

## 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.

#### 5.1 Conclusions

This study has examined the use of conjunctive adverbials (CAs) in journals with different indexation levels to answer the question whether the scientific quality reflects in how the article is written seeing from the conjunctive adverbial use lenses. The study first provided the theoretical background to the subject matter dealing with linguistic issues, such as coherence and cohesion, the term conjunction and its terminology clarification, and conjunctive adverbials. Using these frameworks and previous studies as guidelines, the study took fifteen research articles from each corpus as samples to be analyzed using a qualitative approach. From the analysis, it can be concluded that the use of conjunctive adverbials in research articles indexed in international and national database share more similarities rather than differences. This is shown in the summary of the finding as follows.

**Distribution of CAs:** The distribution of conjunctive adverbials in thirty research articles from two journals has some similarities. First, the most frequent class appears in the whole corpus is additive class, with a glaring difference with the second ranks: adversative class in the data from international indexed journal and causal class in the data from national indexed journal. This finding suggests that the authors tend to add information rather than to compare the information, to make inferences, or to show sequential relationships. Second, the finding from the individual conjunctive adverbials search shows that five out of ten most frequently used conjunctive adverbials in both corpora are dominated by additive class. Third, the result of individual search of the conjunctive adverbials in both corpora presents the conjunctive adverbial *also* as the most frequently used conjunctive

adverbial in both corpora. This glaring finding that conjunctive adverbial *also* is the most frequently used in research articles raises a new problem regarding the informal conjunctive adverbials that are used in formal register, or what Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman (1999a, 2016b) termed as inappropriate register.

**The use of *also*:** As the most dominant conjunctive adverbial found in the whole corpus, conjunctive adverbial *also* underwent the process of deep analysis in order to see the how this conjunctive adverbial is used. The findings show that the conjunctive adverbial *also* is mostly used correctly in both corpora, meaning that it functions as the signal for simple addition of two identical subjects (Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1999a, 2016b). However, the major problem in the incorrect use of conjunctive adverbial *also* is overuse. Some research articles both in international and national indexed journals were detected of having conjunctive adverbial *also* mixed with the other classes and, mostly, with the other members of additive class in one clause. This shows that there is a lack of awareness that conjunctive adverbial *also* is a part of additive class.

Highlighting the problems of inappropriate register and overuse in the current study, it is highly recommended for authors to develop the awareness concerning the proper use of conjunctive adverbials in order to bring logical connection among ideas. The learning process to understand deeply about the proper functions of each adverbial along with the register they belong to should start from reading more than one grammar book in order to find other insights. Furthermore, underlining the practical suggestions from Crewe (1990), the suggestions to increase the critical awareness of conjunctive adverbials in writing, especially in academic prose, come in three ways: (1) reduction, (2) paraphrase, and (3) explication. These ways, along with the deep learning of the semantical function of each conjunctive adverbial, hopefully will help authors to produce a good writing.

## 5.2 Suggestions for Future Works

The current study focuses on answering the burning question about the use of conjunctive adverbials. From the findings of this study, there is a considerable number of future works in investigating the use of conjunctive adverbials in academic prose, especially in research articles. For example, an interesting in-depth analysis can be conducted in regards to the use of conjunctive adverbials from other classes. For the future works on the adversative group, there is a claim by Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman (2016) that adversative class proves as the most difficult one to use because of the members' interchangeability traits. This study may be conducted by comparing the use of adversatives in NES (Native English Speakers) and NNES (Non-Native English Speakers) research articles.

For future works on causal class can be taken from another statement by Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman (1999) that the causal *therefore* is frequently misused in writing. The study may take research articles as the data with other factors playing role in the study, such as linguistic background of the authors and disciplines.

The case of informal conjunctive adverbials that 'make way' into formal register, such as academic prose, may be studied deeper. Some studies, such as Field and Yip (1992), Chen (2006), and Yeung (2009), may become the base of the study. The future study may examine this case in relation to the linguistic background of the authors or across disciplines.

Another interesting study may take Crewe (1990) as the baseline of the study. Crewe (1990) underlines some common errors in using 'logical connectives'. For example, the study of logical leap and its relation to the underlying logical relationships between two sentences or span of texts may be conducted. The focus may be in investigating the frequency of occurrences of logical leap in research articles. The articles being compared may vary, such as from journals with different indexing, journals with different disciplines, or NES and NNES writing. This study can examine the occurrence frequency of the

misunderstanding of logical relations between sentences that becomes one of the problem sources in illogical relations.