

**INTRODUCTION CHAPTER
OF AN EFL UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT'S THESIS:
EXPERT READERS' EXPECTATIONS
AND THE STUDENT'S WRITING**

**a paper presented to LPPM-UKM
based on the research
that was conducted in the first semester of
the academic year 2011-2012**

YUGIANINGRUM

**NIK 410014
NIP 194710251986032001**

**ENGLISH DEPARTMENT—FACULTY OF LETTERS
MARANATHA CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY
BANDUNG--DECEMBER 2011**

LEMBAR IDENTITAS DAN PENGESAHAN

1. a.. Judul Penelitian : *Introduction chapter of an EFL undergraduate student's thesis: Expert readers' expectations and the student's writing*
b. Jenis penelitian : Kualitatif
2. Peneliti
Jumlah peneliti : satu (1) orang
Ketua peneliti
a) Nama lengkap dan gelar : Dr. Yugianingrum, M.S.
b) Jabatan/Pangkat/Gol./NIK : Lektor Kepala/Pembina Tk. I/IV/b/410014
c) Fakultas/Jurusan : Sastra/S1 Inggris
d) Pusat/Bidang studi : Linguistik Terapan
3. Lokasi penelitian : Universitas Kristen Maranatha
4. Sumber dana penelitian : LPPM UK Maranatha
5. Biaya penelitian : Rp. 3.700.000,-
6. Lama penelitian : Juli sampai dengan Desember 2011 (6 bulan)

Menyetujui,
Dekan Fak. Sastra
UK Maranatha

Bandung, 5 Januari 2012
Ketua Peneliti,

Drs. Edward A. Lukman, M. Hum.

Dr. Yugianingrum, M. S.

Mengetahui,
Ketua LPPM UK Maranatha,

Ir. Yusak Gunadi Santoso, M.M.

ABSTRACT

Recently in Western and non-Western countries there has been a great interest in the studies on research article introductions. However, in Indonesia this research topic has received less attention. In this present study, the researcher evaluates the introduction chapter of a linguistics thesis written by an Indonesian EFL undergraduate student. The purpose is to find and explain some discrepancies between international expert readers' expectations and the student's practice in a) presenting the sentences and paragraphs, and b) presenting and organizing the text contents. The researcher also interviews the student to reveal some possible reasons for the available discrepancies. The evaluation findings show that the student's writing is still inconsistent with the expert readers' expectations. The result of the interview exposes that the student has received insufficient information about expert readers' expectations for research article writing.

Key words: EFL student's thesis introduction chapter; expert readers' expectations; discrepancies

PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This research report is submitted to LPPM--UK Maranatha, to fulfill the requirements for gaining the research financial support from LPPM--UK Maranatha. The research is also meant to be the implementation of the research assignment of the *Tridharma Perguruan Tinggi*.

In this study, I evaluate the introduction chapter of an EFL undergraduate student's thesis and then explain the discrepancies that occur between the expert readers' expectations and the student's writing. This research is meant to be contributed to the improvement of the students' thesis writing process in the related department.

I would like to express my gratitude to the people who have helped me in preparing this research. They are the Dean of Faculty of Letters-Maranatha Christian University, Drs. Edward A. Lukman, M. Hum., and the Head of the English Department-Maranatha Christian University, Dra. Lena Chandra, as well as some students who now have graduated. I also feel grateful for the financial support from LPPM-Maranatha Christian University and all the encouragement from everybody in the department. Without their support this research would not be well accomplished.

Bandung, December 2011

TABLE OF CONTENTS

COVER

IDENTITY AND APPROVAL PAGE.....	i
ABSTRACT.....	ii
PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iv

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study.....	1
1.2 Identification of the Problem.....	3
1.3 Limitation of the Study.....	4
1.4 Statement of the Problem.....	4
1.5 Purpose and Significance of the Study.....	4
1.6 Organization of the Writing.....	5
1.7 Research Methods.....	5
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	7
CHAPTER 3: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.....	14
CHAPTER 4: CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION.....	22
REFERENCES.....	25
APPENDIX	
Researcher's Curriculum Vitae.....	27

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1. 1 Background of the study

