

## CHAPTER V

### CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

The main purpose of the present study was to analyze the rhetorical functions of citations and the transitivity system of citations in the Discussion of two articles on citation practice taken from *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*. Despite the scope, it was found that attribution, comparison with sources, and establishing links between sources were the rhetorical functions used in the Discussion section of the present study, among other functions, supporting previous studies on rhetorical functions by Mansourizadeh & Ahmad's (2011) and Petrić's (2007), although the distribution of each function varies, in that Article 1 writers considerably lean more towards comparison with sources, rather than attribution, which is more prominent in Article 2. Given how attribution is the most rhetorically simple citation function as it is not integrated directly into the writer's argument, this result was expected. It is necessary to note that comparison with sources was revealed to be the function that was similarly employed the most as to allow the writers of the article to interpret the findings of their study in relation to the existing framework of knowledge, showing that both attribution and comparison with sources are equally important in the Discussions section of both articles.

In addition to rhetorical functions, transitivity analysis was performed to understand how the citations are shaped in the articles. In light of the genre analysis, each rhetorical function its own communicative purpose, which can serve to help understand the ways of communicating in a discourse community.

As can be seen from the findings, various types of processes were used to communicate with readers. As there is not enough sample of establishing links between sources to draw conclusion from in the present study, only the transitivity system of comparison with sources and attribution are inferred.

In comparison with sources, verbal processes were the most prominent type of process, followed by relational, material, and mental processes. Verbal processes in comparison with sources were found to be used when the writers describe previous studies in relation to their work. This could be linked to the writers' authoritativeness, which is significant in strengthening their argument under discussion. Relational processes serve to explain how the findings are associated with other relevant findings, while also retreating from interpersonal utterances. Additionally, material processes are involved with clauses of "doing". It is acknowledged that this process is expected to be written in terms of a detailed description of the statistical devices used to support the generalizable findings. By doing so, this process represents object-oriented processes and lacks interpersonal clauses, like mental processes, which considerably have lower frequencies.

On the other hand, relational processes were the most frequent type of process encountered in the attribution function, followed by material, verbal, and mental processes. The writers seem to depend on relational processes more in this function to underline the accuracy of information. Material processes were used in this particular function in order to report the findings of the study on how the participants used the

citations. The low frequencies of mental and verbal processes support the tonal style of objectivity throughout the function.

In any case, the findings of this research have confirmed the relation between the use of rhetorical functions and transitivity analysis for understanding how citations are shaped in texts. Transitivity analysis in the present study revealed how the communicative purpose of each function can be realized by different process types. The findings therefore suggest that rhetorical functions of citations and transitivity of citations should receive more attention in the field of written academic discourse. It is recommended that future studies on the transitivity of citations should be carried out to explore the similarities and differences in the field of written academic discourse. Further, analyzing individual journals would offer insights to comprehend the communicative effects on discursive variations.