

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This chapter discusses the general idea or the background of the study, research questions, the purpose of the study, the scope of the study, and the significance of the study.

1.1. Background of the study

The term of writer-reader interaction or the way how writer builds a relationship with the reader through his writing, has become popular study called Metadiscourse. "Metadiscourse embodies the idea that communication is more than just the exchange of information, goods or services, but also involves the personalities, attitudes and assumptions of those who are communicating" (Hyland,2005:3)." Meaning that, the writers have a responsibility to make the text interactive, friendly and acceptable to the reader. In order to do that, the writer should anticipate his readers' expectations and try to engage them in their texts and affect their understandings of them. To avoid misunderstanding of interpretation between writer and the reader, the writer helps them to correctly interpret what the writer trying to deliver by using some markers. Interactive and Interactional metadiscourse are two types of metadiscourse based on Hyland (2005). Interactive markers focuses on how the writer helps to guide the reader through the text, whereas interactional markers focuses on how the writer involves the reader into the arguments.

For academician, either researcher, under-graduate, or post-graduate students, academic article such as journal article is important because their promotion and/or acceptance to higher education programs is somehow depend on the number of journal articles they can publish in prestigious journals related to their discipline. As cited from Hartley (2008), journal articles as one of academic writing should be impersonal and unnecessary complicated but easy to follow. In other words, an easy to follow journal articles facilitates the readers to acquire their knowledge easier in order to write their own journal articles. The idea of audience in writing a text is a difficult task of a writer or a researcher, but it makes a clear sense to construct a communicative text in order to make journal articles that are easy to follow. Metadiscourse is a device that refers to an interesting approach to conceptualizing interactions between text producers and their texts and between text producers and users (audience). Then, the features or markers of metadiscourse that help writer construct a communicative text is code glosses markers.

Code glosses is a part of interactive metadiscourse used to ensure the audience understood the information that has been said by supplying additional information by rephrasing, explaining, or elaborating the intension of the writer (Hyland, 2005). So, by using code glosses markers in the text, the readers become more involved and active as they read. Considering the important role of code glosses in writing, the researcher tries to explore the significance of metadiscourse elements in journal articles, which is code glosses.

Several studies have been conducted either in the field of metadiscourse or code glosses. First, Hyland and Tse conducted a research in Metadiscourse area in

2004. They analyzed 240 dissertations; 20 masters and 20 doctoral dissertations from each six academic disciplines with total 4 million words. According to the frequency especially in interactive metadiscourse, the code glosses took in the third place from all academic disciplines.

Another researcher that also has a metadiscourse study is Farzannia and Farnia. In 2016, they try to examine English mining engineering articles written by Iranian and native English authors in the field of metadiscourse features such as interactive and interactional. The corpus is 68 articles written in English, 34 articles from native English researchers and 34 from Iranian researchers.

The results showed that both interactive and interactional metadiscourse features applied in Iranian and English Native articles. Interactional metadiscourse is applied well in English native articles rather than English Persian articles (1910 versus 1757), in contrary, interactive metadiscourse is applied more in English Persian article than English Native articles (512 versus 467). Then, for the code glosses itself, the use of code glosses in English authors is more than in Persian authors. There are 213 markers of code glosses in English author whereas in Persian author only applied 171 markers. Based on the frequency in interactive metadiscourse, code glosses is in the third position after transition and evidential markers in both English and Persian authors.

We have seen the researches in the field of metadiscourse. In this study, the researcher will focus on code glosses which has been conducted by some researchers. First, in 2007, Hyland conducted a study on code glosses that appears

to be the researcher reference. He conducted the study to Academic discourse of different disciplines. Based on the main function category, exemplifications function has the lead. And among reformulation function, there is a misbalance of use of reformulation markers. The underuse of paraphrase function and overuse of specification function would lead to the less effectiveness of potential messages writer to deliver.