Studies on research article introductions, which previously were conducted mostly by Western scholars, recently have also received considerable attention from non-Western ones. Among the non-Western researchers are Chalerm Sri Jogthong, Ria Rosdiana Jubhari, Pejman Habibi and Ummul K. Ahmad. Jongthong (2001) has found, among other things, that unlike English writers, Thai research article writers avoided criticizing and evaluating the works of others. In Jubhari's (2003) study, the focus is on cultural influences on the rhetorical structure of Indonesian undergraduate thesis introductions. Another study, by Habibi (2008), results in some marked differences in research introductions across three disciplines (English for Specific Purposes, Psycholinguistics, and Sociolinguistics) in terms of Swales' (1990) CARS model, whereas Ahmad (2011) describes the linguistic and rhetorical characteristics in research article introductions in Malay.

Besides the various foci of the studies on research article introductions, it is generally accepted that to be internationally recognized, the introduction of a research article is expected to follow the international academic writing conventions

in the related discipline. In addition to the conventions, some academic writing scholars have presented ideas to improve the quality of the writing.

One of the scholars, John M. Swales (1990), introduced the model of Creating a Research Space, or CARS, which consists of three moves: *establishing a territory*, *establishing a niche*, and *occupying the niche*. The model emphasizes that in the introduction section of a research article, the research topic should be related to previous relevant studies. In relation to thesis writing, this assertion should be interpreted as follows: A thesis will be regarded as valuable by relevant experts if its introductory paragraph presents a) a problem that is worth studying and has never been studied before; or b) a problem that has been studied but still needs a further study or more.

On the contrary, a thesis will not deserve good appreciation from expert readers if the introduction presents

1. a new but unimportant problem and thus not worth studying, or
2. an interesting problem having been studied previously but promising no different, valuable findings, or
3. a worth studying problem that is reported in confusing and uninteresting ways.

The argument above is in line with an opinion that research article writers must “understand the directions in which a field is developing at any given time and possess the rhetorical savvy necessary for positioning their work within it” (Berkenkotter & Huckin, 1995, p. 3). This quotation is relevant to the responsibility

of a thesis writer, who is required to possess sufficient knowledge about the development of the field of his/her study so as to be able to make a fresh contribution to disciplinary knowledge. Other requirements for writing a good thesis are the writers' sufficient writing knowledge, skills and practice that should be demonstrated in the use of the language and discourse elements in the text (Zhou, 2007). In this current research, the text is the introduction chapter, which has a specific and important function in a thesis. The function is specific because it is different from the functions of the other chapters of the thesis, and it is important because the introduction will determine the expert readers' responses toward the whole thesis.

In practice, however, those requirements are not always well fulfilled, at least in the teaching-learning setting. On one hand, teachers would regard research paper writing as a specific assignment that "produces such a discrepancy between what [the teachers] hope for and what [they] get" because "students are generally unfamiliar with the conventions and expectations of academic discourse" (Sutton, 2000, p. 446). On the other hand, the teachers who decide whether or not a student's research paper is acceptable may have certain reasons for not conforming to the international writing conventions and expert readers' expectations.

1. 2 Identification of the problem

With the idea of discrepancy in mind, I realize that up to 2011, when this study is conducted, the theses written by students of an English department have showed some inconsistencies with expert readers' expectations. The main discrepancy is found in the absence of the review of previous relevant studies in the

students' theses. I also detect some discrepancies between the students' language and the academic language expected to be used in an academic paper.

1. 3 Limitation of the study

The source of the data is the introductory chapter of an English as a Foreign Language (EFL) undergraduate student's thesis that belongs to Linguistics concentration. However, this study only evaluates the longest part of it, which is subtitled *the Background of the Study*. The other parts of the same chapter are not evaluated because each of them is too short, consisting of not more than one paragraph so that the structure and the language are too simple to evaluate. Moreover, only one thesis was chosen to be the data source because it had reflected what the department considered to be a good thesis. The evaluation was only conducted to the sentences, paragraphs, and the contents as well as the structure of the contents. This study does not evaluate the grammar, diction, or the ways the writer cites from the sources.

