PAYKAREH
Volume 14 Issue 42 Winter 2026 Pages 45-57

Original Research Article

Analyzing the Rhetorical Structure of the Conclusion Section in Art-Related Research Articles

Elham Abdolahpour[1]; **Mansour Kohi Rostami**[2]
1. PhD Student in Information Science and Knowledge Studies, Faculty of Education and Psychology, Shahid Chamran University of Ahvaz, Ahvaz, Iran.
2. Corresponding Author, Associate Professor, Department of Information Science and Knowledge Studies, Faculty of Education and Psychology, Shahid Chamran University of Ahvaz, Ahvaz, Iran.
E-mail: m.rostami@scu.ac.ir

Received: 10 January 2025 Revised: 5 September 2025 Accepted: 3 November 2025

Abstract

Introduction: The examination of the structural organization of research articles and the manner in which their content is arranged has long attracted the attention of scholars in the fields of discourse analysis and academic writing studies. Such investigations can reveal prevalent rhetorical patterns and the characteristic conventions of academic texts, thereby providing a foundation for more detailed analyses of the various sections of research papers. Given that the conclusion section serves as the final part of an article and plays a crucial role in presenting the findings and outcomes of a study, the structural analysis of this section and the identification of its common organizational patterns are particularly significant. Such analysis can enhance the overall quality of research writing. Accordingly, the present study aims to analyze the structural organization of the Conclusion Sections of research articles in the field of Art. It seeks to answer the following questions: «What are the prevalent structural patterns and specific rhetorical moves employed in the Conclusion Sections of Art-related research articles?» and «How can understanding these patterns contribute to improving the quality of academic writing and assist researchers in refining the structure of their article conclusions?»

Research Method: This study employs both quantitative and qualitative approaches and uses the Three-Move Model proposed by Yang and Allison to analyze the Conclusion Sections of 50 research articles in the field of Art, all published in reputable national journals.

Findings: The rhetorical analysis of the Conclusion Sections revealed that, in most articles, the three main Moves, including «Summarizing the study», «Evaluating the study», and «Deductions from the research», were employed. Among these, the first and second Moves occurred most frequently and were identified as obligatory components of the structure of conclusions. Conversely, the Steps involving the «Indicating limitations» and «Recommending further research» appeared far less frequently and were often omitted altogether. Furthermore, the overall structural pattern of the Conclusion Sections tended to be linear and sequential. However, in some articles, a cyclical pattern, featuring a return to the first or second Move, was also observed, indicating a degree of flexibility in the organizational strategies adopted by some authors.

Conclusion: Overall, although the structure of Conclusion Sections in art-related research articles generally follows the Three-Move Model, their implementation exhibits distinctive features. These include a strong emphasis on restating the study's findings, a greater focus on positive aspects rather than on critical or forward-looking dimensions, and a predominance of educational and conceptual themes over strategic or practical recommendations. This pattern may be viewed as a reflection of the field of art's particular discursive tradition, grounded in interpretation, reflection, and intuitive understanding.

Keywords

Art-related Research Articles, Rhetorical Structure, Conclusion Section, Yang and Allison Model, Discourse Analysis

How to cite this article: Abdolahpour, E. & Kohi Rostami, M. (2025). Analyzing the Rhetorical Structure of the Conclusion Section in Art-Related Research Articles. *Paykareh*, 14(42), 45-57.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.22055/pyk.2025.20371

©2025 by the Authours.This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0 license) https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0

Introduction and Problem Definition

The examination of research article structures and the organization of their content has long been a focal point for scholars in the fields of discourse analysis and academic writing studies. Structural analysis explores how information is arranged and organized within an academic text and demonstrates that each section of an article follows specific rhetorical patterns reflecting its communicative purposes. John Swales was the first scholar to systematically analyze the structure of research articles, demonstrating that the various stages through which authors establish their research framework can be identified and studied. Numerous subsequent studies have examined the structures of different sections of research articles, identifying common patterns in the Introduction, Methodology, Results, and Discussion Sections. However, compared to other sections, the Conclusion Section has received considerably less scholarly attention, despite its critical role as the final section of the paper, where findings and achievements are presented and the reader's overall perception of the research is shaped. Therefore, analyzing the structure of the Conclusion Section and identifying its recurrent organizational patterns is particularly significant, as such analyses can improve the quality of academic writing. The field of Art in Iran, with its rich heritage and remarkable diversity, has consistently attracted scholars and enthusiasts alike. This study aims to analyze the structural organization of the conclusions in research articles in the field of art, published in reputable Iranian academic journals. It seeks to identify the common rhetorical patterns and to offer practical recommendations for enhancing the writing of this section. The findings of this research can assist authors, reviewers, and journal editors in the field of Art in presenting their scholarly work more effectively by adhering to academic writing conventions. The primary objective of this study is to conduct a structural analysis of the Conclusion Sections of art-related research articles published in credible Iranian journals. To achieve this goal, the study seeks to answer the following key questions: «What are the prevalent structural patterns and specific rhetorical *Moves* employed in the Conclusion Sections of art-related research articles?» and «How can understanding these patterns contribute to improving the quality of academic writing and assist researchers in refining the structure of their article conclusions?»

