CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Over the past 20 years, numerous research has examined how L1 and L2 learners use citations, as these studies have shown that because cultural, psychological, and educational aspects are significant, it is more difficult for learners to utilize citations properly and effectively (Bloch & Chi, 1995; Cumming et al., 2005; Liu, Lin, Kou, & Wang, 2016; Zhang, 2015). Hyland (1999) defines citation as a rhetorical aspect that is "central to the social context of persuasion" (p. 341) and plays a significant role in knowledge construction, as they allow writers to interact with source texts; give justification and evidence for arguments and claims; demonstrate a thorough understanding of the literature; demonstrate (dis)alignment with certain scholarship and build credibility.

When students are conducting a thesis, they need to differentiate the function of each section. Introduction could function includes; to provide readers with a foundational understanding of the research area and/or background knowledge so they can comprehend the primary focus of the research; to specify the scope of the study; and to introduce the current study (Lin, 2021). In addition, the highest citation density may be seen in literature reviews, which also functions as forming a connection of prior research to place the writer's own study, identifying the niche, providing a theoretical context, and developing theoretical frameworks (Kwan, Chan, & Lam, 2012; Mansourizadeh & Ahmad, 2011; Tseng, 2018). Even though

both have higher citation density than other sections due to the distinction in their functions, the distribution of citation features may differ between these two sections.

Corpus linguistics research has investigated citation practices in a range of areas, including those of L1 student writers and advanced L2 writers (e.g., Ädel & Garretson, 2006; Borg, 2000; Swales, 2014; Yoon, 2008). In this case, there are studies underlying the writer's stance. Aull and Lancaster (2014) examined linguistic expressions on stance in over 4000 argumentative essays, written by first-year university students compared to upper-level undergraduate students who came from two different US Universities. They found that despite disparities in students' educational contexts, they discovered that language stance markers were shared among first-year writings, with the greatest distinctions arising between first-year writers and even more advanced writers. Additionally, Aull et al. (2017) examined the use of selected indefinite pronouns and severe amplifiers to indicate generality as an aspect of stance in three corpora: new college writing (incoming L1 and L2 at two US universities between 2009 and 2015), advanced student writing (written by the native and non-native speaker in their final year of undergraduate) and published academic writing. The findings revealed two distinct but prevalent rhetorical uses of generalization markers: highlighting the claim's broad applicability and projecting shared notions. The study also revealed significant disparities in the frequency of generalizations made and the breadth or scope of generalizations made. Furthermore, the fewest generalization markers were found in published academic writing, but new undergraduate writing contains the largest generalizations and generalizations that cover vast groups and historical periods. Besides examining

epistemic stance in terms of generality, some studies explored epistemic stance in terms of certainty. For example, Ucceli et al. (2013) investigated the language determinants of writing quality in 51 persuasive essays written by high school students at a linguistically and ethnically diverse inner-city school in the Northeastern United States. Essays were graded for writing quality by a group of teachers, then transcribed and analyzed to generate automated lexical and grammatical measures, then coded for discourse-level features by researchers who were unaware of the essay's writing quality score. Beyond the contributions of length and lexico-grammatical complexity, regression analysis revealed that the frequency of organizational markers and one type of epistemic attitude marker, i.e., epistemic hedges, strongly predicted the writing quality of persuasive essays. The findings shed light on discourse characteristics that are important to consider when creating pedagogically informative assessment systems. A study of stance acknowledgments was carried out by Chan (2015) to scrutinize how the employment of a variety of lexico-grammatical methods for expressing stance in acknowledgments differs across disciplines. The data gathered or positive/negative from 256 Hong Kong Chinese Ph.D. dissertations written at three Hong Kong universities. It focuses on soft and hard discipline disciplinary writing techniques, as well as stance expressions in terms of social functions and lexico-grammatical patterns.