1. 4 Statement of the problem

The problems in this study are formulated as follows:

1. What discrepancies have occurred between the student's introductory chapter and expert readers' expectations?
2. Why have the discrepancies occurred?

1. 5 Purpose and significance of the study

This study is conducted to reveal

1. The discrepancies between the student's introductory chapter and expert readers' expectations.
2. The possible reasons for the discrepancies to occur.

The results of this study are significant for thesis writers who wish to learn about expert readers' expectations of a research paper. Moreover, novice researchers who wish to have their studies internationally recognized may learn from this present study some ideas to write an introduction chapter that is more consistent with international academic writing experts' expectations.

1. 6 Organization of the paper

This paper is divided into five chapters, which are preceded by *the Abstract*, *the Preface and acknowledgement*, and *the Table of contents*. This present chapter, Chapter One, presents *the Background of the study*, *the Identification of the problem*, *the Limitation of the problem*, *the Statement of the problem*, *the Purpose and significance of the problem*, *the Organization of the problem* and *the Methods of research*. In Chapter Two, *the Review of the literature*, this paper discusses the necessary theories borrowed from some related sources to support the evaluation. Chapter Three is *the Data collection*, which is followed by Chapter Four, *the Evaluation and the findings*. Finally, this paper ends with Chapter Five, *the Conclusion and suggestion*. At the end of this paper there are *the References*, which list the cited sources, and *the Appendix*, which presents the student's introductory chapter and the writer's Curriculum Vitae.

1. 7 Research methods

This research is a qualitative genre analysis on an EAP (English for Academic Purposes) text. The participant was a student who had just passed his thesis defense examination to get a “Sarjana” degree from an English department of a private university in Indonesia. He finished his eight-semester studies in 2011, got A in the thesis defense examination, and his GPA was 3.87 over 4.00; therefore, his thesis was considered to be one of the good theses in the department.

The data source is the introduction chapter of the student’s thesis. This chapter contains five parts: the Background of the Study, Statement of the Problem, Purpose of the Study, Methods of Research, and Organization of the Thesis. Of all these parts, only the Background of the Study was evaluated because it is the longest part, containing seven paragraphs.

I evaluated the text to find discrepancies between the student’s writing and expert readers’ expectations. The evaluation was conducted to the sentences and paragraphs by using Zhou’s (2007) idea of expert readers’ expectations. Based on Swales’ (1990) model of CARS, I also evaluated the text’s contents as well as the structure of the contents. After evaluating the text, I invited the student to be interviewed. I asked him a number of prepared questions based on Yugianingrum’s (2010) four requirements for writing an academic paper, to reveal his knowledge and skills of writing an academic paper. The results of the interview were used to explain why there were some discrepancies between the student’s writing and expert readers’ expectations.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

To evaluate the data, this study utilizes three theories, namely Zhou's (2007) idea of expert readers' expectation, John Swales' (1990) model of Creating A Research Space (CARS), and Yugianingrum's (2010) four requirements for writing an appropriate academic paper.

3. 1 Zhou's idea of expert readers' expectation

About writing a research article introduction Zhou (2007, p. 10) writes, "The most difficult sentence to write is the first sentence," because it determines the flow of the entire introduction. To overcome the problem, Zhou suggests linking it to the title of the research article. He also states that expert readers expect the writer to place familiar information at the beginning and new information at the end of a sentence.

Comparing sentences 1) and 2), Zhou comments that sentence 2) is better

1) Samples for 2-dimensional projection of kinetic trajectories are shown in Figure 7. The coil states are loosely gathered while the native states can

form a black cluster with extreme high density in 2-dimensional projection plane.

- 2) *Kinetic trajectories are projected onto xx and yy variables in Figure 7. This figure shows two populated states. One corresponds to the loosely gathered coil states while the other is the native state with a high density.*

because it uses a) a new sentence to smooth the transition between two original sentences, b) words to link the first to the second sentence and the second to the third sentence (*Figure > This figure; two ...states > coil states*), and 3) new information (*coil states*) at the third sentence.

