



Enhancing Conclusion Sections in Final Year Project Presentations: An Engineering Perspective

Wan Raihan Wan Shaaidi^{1,*}, Noor Raha Mohd Radzuan², Wan Jumani Paizi@Fauzi²

¹ University College TATI, Kampus TATIUC, Teluk Kalong, 24000 Kemaman, Terengganu, Malaysia

² Centre for Modern Languages, Universiti Malaysia Pahang, 26600 Pekan, Pahang, Malaysia

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 22 June 2023

Received in revised form 3 September 2023

Accepted 2 January 2024

Available online 7 February 2024

Keywords:

Move Analysis; Genre Analysis; Final Year Project Presentation

ABSTRACT

The Final Year Project Presentation or FYPP is an essential academic oral presentation for tertiary students across various university courses and fields. Despite its importance, there exists a notable lack of comprehensive understanding about the genre, particularly about the conclusion section. This study aimed to investigate engineering students' perception of the good characteristics of the conclusion section in FYPP. A questionnaire survey was administered to a sample of 33 engineering students, who identified the following features as important components of the conclusion section: a summary of the final year project, presentation of overall findings, references to previous research, discussion of issues related to the final year project, restatement of the objective/focus, specific results, interpretation of results, significance of the results, limitations, counter-arguments, and an explanation of the final year project. The study reveals that students are aware of the various elements that make up the conclusion section and suggests that this knowledge can help them improve their FYPPs. By better understanding the genre expectations and characteristics, engineering students can present their final year project findings more effectively and demonstrate their mastery of the discipline.

1. Introduction

Industries demands that graduating engineering students be equipped with technical and non-technical skills upon entering the job market. Most undergraduate students are expected to be proficient in oral presentation as it's taken as one of the most required skills by the industries as mentioned in Singh [1] and Kuldip Kaur Maktiar Singh *et al.*, [2]. Industries desperately need engineers who can communicate effectively with individuals from diverse backgrounds, the government, the private sector, the general public, and skilled professionals in a range of contexts, including business and academia. Written and spoken genres are essential instruments that practitioners must impeccably utilise in the advancement of their careers as stated in Ruiz-Madrid *et al.*, [3]. Numerous studies by Sigh [1], Radzuan [4], Rajprasis *et al.*, [5], Loi *et al.*, [6], Rosalina [7],

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: wan_raihan@uctati.edu.my

<https://doi.org/10.37934/araset.39.1.7689>

Reals [8] and Puji [9] have shown that engineers and engineering students have trouble communicating effectively while having high technical skills. It has grown to be a significant problem in academia and the engineering field since engineering students are constantly lectured on the value of having a solid command of the English language in oral communication. Therefore, for engineers to achieve professional goals, the capacity for good communication and the capacity for effective presentation is practically essential as investigated by Puji [9].

Nevertheless, research has shown that engineers and engineering students struggle with presentation, particularly when it comes to presenting presentations at business, conferences, seminars, and classrooms. There is a consensus among researchers that there are many different tactics, strategies, and skills for presenting presentations that are covered in textbooks, articles, journals, literature, and online resources, the question of why communication problems, particularly in giving presentations, still linger as stated in M. Yusoff [10], Srinon [11] and Srinon *et al.*, [12]. Disanza and Legge [13] define a technical presentation as a formal presentation to a non-expert audience on themes in science, engineering, technology, business, regulatory, legal, management or social science. Previous studies have reported this presentation includes laboratory presentations, feasibility reports, progress/status reports, survey presentations, training lectures, and business reports as investigated by Disanza and Legge [13,14], Srinon [11] and Srinon *et al.*, [12], Ferrer-Pardo *et al.*, [15]. Rosalina [7], Seals [8], Benraghda *et al.*, [16], Fonseca *et al.*, [17] and Xian Ming [18] defined oral presentation as a partly spoken and visual form of communication that occurs in organisational settings, with the objective to transfer information, established as a formal assessment for the students. Fonseca *et al.*, [17] further adds that such presentations are usually audience-friendly, highly casual, and very difficult for non-native English speakers to perform.

For undergraduates, the most significant presentation in their entire scholarship is the Final year project presentation (FYPP onwards). FYPP is a technical oral presentation as it is an academic discourse conducted in the university to show undergraduates' understanding of a targeted subject to the audience. In university-offered English language classes and discipline-based courses, the final year project presentation is used as a component of the evaluation, to showcase research projects, and to acquaint students with the academic discourse community as mentioned in Benraghda *et al.*, [19], Zareva [20], Zappa-Hollman [21] and Ngah *et al.*, [22]. In this context, the students' Final Year Project Presentation is taken as a form of technical oral presentation in technical communication. All final year engineering students in the university are required to register for the FYPP. The students are required to participate in the FYPP 1 (in semester one) and FYPP 2 (in semester two) which are both three credit hour courses. The FYPP1 includes project proposal, preparation and literature review. The FYPP2 centres on implementation, experimentation, testing, evaluation and analysis of the project.

