

CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH FINDING AND DISCUSSION

This chapter reports about the research findings and discussion of the analysis of metadiscourse categories in thesis abstracts. It is intended to answer the problems of the study. The findings are based on the data which were taken from thesis abstracts and interview. Then, the discussions are based on the result of the data analysis.

A. Research Finding

This research analyzed the metadiscourse categories in thesis abstracts of English Teacher Education Department Students. It also analyzed the metadiscourse categories that frequently appeared in thesis abstracts and its possible cause of frequently appears.

Document analysis and interview were utilized to investigate the research questions. The data was gained from English Teacher Education Department Students' Thesis Abstract year 2014-2016, with certain topic. It was collected from the digital library of UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya (www.digilib.uinsby.ac.id). The topic of thesis abstracts taken was only about writing analysis. Thus, this study analyzed 9 thesis abstracts. The results of the findings are classified based on the research questions of the study.

1. The Metadiscourse Categories Used in English Teacher Education Department Students' Thesis Abstracts

To answer the first research question about the metadiscourse categories used in English Teacher Education Department Students' thesis abstracts, the data had been collected through examining graduated students' thesis abstracts. These data were examined using Hyland's metadiscourse model which is divided into two main categories, they are interactive metadiscourse and interactional metadiscourse. Based on the findings, there were 114 items of metadiscourse in 9 thesis abstracts examined, consisting of 60 interactive categories and 54 interactional categories. The details on metadiscourse use are presented in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1 Metadiscourse Use

No	Metadiscourse Categories	Abstracts Documents									Total
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	
	Interactive	4	6	10	8	10	5	7	4	5	60
1.	Transitions	2	4	8	2	3	3	5	1	1	29
2.	Frame Markers	1	1	1	1	6	1	2	2	1	16
3.	Endophoric Markers	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4.	Evidential	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
5.	Code Glosses	2	-	1	5	1	1	-	1	3	14
	Interactional	5	6	5	9	8	5	3	5	8	54
6.	Hedges	-	2	1	1	5	2	-	2	2	15
7.	Boosters	2	1	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	6
8.	Attitude Markers	-	-	-	1	1	2	-	-	-	4
9.	Self-mentions	3	3	3	6	1	-	3	3	6	28
10.	Engagement Markers	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
	Total	9	12	15	17	18	10	10	9	13	114

As seen in table 4.1, there were 9 thesis abstracts which were coded by alphabetical A to I. As a result, there were four sub-categories of interactive metadiscourse and five sub-categories of interactional metadiscourse. It means a metadiscourse category did not appear in examined thesis abstracts. The further explanation will be discussed below.

a. Interactive Metadiscourse

Interactive metadiscourse allow the writer to help the reader to correctly interpret the text by managing information flow. There are five sub-categories of metadiscourse categories. However, in this study, the researcher found four sub-categories of interactive metadiscourse employed in thesis abstracts, they are transitions, frame markers, evidentials and code glosses. Unfortunately, there was not any use of endophoric markers in thesis abstracts.

Table 4.2 Transitions Markers

No.	Remarks	Total
1	Because	9
2	Since	3
3	Moreover	2
4	Thus	2
5	However	2
6	Therefore	2
7	and	2
8	Furthermore	1
9	So	1
10	Hence	1
11	On the other hand	1
12	Meanwhile	1
13	Not Only ... But Also	1
14	Still	1
	Total	29

2) Frame Markers

Next category is frame markers. The total frame markers used in thesis abstracts is 16 items. All of students are known used this category. The higher number used is 6 items of frame markers applied in a thesis abstract. Here are the analysis results of frame markers.

Table 4.3 Frame Markers

No.	Remarks	Total
1	Focus on/focused on/focuses on	4
2	Aim to	3
3	In this case	2
4	Intends to	2
5	The objective of the study	1
6	Attempts to	1
7	Firstly	1

8	Then	1
9	Goal	1
	Total	16

Code glosses offer valuable resources in order to clarify the presumably ambiguous terms and concepts briefly and extensively through defining, reformulating and exemplifying. It can be also noted by using parentheses to explain the terms.

b. Interactional Metadiscourse

There are 54 interactional items out of 114 items of metadiscourse, which means lower than interactive metadiscourse that get 60 items out of 114 metadiscourse items. In contrast with interactive metadiscourse, the thesis abstracts applied all interactive metadiscourse.