Regarding action verbs, he suggests that the action verb in a sentence should be placed immediately after the subject. If the subject is placed too far from the action verb, the sentence will be more difficult to understand. The following sentences show different places of the action verbs (p. 4):

- 3) *The smallest URFs (URFA6L), a 207-nucleotide (nt) reading frame overlapping out of phase the NH2-terminal portion of the adenosinetriphosphatase (ATPase) subunit 6 gene has been identified as the animal equivalent of the recently discovered yeast H⁺-ATPase subunit 8 gene.*
- 4) *The smallest of the URFs is URFA6L, a 207-nucleotide (nt) reading frame overlapping out of phase the NH2-terminal portion of the adenosinetriphosphatase (ATPase) subunit 6 gene; it has been identified as the animal equivalent of the recently discovered yeast H⁺-ATPase subunit 8 gene.*

In sentence 3) the action verb *has been* is placed far from the subject, whereas in sentence 4) there are two clauses; the action verb *is* in the first clause is placed immediately after the subject *The smallest of the URFs*, and in the second clause the action verb *has been* is placed after the subject *it*.

Zhou also contends that “each sentence should make only one point, which is emphasized at the end of the sentence” (p. 4). He shows that sentence 6) is better than sentence 5) because 6) emphasizes the correct point, namely *between ... (dG) and ... (dC)*, and not *direct measurement*.

5) *The enthalpy of hydrogen bond formation between the nucleoside bases 2-deoxyguanosine (dG) and 2-deoxycytidine (dC) has been determined by direct measurement.*

6) *We have directly measured the enthalpy of hydrogen bond formation between the nucleoside bases 2-deoxyguanosine (dG) and 2-deoxycytidine (dC).*

Moreover, Zhou insists that a good paragraph should only “tell one story about one subject, ... start with a topic sentence and end with a summary or transition sentence for the next paragraph, ... [have] sentences that logically link each other from the beginning to the end and flow from the old to new information” (p. 5). He presents an example of such a good paragraph (p. 6):

7) *Large earthquake along a given fault segment do not occur at random intervals because it takes time to accumulate the strain energy for the rupture. The rates of strain accumulation at the boundaries of tectonic plates are approximately uniform. Therefore, nearly constant time intervals (at first*

approximation) would be exacted between large ruptures of the same fault segment. However, the recurrence time may vary; the basic idea of periodic main shocks may need to be modified if subsequent main shocks have different amounts of slip across the fault.

In 7), the underlined text indicates the links between the present and the previous information, which enables readers to understand the text more easily.

2. 2 Swales' model of CARS

In 1990, Swales wrote *Genre Analysis*, which presents three rhetoric moves in the introduction section of a research paper: *establishing a territory*, *establishing a niche*, and *occupying the niche*. The moves are discussed further as follows.

2. 2. 1 Move 1: Establishing a territory

The writer generally starts by describing the research area by using one or more of the following strategies:

Step 1.1: Claiming centrality

The writer states that the topic of research is useful, relevant, important, or worth investigating as it is part of a significant research area. The sentence will function as the topic sentence of the paragraph that should be followed by supporting sentences. Example: *Recently, researchers have become increasingly interested in ...*

Step 1.2: Making topic generalizations

This step contains statements concerning the current state of either knowledge or practice or description of phenomena. Example: *The general features of ... are well known.*

Steps 1.3: Reviewing items of previous research

The writer relates what has been found or claimed with who has found or claimed it, for example: *Johnson (1990) analyzes the student research paper across two disciplines*. This step is important to show the writer's current knowledge of the development of the field related to his/her study.

2. 2. 2 Move 2: Establishing a niche

After claiming the research territory, the writer claims a “niche” for his/her research. S/he will show that the researched field still needs further studies, or there are aspects of the previous research that need further investigation.

Step 2.1: Counter claiming

This step is used to introduce an opposing viewpoint or show some weaknesses in previous studies. Example: *However, these findings are challenged by recent data showing ...*

Step 2.2: Indicating a gap in previous research

This step is taken to make topic generalization. Example: *Research has tended to focus on ... rather than ...*

Step 2.3: Raising a question about previous research

This step is meant to argue that previous research needs further studies. Example: *Despite the observations, the mechanism ... has remained unclear.*

Step 2.4: Continuing a tradition

This step is frequently signaled by logical connectors, such as *Therefore/ Hence/ Consequently/ Thus*. Example: *Hence, additional studies of ... are needed.*

2. 2. 3 Move 3: Occupying the niche

The writer presents the solution to help fill the gap, answer the specific question or continue a research tradition that has been presented in Move 2.