Research Method

This study used a mixed-methods approach (quantitative and qualitative) and content analysis to examine the rhetorical structure of the Conclusion Sections of research articles in the field of art. The statistical population consisted of peer-reviewed research articles written in Persian and published in journals ranked as «A» by the Ministry of Science, Research, and Technology (MSRT) classification system during 2022-2024. Sampling was conducted using a purposive sampling method, and only articles with doctoral-degree authors were selected to enhance data homogeneity and validity. In total, 50 articles were selected for analysis. For the analysis, the Yang and Allison (2003) discourse structure framework, which includes three Moves and five Steps (Table 1), was adopted as the main analytical model. To operationalize the model, each Conclusion Section was divided into independent semantic units; these units typically consisted of a sentence or a group of sentences conveying a complete idea. Each semantic unit was then assigned to one of the categories of the Yang and Allison Model based on the operational definition of each Move and Step. The coding process was performed manually by the researchers. To increase reliability, a portion of the data was randomly selected and re-coded by a second coder, resulting in high agreement between the two coders. After completing the coding process, the data were analyzed along three principles. In the first stage, frequency analysis was

conducted to measure the occurrence rate of each Move and Step, and according to Swales's (1990) criteria, they were classified as either «obligatory» or «optional» elements. In the second stage, by focusing on the sequence of Moves, the organizational patterns of the Conclusion Section were identified and examined in terms of being linear or cyclical. Finally, in the third stage, communicative function analysis was conducted to determine the role each Move played in advancing the discourse of the Conclusion Section and the extent to which it contributed to the processes of summarization, critical evaluation, and the projection of future research directions. During the process of examination, all sections entitled Results, Discussion and Conclusion, or Conclusion in the articles were considered as the Conclusion Section and analyzed accordingly.

Table 1. The Rhetorical Structure of the Conclusion Section of Research Articles. Source: Yang and Allison, 2003.

Move 1. Summarizing the study	Providing a comprehensive summary of the study, with particular emphasis on the findings. In this section, authors offer an overall review of the research that is not limited merely to the results but also includes the objectives, methods, and references to previous studies. This Move is typically placed at the beginning of the Conclusion Section and is easily identifiable.
Move 2. Evaluating the study	**Step 1.** Indicating significance/advantage: Highlighting the advantages of the study **Step 2.** Indicating limitations: Stating the limitations and weaknesses of the study **Step 3.** Evaluating methodology: Examining the research methodology and evaluating its strengths and weaknesses
Move 3. Deductions from the research	**Step 1.** Recommending further research: Providing practical guidance for future research **Step 2.** Drawing pedagogical implications: Examining practical applications

Research Background

Significant efforts have been made to examine various sections of research articles, namely the Abstract, Introduction, Methodology, Results, and Conclusion, and numerous studies have analyzed their rhetorical structures. For instance, «Mahzari and Maftoon» (2007) investigated the structure of the Introduction Section in research articles written in English and Persian. In relation to the Methodology Section, «Peacock» (2011) analyzed its structure across research articles from eight different academic disciplines. Similarly, within the field of art, «Abdolahpour and Kolahkaj» (2025) examined the structural features of the Methodology Sections of art-related research articles. Moreover, «Gao and Pramoolsook» (2021) analyzed the rhetorical structure of the results and Discussion Sections in research articles in the field of electronic engineering. One key component in evaluating the quality of academic articles is the logical and coherent structure of their Conclusion Sections. The first systematic attempt to analyze this section was made by «Yang and Allison» (2003) in their seminal study entitled "Research Articles in Applied Linguistics: Moving from Results to Conclusions". Their work examined the textual organization of Conclusion Sections in Applied Linguistics research articles and developed a structural model (Table 1) for the rhetorical organization of conclusions. This model has since been widely adopted by scholars interested in analyzing the structure of this section. Among those who have applied the Yang and Allison framework are «Amnuai and Wannaruk» (2013), who conducted a study entitled «A Structural Move Analysis of the