It has been observed that delivering FYPP is not an easy task. Kuldip Kaur Maktiar Singh *et al.*, [2] and also Mohd Radzuan *et al.*, [4], stated, despite the fact that the final year project presentations are an essential part of engineering curricula, most engineering students undoubtedly find it to be a stressful experience. This demonstrates how giving FYPP may be a challenging endeavour and how oral presentations are sometimes quite confusing. The strain of performing the activities needed in presenting in front of audiences might result in presentation disaster if oral presentations are not set correctly. Thus, this present study aims to investigate students' perception towards good characteristics of conclusion section in final year project presentation.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Conclusion Moves in Oral Presentation

Conclusion is a section where the students must conclude and summarise their presentations. According to M. Yusoff [10], the conclusion section is a section that summarised the presentation content and the objectives that had been achieved throughout the task that had been given. Seliman [24] on the other hand, portrayed the conclusion section as a section that required the presenters to hint at the closing of the presentation, generalising the topic, summarising the main points and closing it by thanking the audience and finally, stating the end of the presentation.

Student presentations involve presentations focused on a specific subject, a summary of any study done, or lecture presentations to demonstrate evidence of an awareness of a topic relevant to the course being studied as part of their course evaluation as mentioned in Singh [1]. The content element of the presentation includes aspects that need to be assessed such as knowledge shown, logical appeal, fielding of objections, questions posed, improvisation shown and conclusion as stated by S. Zivkovic [25]. By separating the presentation into meaningful sections, it will assist the audience to understand the presentation content better.

Kite [26] has closely produced two conclusion moves to suit conclusion section for conference oral presentation context. She used preclosing as her first move and closing by thanking the audience as her second move, which looked similar to Seliman [24] study. As for Seliman [24] herself, in her study she has adopted conclusion move from Dubois *et al.*, [27], that changed the term 'conclusion' to 'termination'. This model has been closed adapted by Singh [1] study. She has improvised the moves and came up with just three moves that consists pre-closing, tying up, closing and closing. She has simplified Seliman's termination moves and make it more general. Unlike Seliman [24], Singh [1] focused more on rhetorical move structure of various sections in Academic Oral Presentations (AOPs) in the English language class and discipline-based class, examine the linguistic features that realize the moves in AOPs and to examine the extent the use of rhetorical and linguistic structure reflects students' generic understanding of AOPs. Due to that she has not thoroughly investigating on conclusion section as much as Seliman [24].

There are several drawbacks in the previous research. First, many of genre studies covered only on research articles and they were focusing on introductions and body as it is easier to apply Swalesian moves. There is few research that is on looking on oral presentation especially in engineering academic context. Secondly, most researchers have focused on conferences, graduate seminars, defence sessions where both presenters and audience were professionals, unlike final year project (FYP onwards) student presentations where the presenters were novices. Thirdly, in oral presentation, like the research articles context, there were many researchers that focus on abstract, introduction, body and question-and-answer sessions, but not many has focused on conclusion section for FYPP in an engineering context, which is taken as tedious to conduct an investigation about it, as it is mainly based on scientific disciplines or very discipline specific has been investigated by Singh [1] and Kuldip Kaur Maktiar Singh *et al.*, [2]. Finally, many genre research focusing more on applied linguistic and psychology research articles, like that have been done by Adel *et al.*, [28] and Ruiying *et al.*, [29]. The moves of FYPP genre in engineering field especially conclusion section was barely studied in totality. Thus, this present study aims to investigate students' perception towards good characteristics of conclusion section in final year project presentation.

3. Methodology

The researcher has employed a quantitative research design. This research design is used by the researcher “to establish relationships between variables and sometimes explain the causes of such relationships or answering the research questions” as stated by Fraenkel *et al.*, [30]. In this paper, the focus is undergraduates’ perception of good characteristics of the conclusion section in Final Year Project Presentation.

3.1 Participants

The population of this study consists of 33 Degree students from Faculty of Engineering Technology in one of the university colleges in the east coast region. At the time of data collection, these were the only group of students who were presenting their FYPP. Therefore, sampling was purposive and the selection criteria were that they were final year Engineering students and that they would be presenting their FYPP. The participants were from the Faculty of Engineering Technology from various programmes as illustrated in Table 1.

