

# CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

Chapter I discuss the background, the research question, the purpose, the scope and the benefit of this study

### 1.1 Background of the Study

A *skripsi* is an academic writing which carried out by a student based on the assignment of academic from the college as the requirements of graduation as an undergraduate (Leo, 2013). In the *skripsi* there are five sections which are, introduction, literature review, methodology, finding and discussion, and conclusion. To know the result of the *skripsi*, we can read in the finding and discussion sections. According to Kretchmer (2003), discussion is a part to state interpretations and opinions, explain the implications of findings, and make suggestions for future research. The main function is to answer the questions posed in the Introduction, explain how the results support the answers and, how the answers fit in with existing knowledge on the topic. Findings and discussion sections is a part of research paper which purpose of is to convey the meaning of the result (Hess, 2004) and also to present a summary of data analysis (James H. McMillan, 2010). Salek (2014) argued that, when conveying the meaning of the result, the writer used engagement markers to make participants or reader and writer feeling visible via the writer's choice to promote rapport. According to

(<https://www.heacademy.ac.uk>), finding and discussion sections should not be simply a summary of the results you have found and at this stage you will have to demonstrate original thinking. It should highlight and discuss how your research has reinforced what is already known about the area. When discussing what is already known, the writer explicitly build relationship with reader as same as the function of *engagement markers* (Hyland, 2005).

Engagement markers are devices that explicitly address readers, either to focus their attention or include them as discourse participants. Hyland in his book *Metadiscourse* (2005) explains that engagement markers is where writers acknowledging and connecting to readers, recognizing the presence of their readers, pulling them along with their argument, focusing their attention, acknowledging their uncertainties, including them as discourse participants, and guiding them to interpretations with respect to the positions advanced in the text

According to Hyland (2005) engagement markers focus on reader participation with two main purposes. The first is acknowledges the need to adequately meet readers' expectations of inclusion and disciplinary solidarity, addressing the readers as participants in an argument with reader pronouns (*you, your, inclusive we*) and interjections (*by the way, you may notice*). The second purpose is involves rhetorically positioning the audience, pulling readers into the discourse at critical points, predicting possible objections and guiding them to particular interpretations. Those purposes are mainly performed by questions, directives (mainly imperatives such as *see, note* and *consider* and obligation modals such as *should, must, have to*, etc.) and references to shared knowledge.

In his book *Stance and Engagement* (2005), Hyland offer five key of engagement markers. The first is *reader pronouns*, it is the most explicit way that readers are brought into a discourse and were the most frequent engagement feature. The second is *personal asides*, this expresses a writer perspective on the text, by turning to the reader in mid-flow the writer acknowledges and responds to an active audience, often to initiate a brief interpersonal dialogue. The third is *Questions*, it is a strategy of dialogic involvement, by bringing the audience into an arena where they can be led to the writer's point of view. The fourth is *Directives*, which instruct the reader to perform an action or to see things in a way determined by the writer. The last is *Appeal to share knowledge*, it's explain reader or audience's agreement by creating implicit contract concerning what is relatively incontrovertible. In sum, these different features are important ways of situating academic arguments in the interactions of disciplinary communities.

Refers to journal written by Hamid Allami in (2012), a research writers address their readers use engagement markers to draw on shared understandings and emphasize solidarity. In writing a research, the reseach writers shared their understanding in their disciplinary communities. A reseach conduct by Abdi (2011) in his research about metadiscourse on 54 research articles from social science and natural sciences. He found that engagement markers is used in research article. In introduction section there are 39 engagement markers and 47 engagement markers in method section, while in result and discussion section are 134 engagement markers. His study proved that engagement markers were among the most frequently used metadiscourse markers in result and discussion section. It show that

writers feel more need for interactional involvement in composing the research discussion section.

A research on engagement in writing also conducted by Ruspita (2014), she conducted a research on 7 Indonesian EFL learners' Persuasive writings. She found the occurrences of interpersonal markers in EFL learners' Persuasive texts are as follows: self mention markers are the most numerous interpersonal markers (29 or 45%), followed by attitude markers (22 or 34%), hedges (6 or 9%), boosters (4 or 6%), and finally engagement markers (3 or 5%). This indicates the EFL learner writer are less skillful in engaging the readers.

In English Department UNJ, the studies of metadiscourse especially on engagement markers have been conducted previously, but only explored the spoken form. The study which was conducted by Alfi Ayuni (2015) specifically explored the use of engagement markers in English Department students speech performances. Through the use of engagement markers in their speech performance, Alfi claimed that student's have used four from five categories of engagement markers in their speech, including *reader pronoun (audience pronoun)*, *questions*, *directives*, and *appeal to share knowledge*. It also indicates that students were aware of their audiences' presence and involved them into their speech. The research also found that the most dominant engagement markers used is *reader pronoun (audience pronoun)* which contributed 62,66% from all total of engagement markers, which means that the students were well-aware of their audeinces by addressing them directly and positioning them into the discussion of

the speech. Next, *questions* were constituted 18,28% and directives with 14,38%. *Appeal to shared knowledge* then, has the least frequency with 4,48%

In order to introduce engagement markers and provide deeper insight in the written form, this study focuses on exploring engagement features in findings discussion section of English Department students' skripsi in UNJ. The researcher also employs the model proposed by Hyland (2005).

## **1.2 Research Question**

Based on the background of the study above, this study was investigated the following research question:

1. What types of engagement markers are found in finding and discussion sections of English Department students' skripsi?
2. How are engagement markers used in findings and discussion sections of English Department students' skripsi?

## **1.3 Purpose of the study**

This study is aim to find identify:

1. Types of engagement markers used in finding and discussion sections of the English Department students' skripsi.
2. How are engagement markers used in finding discussion sections of the English Department students' skripsi.

#### **1.4 Scope of the study**

This study focused on engagement markers in finding discussion sections of English Department students' *skripsi* in UNJ according to Hylland (2005) theoretical framework.

#### **1.5 Significance of the study**

The result of the study will lead to the deeper understanding in engagement markers as a part of pragmatic competence especially for students so that they will able to use it in academic discourse, and also give more insight as well as contribution to the development in related area.