Conclusion Sections of Research Articles Published in International and Thai Journals». Using both quantitative and qualitative approaches and the Yang and Allison Model, they conducted a comparative analysis of the Conclusion Sections of Applied Linguistics articles written by Thai authors and published in international journals. Their findings indicated that all articles contained the three main Moves proposed in the model, including «Summarizing the study», «Evaluating the study», and «Deductions from the research», although notable differences were observed in the frequency of these Moves across the two groups. Furthermore, in their study entitled «A Comparative Analysis of the Rhetorical Structure of the Conclusion Sections in Research Articles in Psychology, Persian Literature, and Applied Linguistics», «Adel and Ghorbani Moghaddam» (2015) examined the rhetorical organization of Conclusion Sections across these three disciplines. Employing both quantitative and qualitative approaches and using the Yang and Allison Model as their analytical framework, they applied content analysis to identify disciplinary variations. Their findings revealed that, while research articles in Psychology and Applied Linguistics shared a similar rhetorical structure in their Conclusion sections, Persian Literature articles showed greater structural diversity. In his paper entitled «Conclusions in Research Articles: A Filipino-Japanese Contrastive Rhetorical Study», «Morales» (2012) also employed a mixed-methods approach and content analysis based on the Yang and Allison Model to investigate the rhetorical structure of Conclusion Sections in Filipino and Japanese research articles. The results demonstrated that all three Moves of the model were present in both groups of articles, though with differences in frequency. Specifically, Japanese authors consistently treated the first Move, summarizing the study, as an obligatory rhetorical component, whereas Filipino authors used it only optionally in their conclusions. Similarly, in their study entitled «Rhetorical Move Analysis of the Conclusion Sections of Pakistani Research Articles in Natural and Social Sciences», «Aslam and Mahmoud» (2014) conducted a mixed-methods content analysis to identify structural differences in the Conclusion Sections of these two fields. Their analytical framework was based on the models proposed by Yang and Allison (2003) and Bunton (2005). Aslam and Mahmood's (2014) study found that the rhetorical structures of the analyzed articles exhibited considerable variation, and Pakistani authors employed different organizational patterns depending on the disciplinary characteristics of each field. «Zare and Naseri» (2023), in their study entitled «Rhetorical Functions in the Conclusion Sections of English Review Articles», aimed to analyze the rhetorical structure of Conclusion Sections in review articles within Linguistics and Applied Linguistics. Their research adopted a qualitative approach and used content analysis. According to their findings, five rhetorical Moves were identified in the Conclusion Sections of such articles: Territory, Purpose, Structure, Conclusion, and Suggestion. Focusing on research articles in Art and employing the Yang and Allison Model, the present study examines the rhetorical structure of the Conclusion Section, a domain that has received relatively little attention in previous research, especially within the Humanities, Social Sciences, and Linguistics. In contrast to earlier studies that have primarily focused on disciplines such as Applied Linguistics, Psychology, or the Natural Sciences, this research systematically investigates the structure of Conclusion Sections in scholarly articles in the Arts. Furthermore, the findings, by emphasizing the high degree of rhetorical diversity in this domain, provide a new perspective on how results are articulated and presented in art-related research articles.