Table 1
Faculty

	Frequency (N)	Percentage (%)
Electrical & Mechatronic	12	36.3%
Manufacturing (Tooling & Production Management)	15	45.5%
Chemical Engineering	6	18.2%
Total	33	100%

In Table 1, there are three programmes involved: Electrical and Mechatronic, Manufacturing as well as Chemical Engineering. Six students were from Bachelor of Engineering Technology (Electrical), while another 6 students were from Bachelor in Engineering Technology (Mechatronic) which comprised total of 12 (36.3%) students. Nine students were from Bachelor in Manufacturing Engineering Technology (Tooling), and another 6 students were from Bachelor of Manufacturing Engineering Technology (Production Management) which made up to the total of 15 (45.5%) students. Lastly, 6 (18.2%) Bachelor of Chemical Engineering Technology students have joined the study. All the students involved in this study were in their final year.

3.2 Instrument

For this pilot study, the researcher has employed online questionnaires as to obtained data from the engineering students. The questionnaire contents were adopted from various research both written and oral analysis moves from Loi *et al.*, [6], Adel *et al.*, [28], Ruiying *et al.*, [29], Model *et al.*, [31] and Alamri [32]. In the questionnaire, there were three sections that the researcher has identified to have deeper understanding towards the students’ perception towards good characteristics of conclusion section during FYPP which construe of summarising the study, evaluating the study and providing the deduction.

The first section of the questionnaire was related to summarise the study of FYPP conclusion section with five items that were closely adapted from Loi *et al.*, [6]. This study employed a Likert scale questionnaire, with a rating of 5 for very important, 4 is for quite important, 3 for sometimes important, 2 is for not so important and 1 is not important at all. The second section will touch on

evaluating the study in FYPP conclusion section, with seven items that were adopted from Loi *et al.*, [6], Ruiying *et al.*, [29], Alamri [32], Maswana *et al.*, [33], Sheldon [34] and Swales *et al.*, [36]. While the third section is looking into providing a deduction of the FYPP conclusion section with two items involved, for this item the researcher adopted them from Loi *et al.*, [6], Adel *et al.*, [28], Ruiying *et al.*, [29], Sheldon[34] and Swales *et al.*, [35]. The FYP students were given a link to the questionnaire and they able to complete the questionnaire within a minute of time.

Cronbach Alpha test was used to run a reliability test for the questionnaire items. Cronbach's (alpha) is a reliability coefficient used in statistics. It is frequently used to gauge internal consistency and reliability. A coefficient of .93 is a high coefficient; .6 is an acceptable level for determining whether the scale has internal consistency as stated in Creswell *et al.*, [37]. With a .72 reliability coefficient, the reliability is satisfactory for the scores.

Table 2
Cronbach's alpha Internal consistency

$\alpha \geq 0.9$	Excellent
$0.8 \leq \alpha < 0.9$	Good
$0.7 \leq \alpha < 0.8$	Acceptable
$0.6 \leq \alpha < 0.7$	Questionable
$0.5 \leq \alpha < 0.6$	Poor
$\alpha < 0.5$	Unacceptable

A Cronbach Alpha of 0.93 was calculated indicating high reliability of the scale, refer Table 3 below.

Table 3
Reliability Statistic

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.930	14

3.3 Data Collection and Analysis

Students were given an online questionnaire which consisted of questions that related to their perception (towards FYPP and conclusion moves). Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS 26 Version) was used to analyse the data. Descriptive statistics was employed to analyse the numerical data.

4. Results and Discussion

This pilot study focuses on perception of engineering students towards good characteristics of the conclusion section in Final Year Project Presentation. A descriptive analysis was used to run the frequency of each item in the questionnaire.

Item 1 in the questionnaire seeks the perception of the engineering FYP students regarding the importance of summarising the FYP during FYPP. It is apparent in Table 4 that 22 (66.7%) students agreed that it is *Very important* to present overall findings of their final year project in the conclusion section and 10 (30.3%) students chose *Quite important* and 1 student stated *Sometimes important* to item 1. No students responded that this aspect of the conclusion section was *Not at all important*. Therefore, in the conclusion section it would be expected that all the students would provide a summary of their FYP.

Summarising the FYP requires the students to summarise their final year project in term of objectives, aims or results of the project which crucial in making the conclusion section meaningful. These results were consistent with Rosalina [7], Maswana *et al.*, [33], Sheldon [34] and Bhattacharyya [38] whose stated conclusion section focused more on summarising the study, highlighting overall results and evaluating the study. From the study, it seemed that the students were aware of the moves that were needed in their FYPP.

Table 4
 Item 1 ‘Summarising the Final Year Project During Final Year Project Presentation Is Important for the Students.’