Step 3.1a: Outlining purposes

The writer states the main purpose or aim of the study, for example: *The aim of this paper is to ...* .

Step 3.1b: Announcing present research

This step is an alternative to Step 3.1a and it describes what the research sets out to accomplish. Example: *This thesis proposes a formal procedure for ...* .

Step 3.2: Announcing main findings

The writer considers the results to be the most important aspect of the research. However, not all disciplines allow this step in the introduction section.

Example: *The results indicate that this method is effective in ...* .

Step 3.3: Indicating the structure of the paper

The writer explains the organization or the structure of the text. This step can easily be seen in the following example: *This paper is structured as follows.*

Step 3.4: Evaluation of findings

In this last step, the writer shows how the research results are significant, for example: *The results show that the texts not only contain ... but also have ...*

In genre analysis, this CARS model of Swales' has been the basis of many analyses of introduction sections that result in some modified models, like what are shown in Shao Xiaoman's (2007) discourse analysis of research report introductions,

Betty Samraj's (2008) discourse analysis of master's theses, and Igor Lakic's (n.d.) genre analysis of article introductions.

2. 3 Yugianingrum's four requirements

Yugianingrum (2010) lists four important requirements for a writer to produce an academic text:

1. Having sufficient exposure to current knowledge relevant to the chosen topic
2. Conforming to comprehensive, standard conventions of academic writing
3. Implementing things that lead to successful writing
4. Having supports from the writer's environments

Although the requirements are stated briefly, their realization is not simple, particularly because of the existing local academic policy. In general, local undergraduate students are rarely required to read scientific journals containing the current knowledge relevant to their research topic. It can be said that scientific journals are not popular among undergraduate students. They do not realize that the preparation of publishing a text book is longer than that of a journal so that text books are less current than journals. Moreover, most students are not fully aware of the importance of conforming to the international conventions of academic writing.

CHAPTER THREE

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this study, the evaluation was conducted to the Background of the Study, specifically to its sentences, paragraphs, contents and structure of the contents. To explain why the discrepancies have occurred between the student's writing and expert readers' expectations, the student was interviewed.

3. 1 Sentences

The sentences in the text are evaluated by considering a) the form and function of the first sentence of the text, b) the position of the familiar and new information in a sentence, c) the position of the action verb in a clause, and d) the correct emphasis in a sentence.

3. 1. 1 First sentence

The first evaluation was conducted to the first sentence of the text. The title of the thesis is "The occurrence of humour due to the miscalculation of politeness strategies used in the series *The Office*," whereas the first sentence in its introduction chapter is *Language is very important in communication*. It is apparent that the first sentence is not related to the title: no word in the sentence refers to any word in the

title. Theoretically, the first sentence should be linked to the title of the research article to make the readers more interested in the topic. Thus, the first sentence of this thesis is not consistent with expert readers' expectation.

3. 1. 2 Familiar and new information in a sentence

The sentence in paragraph 5, lines 1-3 of the evaluated text presents familiar and new information in the wrong order.

Politeness strategy belongs to the field of pragmatics, a branch of applied linguistics, since it deals with how people convey their contextual meaning within the utterances they make.

The following is the suggested revision of the sentence.

Politeness strategy deals with how people convey their contextual meaning within the utterances they make. Therefore, it belongs to the field of pragmatics, a branch of applied linguistics.

The revision shows three better points: a) it splits the previous long sentence into two shorter sentences, which present different pieces of information; b) it places the familiar information (about politeness strategy) in the first sentence and puts new information (about pragmatics) in the second; and c) it uses *therefore* to link the first and the second sentences.

3. 1. 3 Action verb

In the following sentence, the subject *how the manager, the employees and the warehouse workers interact with one another* is much longer than the subject predicative *clearly depicted*, which is indicated by the place of the action verb is.