Theoretical Structure

In recent years, scholars focusing on text and discourse analysis have sought to identify the rhetorical structures and organizational patterns of information within various texts. One of the central concerns of these studies has been the examination of «Rhetorical Moves»; that is, the functional or semantic units that writers employ to convey their communicative purposes. Move Analysis, as a branch of textual structure analysis, was first introduced by John Swales, who defined a Move as a «highly structured communicative event or discourse activity» that serves a specific communicative or social purpose in written or spoken contexts. Similarly, Yang and Allison conceptualized a Move as a holistic rhetorical function of a particular section of a text and argued that Steps are the structural instruments through which the communicative goals of a Move are realized. Comparably, Bhatia described Moves as devices for achieving a subset of communicative purposes within a genre. Each Move may range from a single sentence to several paragraphs in length and is often subdivided into smaller rhetorical units called Steps that serve to express the writer's social or communicative intent. Steps are considered optional textual elements that may be present or absent within a text. They can function individually or in combination to realize a specific Move. The significance of Move Analysis lies in its capacity to identify the semantic boundaries and communicative purposes within a text. Consequently, this analytical approach has become a powerful and widely adopted tool in genre studies, particularly for analyzing the rhetorical structures of research articles and other forms of academic discourse. Research articles typically include specific components, such as the Abstract, Introduction, Literature Review, Methodology, Results, Discussion, and Conclusion. Various studies have shown that each of these sections follows particular rhetorical and structural patterns. Accordingly, numerous models have been developed to analyze these structures, enabling the identification of the organization and communicative purposes of each section. In the Abstract Section, one of the most commonly used models is Samraj's (2002) Five-Move Model, which consists of the following Moves: 1. Establishing the research territory, 2. Stating the purpose, 3. Describing the methodology, 4. Presenting the findings, and 5. Drawing conclusions. In the Introduction Section, the well-known CARS (Create A Research Space) Model by Swales (1990; 2004) is among the most influential frameworks. This model divides the introduction into three major Moves: 1. Establishing a territory (introducing the general topic and reviewing previous research), 2. Establishing a niche (identifying the research gap or problem), and 3. Occupying the niche (stating the purpose of the study, research questions, or hypotheses). In the Discussion Section, Peacock (2002) proposed a model for analyzing this section, demonstrating how authors use strategies such as referring to results, providing interpretation, and evaluating the significance of findings to strengthen their scientific argument. Unlike other sections of research articles, few models have been proposed for the Conclusion Section. This scarcity may be due to a lack of clear distinction between the Discussion and Conclusion Sections; in some articles, these two sections are presented under a single heading. The difference between the two sections mainly depends on disciplinary traditions and journal conventions (Bunton, 2005). The Discussion Section usually focuses on the results, interpretation, and explanation of specific findings, whereas the Conclusion Section is devoted to highlighting the overall results, providing an overall evaluation of the research, suggesting directions for future studies, and outlining pedagogical implications (Yang & Allison, 2003). Yang and Allison (2003) categorized the Moves and Steps observed in the Conclusion Section as follows: Move 1: Summarizing the study (reviewing methods, findings, and claims with reference to previous research); Move 2: Evaluating the study (highlighting the importance or advantages of the study, acknowledging its limitations, and assessing its methodology);

Move 3: Deductions from the research (proposing future research directions and presenting pedagogical implications). This study presents the findings from the content analysis of the Conclusion Section of selected research articles in Art. The analyses were conducted using the Yang and Allison (2003) conceptual framework and aligned with the study's objectives and research questions. In accordance with the main aim of this study, which is to examine the rhetorical structure of the Conclusion Section of research articles, the selected articles were carefully analyzed to extract the rhetorical pattern of this section and to conduct its structural analysis according to the components of the model mentioned above.

Identification of Common Rhetorical Patterns in the Conclusion Sections of Art Research Articles

By examining the Conclusion Sections of 50 research articles in Art, nine distinct rhetorical patterns were identified. The analysis revealed that authors in the field of Art do not follow a fixed or rigid structural framework when composing the Conclusion Section. Instead, they tend to organize their writing according to the specific requirements of their research or the editorial policies of the publishing journal. Consequently, the findings indicate a relatively high degree of structural diversity in the rhetorical organization of art-related research articles. In this study, nine distinctive rhetorical structures were identified across the 50 analyzed articles, suggesting both a high level of variation and the absence of a standardized pattern in the field of art.

Table 2. The Rhetorical Structure of the Conclusion Section of Research Articles Based on Yang and Allison (2003) Model. Source: Authors.

No.	Rhetorical Structure	No. of Articles
1	Evaluation-Summary-Deduction	15
2	Summary-Deduction	9
3	Summary-Evaluation-Deduction	9
4	Summary-Evaluation-Summary-Deduction	3
5	Evaluation-Summary	2
6	Evaluation-Deduction	7
7	Evaluation-Deduction-Summary	2
8	Evaluation-Summary-Deduction-Summary-Deduction	1
9	Evaluation-Summary-Evaluation-Summary-Deduction	1

Table 2 presents the identified rhetorical structures, organized according to the three Moves proposed in the Yang and Allison Model: Summarizing the study, Evaluating the study, and Deductions from the research. The table indicates that the Conclusion Sections of the analyzed articles did not all begin with the same rhetorical Move. Although more than half of the articles started with the Move «Evaluating the study», 20 articles followed the Yang and Allison Model more closely and began with the Move «Summarizing the study». Furthermore, in 18 of the articles, only two of the three main Moves were employed. The findings also show that a significant portion of the analyzed articles followed a linear structure in their Conclusion Sections. In such structures, the three rhetorical Moves of the Yang and Allison Model (summarizing, evaluating, and deduction) appeared once and in a fixed sequential order within the text. Conversely, only five articles exhibited a cyclical or recursive structure, in which the rhetorical Moves recurred multiple times and in a non-linear sequence. Examples of these cyclical patterns included structures such as «Summary-Evaluation- Summary- Deduction», «Evaluation- Summary- Deduction- Summary-Deduction», and «Evaluation- Summary- Evaluation- Summary- Deduction». These structures indicate that some authors preferred to revisit their analysis multiple times rather

than presenting a single, final-stage conclusion. They returned to previously discussed findings, re-evaluated them, and emphasized them again throughout the conclusion. Notably, the «Summarizing the study» Move showed the highest tendency to recur; an observation consistent with Yang and Allison's (2003) findings, which also identified summarizing as the most cyclical Move within Conclusion Sections. Similarly, in the present study, this Move was repeatedly used in the Conclusion Sections of art-related articles and played a key role in shaping their rhetorical structure. Although the Yang and Allison Model generally suggests a linear structure for the Conclusion Section, this study confirms that such a structure predominated among the analyzed articles, with limited instances of cyclical variation.