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Sometimes Important	1	3.0
	Quite Important	10	30.3
	Very Important	22	66.7
	Total	33	100.0

As shown in Table 5, item 2 emphasised the need ‘to present overall findings of the final year project in conclusion section’, which was the most popular choice among the FYP students. Eighteen (54.5%) out of 33 engineering students agreed that it was *Very Important* to present the overall findings of their FYP in conclusion section during their FYPP. Eleven students (33.3%) perceived that it was *Quite Important* while only 3 students thought it is *Sometimes Important* and 1 student thought it was *Not So Important*. While the majority of the students were aware of the importance of presenting the overall findings in the conclusion section of the FYPP, there were still students who did not take it as significance. Therefore, it would be expected that not every student would present an overall finding in conclusion section during their FYPP. Those who stressed the importance of the overall findings should focus on the intensity and quantity of a phenomena and improvement of their FYP process, as students are needed to make their arguments or demonstrate the certainty of their technical knowledge, as supported by Singh [1], Loi *et al.*, [6] and Rosalina [7].

Table 5
 Item 2 ‘It Is Important for Students to Present Overall Findings of Their Final Year Project in Conclusion Section.’

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Not So Important	1	3.0
	Sometimes Important	3	9.1
	Quite Important	11	33.3
	Very Important	18	54.5
	Total	33	100.0

It can be seen in Table 6, the pattern is descending again 14 (42.4%) students agreed that it was *very Important* for them to ‘refer to past research related to their final year project in the conclusion section’ during their FYPP. 11 (33.3%) agreed it was *Quite important*, followed by 6 (18.2%) saying that it was *Sometimes important* and 1 student each for *Not so important*, and *Not at all important*. Again, theoretically, majority of the students were aware they should refer to past research and yet, the awareness was not unanimous. This means that in the FYPP, there would be conclusions with no reference to past research although the FYP students were requested and had been advised by their supervisors to give supporting arguments by acknowledging similar findings in past research to support their data, results or end product of their FYP, which was consistent with Ruiz-Madrid *et al.*, [3], Artemeva *et al.*, [39], DiSanza, J.R. & Legge [14] and Qiu *et al.*, [40].

Table 6
 Item 3 ‘It is Important for Students to Making Reference to Past Research in Conclusion Section.’

	Frequency	Percent
Valid Not at all Important	1	3.0
Not So Important	1	3.0
Sometimes Important	6	18.2
Quite Important	11	33.3
Very Important	14	42.4
Total	33	100.0

Table 7 above shows 13 (39.4%) students seemed to admit that it was *Very Important* to ‘refer to issue related to their FYP in conclusion section’ during their FYPP. 12 (36.4%) agreed it was *Quite Important*, followed by 7 (21.2%) saying it was *Sometimes Important* and 1 student for *Not at all Important*. The current study found that the students must assertively engage with other perspectives on an issue with assertion by referring to existing knowledge related to FYP. Besides that, these students too have been moulded with a strong research report writing format as stated by Ruiz-Madrid *et al.*, [3] and Yusoff [23] in which they have transferred the format into their FYPP, thus it has become a must for them to present the same information as being written in the FYP report into their FYPP similar to Loi *et al.*, [6] and Rosalina [7].

Table 7
 Item 4 ‘It is Important for Students to Making Reference to Issues Related to Their Final Year Project in Conclusion Section

	Frequency	Percent
Valid Not at all Important	1	3.0
Sometimes Important	7	21.2
Quite Important	12	36.4
Very Important	13	39.4
Total	33	100.0

The results, as shown in Table 8, 18 (54.5%) engineering students seem to agree with ‘reiterating the objective/focus of the study in FYPP conclusion section’. 8 (24.2%) students chose *Quite Important*, 6 (18.2%) students agreed to *Sometimes Important* and 1 student *Not so Important*. It was necessary to them to reiterate the objective/focus of the study in conclusion section during their

FYPP. This pilot study produced results which corroborate the findings of the previous work in this field. According to earlier studies by Singh [1] and Loi *et al.*, [6], item 5 was essential for FYP engineering students as it would assist the students to state the certainty of the technical knowledge in presenting overall findings in terms of achieving the objectives or the aims of the project, besides it would assist the presenter to remind the listeners (the FYPP panels) of the objectives of the study and emphasised its significance.

Table 8
 Item 5 'It is Important for Students to Reiterating the Objective/Focus of the Study in Conclusion Section.'

	Frequency	Percent
ValidNot So Important	1	3.0
Sometimes Important	6	18.2
Quite Important	8	24.2
Very Important	18	54.5
Total	33	100.0

Item 6 in the questionnaire seeks the perception of the engineering FYP students regarding 'the importance of stating specific outcome of The FYP in conclusion section'. We could see that 17 (51.5%) students agreed that 'stating specific outcome of the final year project during conclusion section' was also *Very Important* in conclusion section. Twelve (36.4%) students chose *Quite Important* and 4 (12.1%) stated *Sometimes Important* to item 6. A concrete factor that influenced the FYP students to choose item 6 as very important was because they have been moulded to assert specific result/outcome from their FYP report, thus they had employed the same writing moves to their engineering presentation. This makes sense as these were similar results to Loi *et al.*, [6] and [34], as they mentioned that students were drawn to academically structured content-based type of presentation, they tend to uplift the moves from their FYP report to be used during their FYPP, which academically is being encouraged by the panels during their presentations.