In this film, how the manager, the employees and the warehouse workers interact with one another is clearly depicted. (par. 6, lines 10-12)

The suggested revision below shows that the action verb depicts occurs much closer to the subject This film.

This film clearly depicts how the manager, the employees and the warehouse workers interact with one another.

3. 1. 4 Correct emphasis

The phrase *the elements that make this series interesting as well as humorous* in the data is placed at the end of the sentence and thus the sentence emphasizes the wrong point.

The rivalry among some of the workers, the love affairs between workers, and even problems in the office are the elements that make this series interesting as well as humorous.(par. 6, lines 5-7)

To emphasize the correct point, which is *the rivalry among some workers, the love affairs between workers, and even problems in the office*, the sentence should be revised to be as follows:

This series has been made interesting as well as humorous by its elements, namely the rivalry among some workers, the love affairs between workers, and even problems in the office.

3. 2 Paragraphs

The evaluation of the seven paragraphs in the text is focused on the presentation of the topic sentence in a paragraph and the rule of one topic sentence in one paragraph.

3. 2. 1 Presentation of the topic sentence

In the first paragraph of the text, the first sentence does not make the topic sentence of the paragraph and it does not link to the second sentence either. Therefore, the sentence is considered to be redundant.

Language is very important in communication. One must know how to conduct his speech well in order to make the conversation run smoothly.

The sentences above can be improved by restructuring the ideas as follows:

In oral communication, the participants must know how to conduct their speech appropriately to make the conversation run smoothly.

3. 2. 2 One topic in one paragraph

Another problem occurs in paragraph 6: It evidently presents two topic sentences, namely *The source of data ...is ...* . (lines 1-3) and *I am interested in this film because ...* . (lines 7-10). To correct the mistake, the paragraph should be split into two, each presenting only one topic sentence.

3. 3 Contents and structure of the contents

The moves found in the data can be presented as follows:

Paragraph 1: presenting a definition of a utilized term: *Politeness strategy is ...* .

Paragraph 2: introducing the topic of the thesis: *The topic of this thesis is ...* .

Paragraph 3: explaining the importance of politeness strategy in communication:

Should they not use politeness strategies well in communication, funny things will appear or

Paragraph 4: describing the purpose of the study and the significance of the study: *I*

choose this topic because

Paragraph 5: introducing the theories of politeness strategy: *Politeness strategy*

belongs to the field of pragmatics, a branch of

Paragraph 6: Describing the data source and the reason for the student to choose the

data source: *The source of data that I am going to analyze is ...* .

Paragraph 7: stating the significance of the study: *I hope this analysis can be used as*

an additional reference for

It is evident that not all moves of Swales' model of CARS are employed in the data. The paragraphs only contain Move 1 and Move 3, which appear in paragraph 3 (Move 1, step 1.1: claiming centrality); paragraph 4 (Move 3, step 3.1a: Outlining purposes); paragraph 2 (Move 3, step 3.1b: Announcing present research) paragraph 7 (Move 3, step 3.4: Evaluating the findings) Move 2 does not exist at all due to the fact that in Move 1 there is no step 1.3, which is reviewing items of previous research.

To make the steps in the data fulfill the requirements for the moves of Swales' CARS, the following revision is suggested:

Move 1: Establishing a territory

Step 1.1: Claiming centrality: *In communication, knowledge of politeness strategy has great importance for the participants to perform a successful conversation and to maintain the desired relationship between them.*

Step 1.2: Making topic generalization: *Various sources of data concerning the use of politeness strategy in communication has been used in several studies in ..., for instance ...* (complete this sentence with the previous relevant studies at least in the department).

Step 1.3: Reviewing items of previous research

In this step, the student reviews the previous relevant studies at least in the department by underlining the most important part of the studies, whether it is the data sources, the research methods or the findings, for example: *Observations by X in ... (year of study) suggest that ...* .

Move 2: Establishing a niche

Step 2.1b: Indicating a gap

This step shows that the previous research is not complete and it is still possible to investigate another relevant topic. Example: *Previous research has tended to focus on ... rather than ...*

Step 2.1 d: Continuing a tradition: *Hence, a study on the occurrence of humour due to the miscalculation of politeness strategies is worth conducting.*

Step 3.1a: Outlining purposes. This step is not presented in the Background of the Study as in the student's thesis introduction, the purpose of the study is stated in a separate part in the same chapter.