Analysis of the Occurrence of Rhetorical Moves in the Conclusion Sections of Art Research Articles

As previously noted, the Yang and Allison Model consists of three Moves and five Steps (see Table 1). In this section, the frequency of occurrence of these Moves and Steps in art-related research articles is examined to determine their structural status as either obligatory or optional components. The classification of Moves as obligatory or optional in this study follows Swales's (1990) criterion, according to which any Move appearing in more than 50% of the sample is considered obligatory, while those appearing in fewer than 50% of cases are classified as optional. The distribution of Moves in the Conclusion Sections of art-related research articles is presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Frequency of Moves and Steps in the Conclusion Section of Art Research Articles. Source: Authors.

Rhetorical Components and Subcomponents	Art-Related Artices	
	Frequency	Percentage
Move 1. Summarizing the study	50	100
Move 2. Evaluating the study	41	82
Step 1. Indicating significance/advantage	36	72
Step 2. Indicating limitations	3	6
Step 3. Evaluating methodology	7	14
Move 3. Deductions from the research	48	96
Step 1. Recommending further research	5	10
Step 2. Drawing pedagogic implications	48	96

Table 3 shows that the Move «Summarizing the study» appeared in all of the analyzed articles (100%) and is therefore regarded as an obligatory component in the rhetorical structure of the Conclusion Section of Art research articles. Similarly, the Move «Deductions from the research» appeared with a frequency of 96%, while «Evaluating the study» occurred in 82% of the articles, both of which also qualify as obligatory Moves. As observed, when authors evaluated the study, they predominantly focused on highlighting the research's significance or advantages (72%), while references to research limitations were minimal (6%). Regarding the third Move, «Deductions from the research», although this Move was present in nearly all articles, the analysis of its Steps revealed variation in how authors employed them. The Step «Drawing pedagogical implications» was widespread (96%), whereas «Recommending further research» appeared in only five

articles. Based on these findings, it can be concluded that although all three main Moves of the Yang and Allison Model were present to some extent in the Conclusion Sections of art-related research articles, specific Steps, particularly «Indicating limitations» and «Recommending further research», which emphasize a critical and forward-looking perspective, received comparatively little attention. This lack of focus may influence the transparency of the research process and limit the extent to which future studies can build upon or apply the findings of the analyzed works.

Analysis of the Relationships Between Moves and Steps in the Conclusion Sections of Art Research Articles

1. Move 1: Summarizing the Study: This Move, which aims to provide a comprehensive summary of the research, places particular emphasis on the findings of the study. In this section, authors typically offer an overall review of their work that includes not only the main results but also references to the research objectives and, at times, prior studies. Generally, this Move appears at the beginning of the Conclusion Section and is easily identifiable. In nearly all of the analyzed Conclusion Sections, this Move was present and accounted for the most significant proportion of textual content compared to the other Moves. In the examined art-related articles, the «Summarizing the study» Move was limited mainly to a brief restatement of the findings, with minimal elaboration on research objectives or connections to previous studies. This pattern suggests that authors in the field of Art tend to focus primarily on reporting their results rather than situating them within the broader research context. While Art research articles typically employ a concise and report-like approach to this Move, the summaries tend to be descriptive and condensed rather than analytical or interpretive. Rarely do authors include intertextual links or critical commentary when summarizing their studies. This characteristic may reflect the dominant writing style and rhetorical conventions of the Art discipline, or it may arise from disciplinary discourse traditions that favor descriptive over analytical or comparative expression.

2. Move 2: Evaluating the Study: This Move is intended to provide an analytical and reflective perspective on the conducted research and typically includes three Steps: 1. Indicating significance/advantage, 2. Indicating limitations, and 3. Evaluating methodology. It is considered one of the key rhetorical components of the Conclusion Section, as it enables authors not only to emphasize the value and effectiveness of their research but also to engage in a responsible and transparent reflection on its strengths and weaknesses. An examination of the distribution of this Move across the analyzed art-related research articles reveals that more than 82% of them employed some form of the «Evaluating the study» Move. This indicates a relatively established and significant presence of this rhetorical element in the structure of the Conclusion Sections within this discipline. Such a pattern suggests that, although Art researchers adopt diverse approaches in realizing this Move, they generally strive to underscore the scholarly contribution and merit of their research at the end of their articles. Given the considerable presence of this Move in art-related research articles, the following analysis explores how authors address its three component Steps, including «Indicating significance/advantage», «Indicating limitations», and «Evaluating the methodology», to determine the degree of emphasis placed on each dimension within the «Evaluating the study» Move.

