CHAPTER V
CONCLUSION

This chapter presents a brief summary of the main findings of the present study. In addition, this chapter also draws conclusion of the results and presents recommendation that may be of interest for those involved in curriculum development of English subject and for future researchers interested to conduct studies in the same area.

5.1 Conclusion

This study was conducted to investigate the use of grammatical metaphor in nine research articles of three postgraduate students and how the use of grammatical metaphor in their paper increases the written language characteristics of the texts. The study showed that all the types of grammatical metaphor were demonstrated by the participants and this use contributed to the texts' written language characteristics. In addition, the study revealed that there was variation in the use of grammatical metaphor in the participants' texts. The main findings of the study are summarized below.

The study showed that nominalization dominated the types of grammatical metaphor found in the texts. There was variation however regarding the sections in the participants' paper with most occurrences of grammatical metaphor.

The pervasiveness of nominalization in the data lends support to the findings of previous studies regarding nominalization (Colombi, 2006; Christie and Derewianka, 2008) as the most powerful and the most frequent type of grammatical metaphor to occur in academic writing. As revealed in the previous chapter, the dominance of nominalization was demonstrated by all the

participants in their research articles; the realization of which was manifested through metaphorical realization of quality, process, and circumstance as entity. One manifestation of logical metaphor, the metaphorical realization of conjunction as noun, which was relatively numerous in the participants' writing, strengthened the dominance of nominalization in this study.

In line with the well-documented status of nominalization which many systemic functional linguists claim as one single most powerful type of grammatical metaphor (Christie and Derewianka, 2008; Colombi, 2006; Halliday, 1994; Halliday and Matthiessen, 2004; Martin and Rose, 2008), the present study revealed the dominant influence of nominalization on creating written language characteristics in the participants' texts as summarized in Table 5.1.

Table 5.1 Grammatical Metaphor Effect on the Texts' Written Language Characteristics

Written Language Characteristics	Types of Grammatical Metaphor
1. Lexical Density	1. Experiential metaphor (especially nominalization), logical metaphor
2. Abstraction	2. Nominalization
3. Implicit logical connection	3. Logical metaphor
4. Impersonal construction	4. Nominalization, explicit objective types of interpersonal metaphor
5. Clear text structuring	5. Textual Metaphor, nominalization

In addition to nominalization, awareness of written language characteristics in academic setting was displayed through the incorporation of explicit objective types of interpersonal metaphor, the type used in most cases in the participants' texts. This finding is in line with the studies conducted by Miremadi and Jamali (2003) and Schleppegrell (2005) which show the use of explicit objective type of interpersonal metaphor in social science writing. In addition, the findings of the present study regarding the use of explicit objective type of interpersonal

91

metaphor also confirms Schleppegrell's (2005) study which reports the favour of explicit objective variants of interpersonal metaphor in academic writing.

Contradictory to the participants' success with the two types of grammatical metaphor mentioned above – nominalization and objective explicit type of interpersonal metaphor -- similar degree of success was not demonstrated in their use of textual metaphor. Both hyper-Theme and macro-Theme were present in their writing but most were neither well-constructed nor developed. The problem with most hyper-Theme was the absence of nominalization which further lead to poor generalization and analysis of the idea encapsulation to be developed in the paragraph. Such poor construction and development of hyper-Theme have also been reported in the previous studies by Ravelli (2005) and Schleppegrell (2005) as typical characteristics of low-graded writing products. Concerning the problem with macro-Theme, as revealed in the discussion of the preceding chapter, some research articles showed dislocated development in some of their sections. This poor global development contradicts Martin's description (1992, 1993, and 1997) of a written product, which, due to its process of drafting and revising (Eggins, 2004), typically reflects clear text structuring.

Another main finding of the present study was the variation regarding the quantity of grammatical metaphor in the sections of the research articles among the participants. One noticeable distinction was the tendency of grammatical metaphor to appear in the first two sections of the text in the low achiever writings. The first two sections use relatively denser construction of grammatical metaphor, while the other three sections, especially that of Findings and Discussion, are nearly without one. As discussed in the previous chapter, one factor contributing to this imbalanced proportion was poor elaboration. It has also been exemplified in the preceding chapter that in the Result Sections of two research articles, the low achiever only

presented tables and transcripts with hardly any description: thus no room for demonstrating the use of grammatical metaphor.

5.2 Recommendation

5.2.1 Pedagogical Implication

Below are suggestions for pedagogical implication in relation to the present study.

It is suggested that the concern of grammatical metaphor receive more emphasis in the curriculum of English learning especially in that of higher education. Exposure to grammatical metaphor will help students to understand advanced literacy which is heavily constructed with rich grammatical metaphor. Such exposure will also help them to produce sophisticated piece of texts highly valued in academic writing.

Considering the confusion regarding the global development of research articles in some participants' texts in this study, it is also recommended that English writing at tertiary level put a considerable emphasis on this genre. Good research articles are a benchmark for academic community and it is important for university students particularly those at graduate schools to have the capability to produce good research articles.

5.2.2 Suggestions for Further Research

Below are suggestions for those interested in conducting research in the area of grammatical metaphor.

Due to the relatively few studies on interpersonal and further fewer on textual metaphor, it is suggested that future research focus more on one of these types of grammatical metaphor. Numerous studies have been conducted to investigate ideational metaphor especially the

experiential type. New focus of study is recommended if future researchers are interested to investigate this area.

To increase time effectiveness, it is recommended that future researchers deploy software for analyzing the occurrence of grammatical metaphor at a clause level. Using software would minimize the time devoted to the scrutiny of grammatical metaphor cases particularly if the study uses large corpus.

It is also suggested that future researchers pay more attention to the authenticity of the participants' writing. Cases of plagiarism in particular would bring another important consideration to be included in the research. This may lead to broader insights into the students' knowledge in writing since plagiarism might be due their poor ability in paraphrasing. The inclusion of this aspect into research will bring further pedagogical implications for students' writing improvement program.

Finally, even though text analysis using systemic functional grammar has high reliability as proposed by linguists working in the area, using interview as a triangulating method in the study would however further strengthen its results.