

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents an overview of the study, including the background of the study, statements of the problem, objectives of the study, scope of the study, clarification of terms, the significance of the study, and the organization of the paper.

1.1 Background of the Study

Indexation of journals is considered to be a window to the high quality of research. It is mostly known to be efficient and objective databases for literature researchers (Chadegani, et. al, 2013). Indexed journals, then, are regarded as the world of research with higher scientific quality than the non-indexed journals, besides being authoritative sources of scientific information (Balhara, 2012; Rajagopalan, 2015). Journal indexation is a common indicator that a journal is standard (Nagoba, et. al., 2016). The essentials of being indexed are, more or less, similar to a domino effect: since the indexed journals will be accessible to a wide audience, they will have a fat chance to have a high reputation as the increase of readership (Rajagopalan, 2015). Thus, with such benefits, no wonder academicians aspire to have their research articles published in indexed journals.

With the income of readership, internationally indexed journals certainly gain more visibility than local ones. Not merely on the scope of readers, international indexation also influences researchers' opportunities to collaborate with international researchers and of the article having additional citations, and therefore, contribute to the community of the specific fields (Elsevier, 2018). With these profitable advantages come strict requirements for the publication: the research should be the most up-to-date and have the highest quality of interdisciplinary content. To ensure only the best quality of content in their publication, international research databases, for example, Scopus has a panel of independent, international board of journal editors, librarians, and bibliometricians. With such strict requirements and selection from the board, the

internationally indexed journals may have a high credibility among the locally indexed journals, and thus, raise a stereotype that the internationally indexed journals are higher in status than the local ones.

Despite the emphasis on the quality of scientific research published, the quality of writing also defines it. Research articles require strong writing skills in order to convey the analysis of different interpretations and the “original” arguments of the researchers. They center the attention to communicating the production or analysis of knowledge and disseminating ideas; therefore, making them pivotal (Hyland, 2009). As a consequence for these functions, a well-organized text is essential so that the readers may follow the mind of authors or researchers and enhance their understanding (Basturkmen & Randow, 2014; Hyland, 2009; Stapleton & Wu, 2012). The well-organized academic text may be achieved through a more structurally elaborated writing, indicated by the longer sentences, longer ‘t-units’, and a greater use of subordinate clauses (Biber & Gray, 2010).

As a part of academic writing, research articles also hold the same rules of academic writing style, which emphasizes formal tone and, most importantly, a logical flow of ideas to form a unity (Labaree, 2009). A unified whole of ideas will help readers to follow the logical arguments in the research articles and make sense of the content that is being communicated. This fact, then, inquiries a new issue whether the higher in scientific quality reflects a higher quality of writing.

There are various studies concerning how the ideas are connected logically in research articles, and generally, in academic writing. By considering the great use of subordinate clauses in academic writing (Biber & Gray, 2010), these studies mostly observe the use of logical connectors, especially conjunctive adverbials (CAs) as a grammatical aspect in constructing the logical connection of ideas (cf. Chapter 2, Section 2.4). Currently, research on conjunctive adverbials can be categorized into two major themes. First, there are those who investigated the use of conjunctive adverbials in relation to the linguistic background of the authors. These studies focus on the issue of L1 and L2 writing, investigating how Non-Native English Speakers (NNESs) build connection using conjunctive

adverbial tools (see Granger & Tyson, 1996; Cho, 1998; Chen, 2006; Mur-Dueñas, 2009; Yeung, 2009; Mur-Dueñas, 2011; Carió-Pastor, 2013; Esfandiari & Barbary, 2017; Uçar and Yükselir, 2017; Rojanavarakul & Jaroongkhongdach, 2017). Their methods are varied; some of them compared NNEs to Native English Speakers (NESs) while the others only examined the NNEs writing and compared them with other NNEs writing from different L1 (cf. Chapter 2, Section 2.5). The results of their observations are mostly to be dedicated to evaluating the pedagogical approach in teaching academic writing to NNEs.

Meanwhile, other researchers tend to focus on conjunctive adverbial use in relation to varied issues (see Rahimi & Qannadzadeh, 2010; Gholami, Ilghami, Hossein, & Tahoori, 2012; Mahmoud, 2013; Martínez, 2015; Mohammed, 2015). The perspectives of the studies are multifarious, such as from the quality of texts, the area of disciplines, and even authors' intelligences (cf. Chapter 2, Section 2.5). The results of these studies bring a new point of view in seeing conjunctive adverbial use: the use of conjunctive adverbials may not always be seen specifically from the linguistic background of the authors, but it may also correlates with other backgrounds.