Another research titled A Cross-Disciplinary analysis of Code Glosses in Pakistani Academic Writing conducted by Yasmin & Mahmood. They conducted a research entitled A Cross-Disciplinary analysis of Code Glosses in Pakistani Academic Writing. This study attempted to explore the frequency and functions of code glosses in the introduction section of the academic writing of Pakistani Postgraduate Students. The corpus used in this research comprised of introduction section of 235 research dissertations of Ph.D and M.phil level. These research dissertations were selected from three major faculties: social sciences, humanities and sciences. Results revealed that the writers use more code glosses in the discipline of science than in humanities and social sciences. In those research dissertations, reformulation is applied more than exemplification. The frequency total of reformulation in all dissertations is 2108.01 whereas exemplification only 94.01.

The next study from Dehghan and Chalak in 2016 titled Code Glosses in Academic Writing: The Comparison of Iranian and Native Authors. They decided to find out whether native English speakers and Iranians use code glosses as a sub-category of metadiscourse similarly in their academic writings. The data was

introduction section of 30 journal articles written by native and Iranian non-native English authors. They were analyzed using both descriptive and inferential statistics were used to answer the research question of this study. Then, to answer the research question of the study, frequency tables, and charts were used to display the data, a Chi-square test was run because the collected data were frequency counts. The result of this study showed that there is no significant difference between Native and Iranian writers even though Native writers used code glosses markers more with total 97 code glosses than Iranian writers with 85 code glosses. Then, both Native and Iranian writers applied more reformulations rather than exemplification. And the last study of code glosses is conducted by English Department students, Fauzan Ahmad in 2015. He analyzed the code glosses in literature review of *skripsi* in Education and Literature program. The result is Education program used code glosses more with total 119 code glosses rather than Literature Program with total 89 code glosses. Then, the explanation markers has the highest appearance code glosses with total 102 appearances.

Finally, based on above-mentioned discussion a number of studies have been conducted, the researcher decides to conduct the study of code glosses in journal article written by Indonesian and English Native speaker. Because the researchers want to see the difference in the use of code glosses whether this study would produce the same results with prior research. In two previous studies, where his research was between Iranian and English native authors in the research article. The result found that the study conducted by Rahimpour (2013) between Iranian and English Native research article, the result revealed that code glosses used more

in the Iranian research article rather than in English Native research article. In other hand, in the study conducted by Dehghan and Chalak (2016) who also conduct the research between Iranian and English Native journal articles revealed that code glosses is used more in the English Native research article rather than Iranian research article. From those studies, the researcher decides to explore more the use of code glosses between Indonesia and English native journal articles. Besides that, the researcher also analyzes how the code glosses used in terms of context and function. This is also different from the previous study because the context and function of code glosses has not been touched yet by other researchers.

Moreover, in this case, the researcher wants to find out more the code glosses in discussion section of the Indonesian and English Native Applied Linguistics journal articles. The journals are taken from Oxford University Press (OUP), E-journal UPI, and EBSCOhost websites. The journals are randomly taken from the sources. Regardless of the many or at least metadiscourse in discussion part, discussion section is a crucial part which is the place for interpreting findings of a study. In this section, the researcher try to interpret how the findings answer the research question along with how the findings will affect the precious or next studies on the particular or related topic. Then, being able to analyze the code glosses between Indonesian and English Native speakers, help us reflect and learn from the English Native how they can engage the reader to the text by using code glosses.

1.2 Research Questions

Based on the identification above, the researcher formulates the research question as follow:

1. How are the code glosses employed in Discussion section of journal article written by Indonesian and English Native speakers?
2. How are the code glosses used in terms of contexts and functions?

1.3 Purpose of the study

This study is aimed to analyze:

1. The code glosses employed in Discussion section of journal articles written by Indonesian and English Native speakers
2. The contexts and functions of code glosses used in journal articles written by Indonesian and English native speaker

1.4 Scope of the study

This study focuses on the use of code glosses in discussion section of Applied Linguistic journal article written by Indonesian and English Native speaker.

1.5 Significance of study

This study is theoretically used to develop the code glosses markers in discussion section of journal articles written by Indonesian and English Native speakers. Furthermore, this study practically will be useful for students who write academic paper have in-depth understanding on how to accommodate their readers a guidance to read through the text. Second, to help the students write the

academic paper in more native way. Third, this study also expected to be useful for both future researchers and students in English Education and Literature to improve a reader-friendly academical text, especially journal article, by using the code glosses markers in academic writing.