2.1. Step 1: Indicating Significance/Advantage: This Step is written to emphasize the importance or advantages of the research. Authors typically use positive language to convey the value and contribution of their work. The analysis of the selected articles revealed that more than half of the authors of art-related research articles referred to the significance or

advantages of their study in the Conclusion Section. This level of attention indicates that this Step holds a relatively established position among writers in this field and is recognized as a common strategy for reinforcing the credibility and scholarly value of their research. Such an approach suggests that Art researchers are aware of the need to articulate the added value of their investigations within the broader academic and artistic context. An interesting finding is that authors in this domain frequently begin their Conclusion Sections by highlighting the importance of their topic. They first draw the reader's attention by emphasizing the value and necessity of the research subject, then summarize the main findings. This pattern indicates that articulating the significance of the study functions not only as a key rhetorical Step within the conclusion but also as a transitional Move that bridges the presentation of findings with the discussion of their practical implications and applications.

2.2. Step 2. Indicating Limitations: This Step demonstrates the researcher's academic honesty and transparency, enhances the credibility of the findings, and clarifies the scope of generalizability. It also provides the author with an opportunity to delineate the research's impact and lay the groundwork for future studies. However, an examination of the art-related research articles shows that mentioning limitations in the Conclusion Section is relatively uncommon. Only three of the analyzed articles explicitly referred to their research limitations. This small number reflects a prevailing tendency among Art researchers: A focus on strengths and achievements rather than on weaknesses or constraints. Authors in this field seem inclined to highlight the positive aspects of their work, while critical self-reflection receives limited attention. This cautious tendency may stem from a concern that indicating limitations could diminish the perceived credibility or impact of the study in the eyes of reviewers and readers, a form of implicit conservatism observable in academic writing within this domain. Another explanation may lie in the descriptive and interpretive nature of Art research, which often relies less on rigorous experimental or quantitative methods. This disciplinary characteristic reduces the perceived necessity of critical evaluation compared to fields that prioritize empirical precision. The findings of the present study regarding this Step are consistent with previous research. For example, Morales (2012) found that indicating limitations was rare in Japanese and Filipino humanities research articles, and Adel and Ghorbani Moghaddam (2015) similarly reported that this Step appeared infrequently in Persian literature articles. Nevertheless, the Yang and Allison (2003) model also emphasizes that indicating limitations is an optional Move in the rhetorical structure of Conclusion Sections, the inclusion of which depends on disciplinary conventions, writing styles, and authorial intentions; a position that the findings of this study likewise support.

2.3. Step 3: Evaluating the Methodology: In this Step, authors reflect on their research methodology and seek to demonstrate the degree of alignment between the chosen method and the study's objectives. They often highlight methodological strengths such as the appropriateness of the research design, its consistency with the research problem, and the systematic organization of the research process, thereby reinforcing the methodological credibility of their studies. In some cases, authors also refer to limitations, for instance, those related to sample size or data collection instruments. According to the findings of this study, methodological evaluation was the second most frequent Step within the second Move, following the emphasis on the study's significance, and was identified in seven of the analyzed art-related research articles. Interestingly, authors in this field often use the present tense when describing this Step, which lends immediacy and a sense of direct evaluation to their methodological commentary. For example: "On one side stood the verbal pretext with its coherent linguistic structure, and on the other, abstract volumetric works

were interpreted as hypertexts. After examining each semiotic system and identifying intertextual relations, points of convergence and divergence in the portrayal of the character Farhad in verbal and visual texts were analyzed. Through thematic analysis and the separation of overt and covert signs across the two textual layers, intertextual connections were identified." This type of methodological description demonstrates an analytical awareness of the procedures used in the study and how they contributed to the interpretation of results. The present findings are consistent with Amnuai and Wannaruk (2013), who observed the low frequency of methodological evaluation in Thai research articles. Conversely, Aslam and Mahmood (2014) reported that in the Natural and Social Sciences, this Step plays a more prominent role and is articulated in a more transparent, analytical manner.

