bases para la comprensión organizativa del texto". *Revista de Lingüística y Lenguas Aplicadas* 6: 125–37.
- (ESP 08) Sánchez Rufat, Anna. 2016. "Las funciones diagnóstica y evaluativa del análisis contrastivo de la interlengua del español basado en corpus". *Linred* 13: 1–14.



- (ESP 09) Penadés Martínez, Inmaculada. 2015. “Las colocaciones del tipo verbo más locución verbal: implicaciones teóricas y aplicadas”. *Linred* 12: 1–13.
- (ESP 10) Quevedo–Atienza, Ángeles. 2017. “El español con fines académicos: progreso de un estudio sobre necesidades lingüísticas de estudiantes en programas de movilidad”. *Revista Nebrija de Lingüística Aplicada a la Enseñanza de Lenguas* 22: 144–50.
- (ESP 11) Llorían González, Susana. 2018. “La evaluación de la habilidad comunicativa específica en contextos académicos: la comprensión de las clases magistrales”. *Revista Nebrija de Lingüística Aplicada a la Enseñanza de Lenguas* 24: 93–11.
- (ESP 12) Jiménez, Antonio Luis. 2017. “Jerarquía de aprendizaje: un caso práctico con «por» y «para»”. *Revista Nebrija de Lingüística Aplicada a la Enseñanza de Lenguas* 22: 1–15.

### Corpus ELE

- (ELE 01) Seljak Adimora, Katja. 2012. “Los valores del pretérito perfecto compuesto y del pretérito perfecto simple en *Inquieta Compañía* de Carlos Fuentes”. *Vestnik za tuje jezike* 4: 33–42.
- (ELE 02) Trenc, Andreja. 2012. “Construcciones impersonales con *se* en español y su tratamiento didáctico desde una perspectiva de *focus on form* o la *atención a la forma*”. *Vestnik za tuje jezike* 4: 207–26.
- (ELE 03) Pihler Ciglič, Barbara. 2014. “Los marcadores verbales de modalidad epistémica y su papel en el desarrollo de las competencias comunicativas”. *Linguistica* 54: 381–95.
- (ELE 04) Šifrar Kalan, Marjana and Andreja Trenc. 2014. “La calibración de la comprensión lectora dentro del examen nacional de ELE según el MCER: algunas cuestiones de evaluación”. *Linguistica* 54: 309–23.
- (ELE 05) Pihler, Barbara. 2010. “Paradigmas verbales en el discurso lírico de Machado, Jiménez y Aleixandre: el criterio de la actualidad”. *Verba Hispanica* 18: 175–86.
- (ELE 06) Trenc, Andreja. 2014. “Las máximas conversacionales desde un enfoque cognitivo: algunos casos del discurso indirecto en castellano”. *Verba Hispanica* 22: 71–87.
- (ELE 07) Kastelic Vukadinović, Uršula. 2016. “Las palabras culturales en las traducciones al esloveno de las obras de Juan Rulfo y Carlos Fuentes”. *Verba Hispanica* 24: 53–69.
- (ELE 08) Šifrar Kalan, Marjana. 2016. “La universalidad de los prototipos semánticos en el léxico disponible de español”. *Verba Hispanica* 24: 147–65.
- (ELE 09) Šifrar Kalan, Marjana. 2014. “Disponibilidad léxica en diferentes niveles de español/lengua extranjera”. *Studia romanica posnaniensa* 41(1): 63–85.

- (ELE 10) Veselko, Vita. 2017. "Sobre la oración subordinada en función de atributo". *Verba Hispanica* 25: 147–64.
- (ELE 11) Skubic, Mitja. 2013. "Tempora si fuerint nubila". *Verba Hispanica* 21: 117–28.
- (ELE 12) Šifrar Kalan, Marjana. 2012. "Análisis comparativo de la disponibilidad léxica en español como lengua extranjera (ELE) y lengua materna (ELM)". *marcoELE* 15: 1–19.

## Corpus SLO

- (SLO 01) Lah, Meta. 2015. "«Med prakso sem spoznal, da sem študij dobro izbral» – Evalvacija pedagoške prakse prve generacije študentov bolonjskega študija francoščine". *Vestnik za tuje jezike* 7: 289–04.
- (SLO 02) Premrl, Darja. 2012. "Stališča staršev na Notranjskem in poglavitni motivacijski dejavniki za vključitev otrok v programe zgodnjega učenja tujega jezika pred otrokovim devetim letom starosti". *Vestnik za tuje jezike* 4: 189–05.
- (SLO 03) Paternoster, Alenka. 2011. "Slovenska imena bitij in zemljepisna imena v turističnih vodnikih in virih informativne narave, prevedenih v francoščino". *Vestnik za tuje jezike* 3: 7–22.
- (SLO 04) Pokorn, Nike K. 2016. "Nič več obljubljenega dežela: dinamični premiki na slovenskem prevajalskem trgu in področju izobraževanja prevajalcev". *Vestnik za tuje jezike* 8: 9–21.
- (SLO 05) Rieger, Mladen. 2014. "Prevod na pogled (prima vista) – Od pop-estritve klasičnega pouka prevajanja do Lakmusovega papirja za prevajalske probleme". *Vestnik za tuje jezike* 6: 49–62.
- (SLO 06) Kocbek, Alenka. 2017. "Deset smernic za prevajanje pravnih besedil". *Vestnik za tuje jezike* 9: 107–24.
- (SLO 07) Sicherl, Eva. 2016. "Primeri slovenskih manjšalnic z vidika evalvativne morfologije". *Jezik in slovstvo* 61–2: 101–15.
- (SLO 08) Polajnar, Janja. 2013. "Neprodani in trdni. Ja, seveda, potem pa svizec... Osamosvajanje oglašnih sloganov v slovenskem jeziku". *Jezik in slovstvo* 58 (3): 3–19.
- (SLO 09) Tratar, Olga. 2014. "Pomenske spremembe pridevnika *priden* od 16. stoletja do danes". *Jezik in slovstvo* 59 (4): 27–46.
- (SLO 10) Pisanski Peterlin, Agnes. 2015. "So prevedena poljudnoznanstvena besedila v slovenščini drugačna od izvirnih? Korpusna študija na primeru izražanja epistemske naklonosti". *Slavistična revija* 63 (1): 29–43.
- (SLO 11) Kržišnik, Erika. 2010. "Idiomatska beseda ali frazeološka enota". *Slavistična revija* 58 (1): 83–94.
- (SLO 12) Bizjak Končar, Aleksandra. 2017. "Dialoške značilnosti pridižnega besedila – jezikoslovni vidik". *Slavistična revija* 65 (3): 517–36.