Table 9
 Item 6 'It is a Must for a Student to Stating Specific Outcome of the Final Year Project in Conclusion Section.'

	Frequency	Percent
ValidSometimes Important	4	12.1
Quite Important	12	36.4
Very Important	17	51.5
Total	33	100.0

Table 10, emphasised the need to 'interpreting the outcome of the FYP in conclusion section'. Thirteen (39.4%) students each agreed that it was *Very Important* and *Quite Important* to item 7. While only 7 (21.2%) students stated *Sometimes Important*. The results of this study showed the need of FYP students to inscribe clarification for the outcome of their project. Through this result, we could see the importance for the students to be able to give clarification of their FYP outcome, as it would prove that they really understand their project inside out as stated in Kaur *et al.*, [41] and Mohamed *et al.*, [42].

Table 10

Item 7 'It is a Must for a Student to Interpreting the Outcome of the Final Year Project in Conclusion Section.'

	Frequency	Percent
Valid Sometimes Important	7	21.2
Quite Important	13	39.4
Very Important	13	39.4
Total	33	100.0

Based on the results shown in Table 11, that 15 (45.5%) out of 33 students believed that it was *Very Important* for them 'to indicate the significance of the outcome of the final year project in conclusion section'. Fourteen (42.4%) engineering students chose *Quite Important* while another 4 (12.1%) students thought it was *Sometimes Important*. To be able to emphasise their research gap and provide a favourable evaluation of the qualities of their study to the panels, seemed to be taken as crucial part to the engineering students, which would boost their marks if they were able to articulate it well during the FYPP this has also been mentioned by Sarah *et al.*, [43].

Table 11

Item 8 'It is a Must for a Student to Indicating Significance of the Outcome of the Final Year Project in Conclusion Section.'

	Frequency	Percent
Valid Sometimes Important	4	12.1
Quite Important	14	42.4
Very Important	15	45.5
Total	33	100.0

The results in Table 12 indicates that, 15 (45.5%) students believed it was vital for them 'to indicate limitation of the final year project in conclusion section'. Eleven (33.3%) students took it as *Quite Important*; 6 (18.2%) students chose *Sometimes Important* and 1 student thought it was *Not So Important*. as this was being highlighted in Rosalina [7], Ferrer-Pardo *et al.*, [15] and Bhattacharyya [44].

Table 12

Item 9 'It is a Must for a Student to Indicating Limitation of the Final Year Project in Conclusion Section'

	Frequency	Percent
Valid Not at all Important	1	3.0
Sometimes Important	6	18.2
Quite Important	11	33.3
Very Important	15	45.5
Total	33	100.0

On the other hand, 12 (36.4%) students seemed to acknowledge the importance of 'providing a counter-claim in the conclusion section of their final year project', as stated in item 10 (refer to Table 13). While 11 (33.3%) students stated *Quite Important*, 7 (21.2%) agreed it was *Sometime Important*, 2 (6.1%) students seemed to think it was *Not So Important* and 1 student stated *Not at all Important*. The students seemed to agree with this move as this would be the part that assists the students to

inscribe or evoke negative appreciation, data or reading on previously conducted research which may appear differently to the data or reading of the students in their FYP as mentioned in Singh [1] and Sèna *et al.*, [45]. Hence, this would portray the sufficient technical knowledge and effort that the students went through to complete the FYP as stated in Mohamed *et al.*, [42].

Table 13

Item 10 'It is a Must for a Student to Provide a Counter-Claim of the Final Year Project in Conclusion Section

	Frequency	Percent
Valid Not at all Important	1	3.0
Not So Important	2	6.1
Sometimes Important	7	21.2
Quite Important	11	33.3
Very Important	12	36.4
Total	33	100.0

Table 14 illustrates those 12 (36.4%) students both agreed that 'to give justification of the FYP in conclusion section' is Very Important and Quite Important. While 7 (21.2%) students chose Sometimes Important and 2 (6.1%) students thought it was Not So Important. This was the most interesting finding in the present study. As the engineering students seemed to be torn between weighing to justify or not to justify their FYP in the conclusion section. Justifying the FYP assists the students to claim their FYP position by accentuating technical points by referring to previous research or project which can strengthen the reasons why the students doing the project.

Table 14

Item 11 'It is a must for a student to give justification of the final year project in conclusion section.'

	Frequency	Percent
Valid Not So Important	2	6.1
Sometimes Important	7	21.2
Quite Important	12	36.4
Very Important	12	36.4
Total	33	100.0

Distinguishing from the previous items, item 12 as seen in Table 15, 13 (39.4%) students acknowledged that was it was crucial for them 'to provide an explanation of the final year project in conclusion section' and 11 (33.3%) students thought it was Quite Important. Almost like item 11, item 12 needs the students to disclaim the presenter's position by emphasising technical points without needing to refer to the previous research or project as mentioned by Mohamed *et al.*, [42].