1) Hedges

Hedges allow the writer to present information as an opinion or plausible reasoning rather than fact. From 114 metadiscourse found, there are 15 hedges found in thesis abstracts. It is the second highest metadiscourse appeared in interactional metadiscourse.

Table 4.6 Hedges

No.	Remarks	Total
1	Most	3
2	It could/can	3
3	Indicates	2
4	Concluded/	2
5	They would/it would be better	2

5) Engagement Markers

This category explicitly addresses readers to draw them into the discourse by addressing them as participants in an argument with reader pronouns such as *you*, *your*, *we*. It can also be noted by obligation modals such as *should*, *must*, *have to*, etc.

Table 4.10 Engagement Markers

No.	Remarks	Total
1	Should	1
	Total	1

2. The Metadiscourse which Frequently Appeared in Thesis Abstracts

In previous section, it was found four sub-categories of interactive metadiscourse (*transitions, frame markers, evidential, and code glosses*) and five sub-categories of interactional metadiscourse (*hedges, boosters, attitude markers, self-mentions and engagement marker*). The frequency use of each category was various. It meant, there was metadiscourse

in this case, *the researcher* and *the writer*. Besides, by using authorial presence such as *the researcher* and *the writer*, it seemed more formal than using personal pronoun like “I”. Thus, the possible causes of frequent metadiscourse categories appeared in thesis abstracts are presented in following findings section.

3. The Possible Causes of Frequent Metadiscourse Appeared in Thesis Abstracts

Third research question asked about possible causes of frequent metadiscourse appears in thesis abstracts. In this study, the researcher used interview to answer this research question. The interview asked based on the frequent metadiscourse categories appears. Based on the data findings in previous section, there are two metadiscourse categories frequently appears in English Teacher Education Department students' thesis abstracts, those are Transitions, and Self-mentions.

From 9 students of examined thesis abstracts, the researcher only could get in touch with 6 graduated students to interview. The interview was about students' awareness of their thesis abstracts' readers, and possible causes of frequent metadiscourse appeared in thesis abstracts. Some of them had similar statements about the questions asked.

One of the key principles of metadiscourse is about writer-reader interaction. It means, in writers' view, writers need to engage and

Second, self-mentions were used because it was only made their writing more formal, *the researcher* and *the writer* are common usage of self-mentions in English Teacher Education Department, and telling the reader that the abstract was written by the researcher. As the students stated below:

56

(Student E)

b) *“Sometimes using self-mentions are important. But for me, I needed to consider the repetition of self-mentions. Using too many self-mentions in abstract made it was not nice to read”* (Student G)

Thus, while the more students might have been slightly more comfortable using self-mentions, few of them saw it as inappropriate for them, believing that too many self-mentions made the thesis abstract was boring and tiff, also it was not nice to read.

B. Research Discussion

Just in case of having similar understanding between the reader and the researcher regarding the finding of the research, this section review those findings by displaying on some theories connected to each following problem. Thus, the discussion is classified based on the research questions of the study.

1. The Metadiscourse Categories Used in English Teacher Education Department Students' Thesis Abstracts

As stated in the background, abstract abstract becomes crucial since readers always read it before reading the entire paper. It becomes the last thing that students write after finishing their thesis, but it will be the first thing that readers seek. Nevertheless, the content of abstract is more important because if it is lack of information about their research, the reader can be able to stop reading their abstract even their thesis.¹ In line with the problem, this study focused on examining the content of thesis abstracts through the metadiscourse categories existence.

This study uses Hyland's model because his metadiscourse model is based on the research in academic discourse, which makes the model more concrete and more influential. Besides, it is also more updated than other models of metadiscourse. It is also noted by Abdi, Hyland's model is highly preferred in modern metadiscourse studies for being recent, simple, clear and comprehensive.²

In this case, the researcher investigated the metadiscourse categories of English Teacher Education Department Students' thesis abstracts. The researcher found that students of English Teacher Education

¹ Latifatul Fajriyah, *Thesis: "Representation of Rhetorical Move of Thesis Abstracts in English Teacher Education Departement"*, (Surabaya:UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya, 2015). P. 51

² R. Abdi. "Metadiscourse Strategies in Research Articles: A Study of the Differences across Subsections". In *The Journal of Teaching Language Skills* 3 (1), Spring 2011, Ser. 62/4, p. 5.