3. Move 3: Deductions from the Research: This Move constitutes one of the core and defining elements of the rhetorical structure of research conclusions, as it represents the point where the researcher goes beyond merely describing or analyzing data to explain the theoretical and practical implications of the study. In this part, the author seeks to demonstrate how the research has opened new horizons of knowledge, offered fresh perspectives on the subject, and generated practical insights or recommendations relevant to real-world issues. Typically, this Move comprises two Steps: «Recommending further study» and «Drawing pedagogical implications». At this stage, researchers emphasize the applicability and utility of their studies, aiming to connect their findings to tangible, practical contexts. The analysis of the examined articles indicates that this Move is frequently and prominently present in art-related research papers. Authors in this field often convey the practical and educational messages of their work indirectly, inviting the reader to engage in intellectual reflection and to infer the meaning and applicability of the results from the text itself. This rhetorical strategy suggests that, rather than presenting explicit prescriptive statements, writers in the field of Art tend to employ a reflective, interpretive mode, encouraging readers to co-construct meaning and to extract implications aligned with the discursive and interpretive traditions characteristic of Art scholarship.

3.1. Step 1: Recommending Further Study: One of the primary purposes of this Step is to draw attention to gaps or unresolved questions that the current study has not fully addressed or has only partially illuminated. Through this Step, the author seeks to identify areas that still require exploration and to outline potential pathways for future research. In the Yang and Allison Model, this Step is regarded as a strategic Move that extends the scholarly trajectory of a study by establishing a link between the current findings and emerging or potential research areas. However, the analysis of art-related research articles indicates that this Step had the lowest frequency among all the Steps within the third Move. The limited attention to or absence of this element may suggest that Art researchers are either unaware of the strategic importance of proposing future research directions or do not consider it essential to the rhetorical structure of their articles. The findings of this study reveal that, in art-related articles, this Step is often overlooked or omitted, which may stem from a lack of a competitive research environment and insufficient awareness of the importance of including this component in scholarly writing. This observation partly contradicts the results of Amnuai and Wannaruk (2013) and Aslam and Mahmood (2014), both of whom emphasized that proposing future research directions is a necessary and constructive part of research conclusions and should therefore receive special attention from academic writers.

3.2. Step 2. Drawing Pedagogical Implications: In this Step, the authors discuss the practical dimensions of their research and clarify the relationship between their findings and real-world or professional contexts. The primary purpose of this Step is to highlight how

the results can be applied in practical or educational settings, thereby demonstrating the research's relevance and usefulness beyond the academic sphere. The data analysis shows that this Step appeared in 96% of the examined art-related research articles. This statistic underscores the prominent role of practical and pedagogical applications within the Conclusion Sections of this field. Authors in this Step frequently employ terms such as «concept», «application», «contribution», and «value» to emphasize the practical aspects and usable outcomes of their work. For example: «In other words, meaningful form (the resultant form in its general and universal sense) and aesthetic perception (the perceptual interpretation of the artwork's content in the viewer's mind) are not two separate entities. Rather, these two concepts should be viewed as parts of a unified whole, as two sides of the same coin, since both refer to a pure and universal beauty. Therefore, these two concepts should not be explained in a cause-and-effect relationship». Nevertheless, the findings indicate that Art research articles tend to place greater emphasis on pedagogical and conceptual implications rather than on direct or technical practical applications. In other words, educational insights and conceptual reflections dominate this Step, while explicit references to applied outcomes are relatively less frequent. This tendency may reflect the interpretive and reflective nature of Art scholarship, where conveying aesthetic understanding and intellectual engagement is often prioritized over immediate practical implementation.

Conclusion

The examination of the rhetorical structures of Conclusion Sections reveals that, unlike in empirical and experimental disciplines, authors in the field of Art tend to adopt a flexible and personalized approach rather than adhering strictly to established conventions. The identification of nine distinct structural patterns across fifty analyzed articles demonstrates that conclusions in art-related texts do not follow rigid or uniform rules; instead, they reflect a diversity of writing styles, conceptual priorities, and even the discursive identities of the authors. Although a linear structure, that is, the single sequential arrangement of the three main Moves, is dominant in most articles, a few of them exhibit a cyclical or recursive pattern in which Moves such as «Summarizing» or «Evaluating» reappear multiple times, forming a layered and dialogic organization. Such diversity in rhetorical structure can be interpreted as a reflection of the interpretive and reflective nature of Art scholarship. In the structural analysis of the Conclusion Sections of art-related research articles, a distinctive pattern emerged regarding the function of rhetorical Moves. The first Move, «Summarizing the study», though consistently and prominently present in all articles and serving as the core element of the Conclusion Section, was generally limited to a simple restatement or report-like summary of the findings. Rather than using this Move as an opportunity for critical reflection or for linking the results to the main research questions and previous scholarship, authors tended to focus primarily on reiterating data and observations. While this approach ensures clarity in presenting information, it vastly underutilizes the potential of this Move to foster conceptual coherence and strengthen the scientific argument. The second Move, «Evaluating the study», although less frequent than summarizing, has nonetheless achieved a relatively stable position in most art-related research articles. This suggests that while authors in the field may not always engage in detailed critique, they increasingly recognize the importance of evaluating their research contributions within the broader academic discourse of the arts. This tendency suggests that authors in the field of Art generally prefer to conclude their articles by emphasizing the achievements and scholarly value of their research, thereby enhancing its perceived impact on the reader.