Table 15
 Item 12 'It is a Must for a Student to Provide an Explanation of the Final Year Project in Conclusion Section.'

	Frequency	Percent
ValidNot at all Important	2	6.1
Sometimes Important	7	21.2
Quite Important	11	33.3
Very Important	13	39.4
Total	33	100.0

Table 16 depicts 9 (27.3%) engineering students admitted that it was Very Important for students 'to provide pedagogical/practical/theoretical implications of the final year project in conclusion section'. Majority of the FYP students with total number of 13 (39.4%) chose Quite Important, 7 (21.2%) agreed to Sometimes Important and only 4 (12.1%) agreed to Not So Important. Item 13 was created to assist the FYP students 'to assert a claim on the implications of their FYPP conclusion section. The present findings, however, contradict the earlier work. According to Bhattacharyya [38] and Bhattacharyya, E. and Zainal [46] in their studies stated that to assert a claim on the pedagogical, practical or theoretical implication of the present study was not significant to the students as well as engineers. This somehow might have an impact on the outcome of the present study.

Table 16
 Item 13 'It is a Must for a Student to Provide Pedagogical/Practical/Theoretical Implications of the Final Year Project in Conclusion Section.'

	Frequency	Percent
ValidNot So Important	4	12.1
Sometimes Important	7	21.2
Quite Important	13	39.4
Very Important	9	27.3
Total	33	100.0

Finally, for item 14 in Table 17, 13 (39.4%) engineering students agreed that it was Very Important to provide suggestion(s) for future research in conclusion section' during their FYPP. Shockingly, 15 (45.5%) engineering students seemed to acknowledge it was Quite Important followed by 4 (12.1%) students agreed to Sometimes Important and 1 student stated Not So Important. The students didn't appear to be able to relate to item 14 because it required them to lower a valuation or elicit approval for future study recommendations. In contrast, research by Bhattacharyya [44] found that engineers and students both agreed on the need of realising the need to "propose recommendations pertinent for consideration in a presentation." As for the current study the students seemed to find it hard to give suggestion for the betterment of their project. This is due to the stigma of their project is being taken as top notch and there's no need for improvement.

Table 17
It is a Must for a Student to Provide
Suggestion(s) for Future Research in
Conclusion Section

	Frequency	Percent
Valid	33	100.0
Not So Important	1	3.0
Sometimes Important	4	12.1
Quite Important	15	45.5
Very Important	13	39.4
Total	33	100.0

From the data above we could conclude that engineering students agreed summarising the FYP (item 1), present overall findings (item 2), making reference to past research (item 3), making reference to issues related to FYP (item 4), reiterating the objective/focus of the study (item 5), stating specific outcome (item 6), interpreting the outcome (item 7), indicate significance of the outcome (item 8), indicate limitation (item 9), provide a counter-claim (item 10) and provide an explanation of the FYP (item 12) in the conclusion section.

4. Conclusion

The aim of this pilot study was mainly to investigate students' perception towards good characteristics of conclusion section in final year project presentation. The findings indicate that engineering final year project students acknowledge the importance of good characteristics of conclusion section in final year project presentation to enhance communicative competence, especially in their final year project presentations. They could identify the importance and good traits of conclusion moves that they think were needed to be included in conclusion section during their final year project presentations, which reflected of their awareness of genre knowledge of conclusion section in the final year project. The findings were useful to suggest enhancement in the assessment rubric so that it could be detailed for the students to improve their presentation as well as report writing. Besides that, students' feedback revealed a positive indication with a call for enhancement in the current conclusion section in FYPP courses offered in the university college. Moreover, there should be research that investigates the perception of supervisors and panels of the final year project presentation to get a deeper insight into their perception of the students' conclusion section during the final year project presentations. From that, a holistic conclusion could be made on the moves and steps to be used in conclusion section for final year project presentation.

Acknowledgement

This research was not funded by any grant.