Drawing on earlier research of diverse terms including *evaluation, stance, appraisal*, and *metadiscourse* (e.g., Hunston and Thompson, 2000; Hyland and Guinda, 2012). Hedges, reporting verbs, instructions, tense, and other linguistic

elements have been studied under these topics for their role in persuasion (e.g., Fittum et al., 2006; Hyland, 2004, 2005; Swales, 2004). Jiang and Hyland (2015) studied a corpus of 160 research publications covering eight fields and comprising 1.7 million words, they looked at the frequency, shapes, and functions of this structure. They demonstrated that the structure is not only widely used to express author opinion and evaluation, but that it also demonstrates a wide range in how it is utilized to generate knowledge across disciplines by developing a new rhetorically based taxonomy of stance nouns.

A study by Lancaster (2016) about stance-taking qualities in undergraduate writing carried out a corpus-based comparative examination of stance in high- and low-grade papers written in two separate undergraduate courses at a US university. Across the HG publications, there is both contextual specificity and overlap, according to the investigation. It demonstrates that in both classes, the HG (High Grade) papers conveyed a stance more frequently than the LG (Low Grade) papers, and in ways that project higher contrastiveness, critical distance, and positive alignment with academic principles. While Coffin (2009) investigated writer stance in an L1 cinema studies Ph.D. dissertation, or the affective position held toward cited sources. She discovered that instead of adopting a strong positive or negative perspective on cited sources, this dissertation writer primarily chose a non-committal stance.

There have been many studies about the writer's stance in academic writing. Most of these studies examined the writer's stance in a range of areas, including L1 student writers (Lam & Crosthwaite, 2018; Coffin, 2009) L2 student writers (Lee et.

all, 2018) and Research Articles (Hu & Wang, 2014) and examining the writer stance in terms of epistemic generality and certainty (Aull & Lancaster, 2014; Aull et.all 2017; Lam & Crosthwaite, 2018), also in lexico-grammatical resources such as reporting verbs (e.g., Bloch, 2010; Hyland, 2002; Thompson & Ye,1991), reporting structures (Charles, 2006; Hyland, 1999; Jalilifar, 2012), and tense (e.g., Bloch, 2010; Hyland, 2002; Thompson & Ye,1991).

However, few studies have explored the citation practices in the writer's stance that explored dialogic function in EFL context, particularly in Indonesia. To fill this gap, this study examines the writer's stance using Coffin (2009) analytical stance framework that focused on referencing in specific disciplinary and rhetorical setting based on dialogic function specifically on EFL writers since most of them examined the L1 or L2 of First Year Writing (FYW) or advanced writers. The analytic framework focuses on linguistic factors that enable a writer to engage with sources in either a dialogically expansive or contractive manner, such that, "making" allowances for dialogically alternative positions and voices or "acting" to challenge, fend off, or limit the scope of such sources (Martin & White, p.102, 2005). Examining EFL Undergraduate citation practices drawing on Coffin's framework offers the affective position taken toward cited sources, whether taking a neutral or positive/negative attitude. By knowing the writer's position taken towards cited materials, we can see how they deal with their sources and readers, therefore they would have more control over when and how to be critical and agreeable.

Taking a qualitative approach, this study examines the citation practices of EFL Undergraduate students' theses focused on ELT in terms of writer stance using

Coffin's (2009) analytical stance framework in Indonesian context focused on the introduction chapter and literature review chapter.

1.2 Research Question

1. What writer's stance is shown in the citation practices of ELESP Undergraduate students' theses in ELT?
2. How does the write writer's stance in the introduction differs from those in the literature review?

1.3 Purpose of the Study

The study seeks to find out the writer's stance shown in the citation practices of ELESP Undergraduate students' theses in ELT and how the writer's stance differs in the introduction and the literature review.

1.4 Scope of the Study

The researcher limits the study through Coffin's (2009) analytical stance framework that could examine referencing in specific disciplinary and rhetorical settings based on dialogic function.

1.5 Significance of the Study

1. Theoretical Significance

The result of this study is expected to be a reference for further researchers who conduct research in a similar field and topic.

2. Practical Significance

The information about the findings in this study can be applied by researchers, linguists, or other academic writers as a reference in examining the citation practices of EFL Undergraduate students precisely in the writer's stance. Also, as the betterment of learning program in English for Academic Purposes.