However, a closer analysis of the internal components of this Move reveals a particular imbalance: Researchers tend to focus primarily on highlighting the significance or advantages of their studies, while paying comparatively little attention to clarifying limitations or evaluating methodological aspects. Such a pattern may stem from cultural considerations, prevailing attitudes within the Academic Art community, or even rhetorical strategies aimed at maintaining a positive image of the research. In the third Move, «Deductions from the research», although this section appears prominently in most articles, the distribution of its internal Steps shows a noticeable asymmetry. Authors in the field of Art often emphasize practical applications and pedagogical implications, rearticulating their findings to connect them to educational needs, creative practices, or applied artistic approaches. This orientation reflects an inclination to demonstrate the social and practical relevance of research in the arts. However, the Step «Recommending further study» is markedly underrepresented, indicating a limited focus on linking current findings to future scholarly pathways and on maintaining the continuity of knowledge production. Such an omission may result in research that primarily addresses immediate or short-term needs, rather than contributing to the strategic organization and sustained development of the discipline's theoretical and methodological foundations. Overall, this rhetorical pattern reflects the distinctive discursive tradition of the Art, one that emphasizes interpretation, reflection, and intuitive expression. Nevertheless, the relative neglect of critical and forward-looking elements may hinder the establishment of structural coherence, reduce the generalizability of findings, and limit their integration into subsequent research within the evolving body of Art scholarship.

Author Contributions

This article is the result of a joint collaboration between both authors. The authors participated in writing various sections, reviewing the findings, analyzing the results, and final approval of the article.

Acknowledgment

The authors of this article would like to express their sincere gratitude to Dr. Mansour Kolahkaj, Associate Professor of the Faculty of Arts, Shahid Chamran University of Ahvaz, who collaborated in the data coding stage.

Conflict of Interest

The author (s) declare that there are no potential conflicts of interest related to this research, in writing, and publication of this article

Research Funding

The author (s) did not receive any financial support for conducting the research, writing up, and publication of this article.

References

- Abdolahpour, E. & Kolahkaj, M. (2025).Review of art articles with emphasis on their research methodology. *Journal of Studies in Library and Information Science*, 16(1), 95-112. https://doi.org/10.22055/slis.2022.37799.1846 **[In Persian]**

- 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.
- Amnuai, W., & Wannaruk, A. (2013). A move-based analysis of the conclusion sections of research articles published in international and Thai journals. *3L: Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*, 19(2).
- Aslam, I., & Mehmood, A. (2014). Genre analysis of conclusion sections of Pakistani research articles in natural and social sciences. *Genre*, 4(22).
- 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
- Gao, S., & Pramoolsook, I. (2021). Move-step structure of the results and discussion section of electronic engineering research articles written by Chinese and Thai researchers. *Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes*, 725-739.
- Mahzari, A., & Maftoon, P. (2007). A contrastive study of the introduction section of English and Persian medical research articles. *Iranian Journal of Language Studies (IJLS)*, 1(3), 201Ğ214.
- Morales, R. C. (2012). Conclusions in research articles: A Filipino-Japanese contrastive rhetoric study. *Philippines ESL Journal*, 8, 83-95. https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.1.4699.7921
- Peacock, M. (2002). Communicative moves in the discussion section of research articles. System, 30(4), 479-497. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(02)00050-7
- Peacock, M. (2011). The structure of the methods section in research articles across eight disciplines. *The Asian ESP Journal*, 7(2), 99-124.
- Samraj, B. (2002). Introductions in research articles: Variations across disciplines. *English for Specific Purposes*, 21(1), 1-17. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(00)00023-5
- Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge University Press.
- Swales, J. M. (2004). *Research genres: Explorations and applications*. Cambridge University Press.
- Yang, R. & Allison, D. (2003). Research articles in applied linguistics: moving from results to conclusions. English for Specific Purposes, (22), 365-385.
- Zare, J., & Naseri, Z. S. (2023). Rhetorical functions in English review articles' conclusions. *Journal of Language Horizons*, 6(4), 27-50.