References

- [1] Kaur, Kuldip, and P. Maktiar Singh. "A Genre Analysis of Academic Oral Presentations of ESL Undergraduates at a Public University in Malaysia." (2019).
- [2] Singh, Kuldip Kaur Makhtiar, Afida Mohamad Ali, Mei Yuit Chan, and Helen Tan. "A genre-based investigation of the introduction sections of academic oral presentations." *Asian Journal of University Education* 15, no. 2 (2019): 94-124. <https://doi.org/10.24191/ajue.v15i2.7559>
- [3] Ruiz-Madrid, Noelia, and Julia Valeiras-Jurado. "Developing multimodal communicative competence in emerging academic and professional genres." *International Journal of English Studies* 20, no. 1 (2020): 27-50. <https://doi.org/10.6018/ijes.401481>

- [4] Radzuan, Noor Raha Mohd, and Sarjit Kaur. "Technical oral presentations in English: Qualitative analysis of Malaysian engineering undergraduates' sources of anxiety." *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences* 29 (2011): 1436-1445. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.11.383>
- [5] Rajprasit, Krich, Panadda Pratoomrat, and Tuntiga Wang. "Perceptions and Problems of English Language and Communication Abilities: A Final Check on Thai Engineering Undergraduates." *English Language Teaching* 8, no. 3 (2015): 111-120. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v8n3p111>
- [6] Loi, Chek-Kim, Jason Miin-Hwa Lim, and Sue Wharton. "Expressing an evaluative stance in English and Malay research article conclusions: International publications versus local publications." *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 21 (2016): 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2015.08.004>
- [7] Rosalina, Utami. "Students' use of Discourse Markers in Oral Presentations." *markers* 1, no. 1 (2022): 36-44. <https://doi.org/10.58660/edutrack.v1i1.38>
- [8] Seals, Douglas R. "Talking the talk: tips for effective oral presentations in biomedical research." *American Journal of Physiology-Regulatory, Integrative and Comparative Physiology* 323, no. 4 (2022): R496-R511. <https://doi.org/10.1152/ajpregu.00179.2022>
- [9] Puji, Muslimah. "An Analysis of Students' Self-Confidence In English Oral Presentations." PhD diss., UIN Ar-Raniry Fakultas Tarbiyah dan Keguruan, 2022.
- [10] Yusoff, Mariana. "Analysing Communication Competence in Oral Presentations: Engineering Students' experiences." *Journal of Human Capital Development (JHCD)* 3, no. 1 (2010): 99-117.
- [11] Srinon, Udomkrit. "Analysis of Generic Structure Developments of Exposition Essays Written by Thai University Students: Sydney Genre-Based School and Systemic Functional Linguistics Perspectives." *Veridian E-Journal, Silpakorn University (Humanities, Social Sciences and arts)* 12, no. 1 (2019): 1173-1192.
- [12] อุดม กฤษณ์ศรีนนท์, and สุพัตรา สุจริต รัชช. "An Analysis of Generic Structure Potential (GSP) of Thai Undergraduate Students' Oral English Presentation: A Genre Perspective." *วารสาร สังคมศาสตร์บูรณาการ มหาวิทยาลัยมหิดล* 7, no. 1 (2020): 40-60.
- [13] DiSanza, James R. *Business and Professional Communication: Plans, Processes, and Performance, 4/e*. Pearson Education India, 2005.
- [14] DiSanza, James R., and Nancy J. Legge. "Business and professional communication: plans, processes, and performance." (*No Title*).
- [15] Ferrer-Pardo, Víctor Raul, Irene Jimenez-Perez, Marina Gil-Calvo, Pedro Pérez-Soriano, and Jose Ignacio Priego-Quesada. "Relationship between Students' Perception of a Rubric for Oral Presentations and Their Academic Characteristics." *Education Sciences* 12, no. 11 (2022): 765. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci12110765>
- [16] Benraghda, Abdelmadjid, Noor Raha Mohd Radzuan, and Fatima Ali Salah Lardhi. "Self-assessment as a self-regulated learning approach in English oral presentations: College students' choices and perceptions." *Cogent Education* 9, no. 1 (2022): 2123472. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2022.2123472>
- [17] Fonseca, William D'Andrea, Eric Brandão, Paulo H. Mareze, Viviane SG Melo, Roberto A. Tenenbaum, Christian dos Santos, and Dinara Paixão. "Acoustical engineering: A complete academic undergraduate program in Brazil." *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 152, no. 2 (2022): 1180-1191. <https://doi.org/10.1121/10.0013570>
- [18] Ming, Xian Zhu. "Developing oral presentation skills in ELT classroom." *Celea Journal* 28, no. 2 (2005): 118-120.
- [19] Benraghda, Abdelmadjid, Zuraina Ali, and Noor Raha Mohd Radzuan. "Investigating the Relationship Between Undergraduates' Attitude And Their Oral Performance Scors In English Oral Presentation In Academic Context." (2015).
- [20] Zareva, Alla. "'And so that was it': Linking adverbials in student academic presentations." *RELC Journal* 42, no. 1 (2011): 5-15. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688210390664>
- [21] Zappa-Hollman, Sandra. "Academic presentations across post-secondary contexts: The discourse socialization of non-native English speakers." *Canadian Modern Language Review* 63, no. 4 (2007): 455-485. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.63.4.455>
- [22] Ngah, Ezihaslinda, and Siti Hamin Stapa. "Exploring the relationship between interactional competence and group oral communication." *International Journal of Language Education and Applied Linguistics* (2019): 55-65. <https://doi.org/10.15282/ijleal.v9.300>
- [23] Yusoff, Mariana. "Analysing communication competence: Malaysian engineering students' experiences of English oral presentations." PhD diss., 2010.
- [24] Seliman, Salbiah. "The genre and the genre expectations of engineering oral presentations related to academic and professional contexts." (1996).
- [25] Živković, Slađana. "The importance of oral presentations for university students." *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences* 5, no. 19 (2014): 468. <https://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2014.v5n19p468>