From the comparison of two categories of perspectives in analyzing conjunctive adverbials in writing, it may be seen that researchers tend to see conjunctive adverbials from the perspective of the linguistic background of the authors. The significant number of studies concerning the linguistic background of the authors may be traced to the aims of the research themselves; they are mostly seeking for efficient methods to teach conjunctive adverbials, especially to NNEs, to enhance the EFL/ESL students' understanding regarding how to use the adverbials appropriately. On the other hand, the analysis of conjunctive adverbial use involving other perspectives has not been fulfilled sufficiently. Apart from the interests in observing NNEs writing, this lack may be due to the conjunctive adverbial tools that are seen as a grammatical aspect in writing, which instinctively correlates with linguistics.

Seeing these two categories of conjunctive adverbial studies, the lack of research concerning other views in analyzing the conjunctive adverbial use in

writing is the starting point of this current study. This study, then, falls into the second category, namely the hybrid category. One of the views that have been observed is regarding the relation between text quality and the use of connectors (see Mohammed, 2015). In this paper, the current study goes beyond the quality of texts to question how the scientific quality of research is related to the use of conjunctive adverbials. To address such a question, this study investigates how conjunctive adverbials are used in two journals with different indexation: one indexed in international level and one indexed in national level. The study uses a qualitative analysis to seek for the possible differences occurring in both journals taken as the sample data. By conducting the study, the question whether the difference in indexation level is reflected in how the article is written may be fractionally answered.

1.2 Statements of Problem

From background statements on Section 1.1, this study, then, is an extension from the previous studies above by filling the gaps of the variable of the subjects being compared, articles indexed in international and national indexation. This research investigates how conjunctive adverbials are used in the scope of language and literature through mapping the distribution of conjunctive adverbials in each corpus and comparing the relationship of independent clauses in the most dominant conjunctive adverbial used in the whole corpus (cf. Chapter 3). The formulation of research questions is as follows.

- 1.2.1 What classes of conjunctive adverbials (CAs) are found in research articles indexed in international and national database?
- 1.2.2 From the most dominant conjunctive adverbial(s), how correctly are they used in research articles indexed in international and national database?

1.3 Objectives of the Study

As the title and research questions indicate, the aim of this study is to draw on the analysis of conjunctive adverbials in two journals with different level of indexing: international indexation and national indexation. Therefore, through the methodology (cf. Chapter 3), the study addressed the following overarching objectives.

- 1.3.1 To investigate classes of conjunctive adverbials occur in the research articles indexed in international and national indexation; and
- 1.3.2 To investigate whether the most dominant conjunctive adverbial(s) is/are used correctly in the research articles indexed in international and national indexation.

1.4 Scope of the Study

The study is confined to analyzing two journals with different indexation levels in the area of language and literature, represented by fifteen samples from a journal indexed in international database and fifteen samples from a journal indexed in national database.

1.5 Clarification of Terms

In order to avoid unnecessary misunderstandings, it is important at the outset to clarify a term used in the title of this paper. The term may appear at some places in the paper.

1.5.1 Conjunctive Adverbials (CAs)

‘Conjunctive Adverbials (CAs)’ is a group of adverbials that belongs to the ‘logical connectors’ proposed by Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman (1999). It connects independent clause, which leads readers or listeners to the ‘sense’ of the sentences.

1.6 Significance of the Study

The study of conjunctive adverbials in different indexation levels of journals will redound to the benefit of academicians because publishing research articles is mandatory in the academic world. The goals of the study are to observe how conjunctive adverbials are used in both journals, and draw on the similarities and differences; thus, reflecting on the findings of the study may help the future researchers to underline the functions of conjunctive adverbials, not only as a grammatical aspect in writing but also as a big contributor to readability of an article that surely may not be underestimated. Furthermore, the study will be beneficial for the advisors of journals as a reflection on the editing process going on in the editors' boards. The output of the study also will be profitable for future researchers as the baseline of information.

1.7 Overview of Chapters

This final section in the introductory chapter maps out the organization of the paper. This paper consists of five chapters as follows.

1.7.1 Chapter 1: Introduction

This chapter presents an overview of the study, including the background of the study, statements of the problem, objectives of the study, scope of the study, clarification of terms, the significance of the study, and the organization of the paper.

1.7.2 Chapter 2: Review of Related Literature

This chapter presents the related literature as a base for doing the analysis, including the introduction to coherence and cohesion, the concept of conjunction, conjunctive adverbials, and previous studies related to the analysis of conjunctive adverbials and connectors.

1.7.3 Chapter 3: Research Methodology

This chapter presents the methodology used in the study which covers the nature of the study, the data collection, and the technique used for analyzing data.

1.7.4 Chapter 4: Findings and Discussion

This chapter presents the findings of the study, elaborated in specific findings of the use of forty conjunctive adverbials from the list of the simplified version proposed by Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman (1999), the analysis of the most dominant conjunctive adverbial found in the whole corpus, and the discussion related to the current findings and previous findings.

1.7.5 Chapter 5: Conclusions and Suggestions

Chapter five presents the summary and the conclusions taken from the current study, and singles out the particular directions for further works in the area of conjunctive adverbials.