- a) *“Error is commonly happen in English learning process **because** the rules of Bahasa Indonesia and English was different.”* (Student A – Line 3 – See Appendix 4)
- b) *“Writing is the most difficult skill in English learning process **and** has close relationship with higher education.”* (Student D – Line 2 – See Appendix 4)
- c) *“....., the difficulty is **not only** in generating and organizing ideas, **but also** in translating these ideas into readable text”* (Student B – Line 9 – Appendix 4)
- d) *“**Moreover**, argumentative skill is needed for university student.* (Student H – Line 3 – See Appendix 4)
- e) *“**However**, building a good writing is not simple enough.”* (Student G – Line 2 – See Appendix 4)
- f) *“**In the other hand**, researcher found that there were 25% were in good and 27% students were in bad.”* (Student G – Line 22 – See Appendix 4)
- g) *“**Thus**, the students’ ability to write logical argument in argumentative essay is high is accepted.”* (Student C – Line – See Appendix 4)

According to Hyland, transition markers are divided into three types, they are addition, comparison, and consequence.⁵ In the examined

⁵ Ken Hyland. *Metadiscourse: Exploring interaction in writing*. (London: Continuum, 2005, p. 50.

Unlike hedges boosters help writers to express with certainty what they have to say. It expresses certainty instead of doubt.¹⁴ The form of *shows*, *there is no doubt*, and *in fact*, show the certainty of writers in writing argument. As seen in sentence (a) the form *shows* explain that the error are part of the process of second language acquisition is a certainty. Also in sentence (b) student B without doubt argued that writing skill is the most difficult skill for second language acquisitions.

- a) *“The error, which is made by the students, **shows** the process of second language acquisition.”* (Student A – Line 2 – See Appendix 4)
- b) *“**There is no doubt** that writing is the most difficult skill for second language learners to master.”* (Student B – Line 8 – See Appendix 4)
- c) *“**In fact**, most students got C in writing subject without knowing in which part they were wrong. By their not understanding.”* (Student E – Line 4 – See Appendix 4)

Attitude markers express the writer's appraisal of propositional information, conveying surprise obligation, agreement, importance, and so on. The sentences below are sample of attitude markers used in thesis abstracts.

¹⁴ Malcolm William, "Translating Metadiscourse: An Explanatory Analysis of Problems in Students' Work", *Mutatis Mutandis*. Vol. 3, No. 1. 73-90. 2010, p.78

- a) *“The researcher **directly** asked the students’ assignment that they get in the middle test to the lecturer of the classes.”* (Student D – Line 24 – See Appendix 4)
- b) *“**Unfortunately**, only 37 of 83 paragraphs became the data in this study because 46 students rejected.”* (Student E – Line 13 – See Appendix 4)
- c) *“**Consequently**, those errors make students’ grammatical accuracy value varied from one student to other students.”* (Student F – Line 18 – See Appendix 4)

Unfortunately, the use of attitude markers only found four times in examined thesis abstracts. The possible reasons of use of attitude markers could be that as non-expert writers, they were not too confident in projecting their voice into their writings nor too critical of the propositions forwarded.¹⁵

use of transitions, representing internal connections in the discourse, it is clearly an important category of academic argument.¹⁸ Equally Hyland also states that self-mention also plays a far more visible role in the soft disciplines such as humanities and social¹⁹, which in this case is education.

3. The Possible Causes of Frequent Metadiscourse Appeared in Thesis Abstracts

In analyzing possible causes of frequent metadiscourse appeared in English Teacher Education students' thesis abstracts, the researcher used interview guideline. To know the possible reason of students who used more certain metadiscourse categories in their thesis, she interviewed 6 of 9 students whose the thesis abstracts were chosen to examined due to the other 3 students could not be contacted before.

Metadiscourse is a new thing for the students. All of them did not know that they applied metadiscourse categories in their abstracts. However, few of them stated that they thought about their readers when writing thesis abstracts, whether the readers would easy to understand their abstracts or not. Hyland in Amiryousefi argues that the use of

¹⁸ Ken Hyland, Polly Tse, "Metadiscourse in Academic Writing: A Reappraisal", *Applied Linguistics*, 25(2), 2004, p.170

¹⁹ Ken Hyland, "Disciplinary interactions: metadiscourse in L2 postgraduate writing", *Journal of Second Language Writing* 13, 2004, 145.

metadiscourse categories allows writers to intrude in their texts to signal their communicative intentions, and affect the ways these intentions are understood by their readers.²⁰