- [26] Kite, Yuriko. "Language use by engineers at an academic conference." *Kansai University for Human Activity Theory Research Center CHAT Technical Reports* 7 (2008): 75-89.
- [27] Dubois, Betty Lou. "The use of slides in biomedical speeches." *The ESP Journal* 1, no. 1 (1980): 45-50. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0272-2380\(80\)90009-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0272-2380(80)90009-8)
- [28] Adel, Seyyed Mohammad Reza, and Rokhsareh Ghorbani Moghadam. "A comparison of moves in conclusion sections of research articles in psychology, Persian literature and applied linguistics." *Teaching English Language* 9, no. 2 (2015): 167-191.
- [29] Ruiying, Yang, and Desmond Allison. "Research articles in applied linguistics: Moving from results to conclusions." *English for specific purposes* 22, no. 4 (2003): 365-385. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906\(02\)00026-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(02)00026-1)
- [30] Fraenkel, Jack, Norman Wallen, and Helen Hyun. *How to design and evaluate research in education (10th ed.)*. McGraw-Hill, 2018.
- [31] 'Typical Research Genre Structure ('), no. May, pp. 2–3, 2015.
- [32] Alamri, Basim M. "Connecting genre-based and corpus-driven approaches in research articles: A comparative study of moves and lexical bundles in Saudi and international journals." PhD diss., The University of New Mexico, 2017.
- [33] Maswana, Sayako, Toshiyuki Kanamaru, and Akira Tajino. "Move analysis of research articles across five engineering fields: What they share and what they do not." *Ampersand* 2 (2015): 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amper.2014.12.002>
- [34] Sheldon, Elena. "Dialogic spaces of knowledge construction in research article Conclusion sections written by English L1, English L2 and Spanish L1 writers." *Ibérica: Revista de la Asociación Europea de Lenguas para Fines Específicos (AELFE)* 35 (2018): 13-40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2018.11.002>
- [35] Swales, John M., and Christine B. Feak. *Academic writing for graduate students*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1994.
- [36] Swales, John M., and Christine B. Feak. *Academic writing for graduate students: Essential tasks and skills*. Vol. 1. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 2004.
- [37] Creswell, John W., and J. David Creswell. *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage publications, 2017.
- [38] Bhattacharyya, Ena. "Walk the talk: Technical oral presentations of engineers in the 21st century." *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences* 123 (2014): 344-352. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.01.1432>
- [39] Artemeva, Natasha, and Janna Fox. "Awareness versus production: Probing students' antecedent genre knowledge." *Journal of Business and Technical Communication* 24, no. 4 (2010): 476-515. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1050651910371302>
- [40] Qiu, Xuyan, and Feng Kevin Jiang. "Stance and engagement in 3MT presentations: How students communicate disciplinary knowledge to a wide audience." *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 51 (2021): 100976. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2021.100976>
- [41] Kaur, Kuldip, and Afida Mohamad Ali. "Exploring the genre of academic oral presentations: A critical review." *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature* 7, no. 1 (2018): 152-162. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.7n.1p.152>
- [42] Mohamed, Abdullah Adnan, and Adelina Asmawi. "Understanding engineering undergraduates' technical oral presentation: Challenges and perspectives." *International Journal of Language Education and Applied Linguistics* (2018). <https://doi.org/10.15282/ijleal.v8.529>
- [43] Benson, Sarah Lynn, and Leila Keyvani Someh. "GIFTS: The secret is in the details. Improving oral presentation skills with a peer and self-assessed feedback module." In *2022 First-Year Engineering Experience*. 2022.
- [44] E. Bhattacharyya, 'A case study of stakeholder perceptions on comm competence in engineering technical oral presentation', pp. i–591, 2014. <http://studentsrepo.um.edu.my/id/eprint/4597>
- [45] Hindeme Ulrich Orlando Sèna and Iwikotan Katchédé Etienne, 'Fostering Students' Critical Thinking Skills in EFL Advanced Classroom', *Studies in English Language Teaching*, vol. 10, no. 3, p. p94, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.22158/selt.v10n3p94>
- [46] Bhattacharyya, E., and A. Z. Zainal. "What do students and engineers have to say about communicative competence in technical oral presentations." *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities* 23, no. August (2015): 123-142.