Step 3.1b: Announcing present research: *In this thesis, I present an analysis of ...* .

Step 3.2: Announcing main findings: *From the analysis I can state that ...* .

Step 3.3: Indicating structure of the paper. This step is also not presented in the Background of the Study of the student's thesis because the organization of the thesis is put in a separate part in the same chapter.

3. 4 Interview of the student

The interview, which was conducted in one sitting of an informal conversation, was based on the following questions:

1. What relevant sources have you read to support your thesis writing?
2. What writing guidelines did you use for writing your thesis?
3. What activities have you done to support your thesis writing?
4. What kinds of and how much support did you receive from your environments to accomplish your thesis writing?

Formerly, the student gave mostly positive answers to the basic questions. Concerning sufficient exposure to current knowledge relevant to his thesis, he said that he had learnt the theories from certain books. He also stated that he used the department's standard writing manual and did other things leading to successful writing but he mostly solved his writing problems by himself. Finally, he obtained

sufficient supports from his environments at least in the forms of necessary time and finance for doing his research.

However, when the questions were given in detail, his answers showed that he had not done the following: a) reading necessary relevant research articles, b) understanding the standard requirements for a good research article, c) mastering the use of English for academic writing, and d) citing appropriately from essential sources. From the student's answers, it is also revealed that the department did not require the student to use previous relevant studies to support his thesis writing. He acquired the knowledge and skills for writing a thesis mostly from the writing classes, which did not provide students with sufficient theories and practice for writing a thesis. Consequently, he did not realize the entire characteristics of the language for academic writing and consequently his writing was not consistent with expert readers' expectations.

CHAPTER FOUR

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

This paper has evaluated the introduction chapter of an EFL undergraduate student's thesis to show some identified discrepancies between his writing and the expert readers' expectations. The student has also answered some questions to reveal some possible reasons for the occurring discrepancies. The first research question to answer is *What discrepancies have occurred between the introduction chapter of an EFL undergraduate student's thesis and expert readers' expectations?* The evaluation results show that the student's thesis introduction chapter is inconsistent with expert readers' expectations, particularly in the writing of sentences and paragraphs, and in the contents as well as the structure of the contents.

The student has showed that the first sentence of his introductory chapter has no immediate relation with the title. This practice indicates that the student has failed to fulfill the expectation of expert readers, which requires the first sentence of an introduction to attract the readers' attention to the research topic.

A quality scientific paper is expected to present sentences that are reader oriented, which means that the readers will understand the message in the sentences

easily. However, some sentences in the data show certain problems that may cause the readers to have some difficulty in understanding the message accurately. The problems include the placement of familiar and new information, the distance between the subject and the action verb, and the emphasis of the right point in a single sentence. By presenting such problems, the student shows discrepancies between his writing and expert readers' expectations.

More discrepancies are found in the writing of the paragraphs. In the first paragraph, the student presented the first sentence that does not make the topic sentence of the paragraph and it does not link to the next sentence either. Therefore, the first sentence does not determine the flow of the idea in the paragraph and thus it is not consistent with expert readers' expectations. In addition, the student presents two topic sentences in paragraph 6 so that the paragraph fails to fulfill expert readers' expectations about one topic in one paragraph.

Concerning the contents and the contents' structure in the data, the evaluation found that not all moves of Swales' model of CARS are employed in the text, which becomes the most important finding in this study because theoretically, an acceptable study should be based on previous relevant studies. It is evident that in presenting Move 1, which is *establishing the territory*, the student does not review items of previous research. Consequently, the student is not able to claim a "niche" for his research, which should be presented in Move 2 (*establishing a niche*). This move does not exist at all in the text. This fact indicates that the student is not aware of the importance of presenting and discussing previous relevant studies in his introduction.

To answer the second research question, which is *Why have the discrepancies occurred?*, I have interviewed the student to reveal the possible reasons for the occurring discrepancies. Although the student admitted that he had sufficient knowledge and skills as well as necessary efforts and supportive environments to accomplish his thesis, I detected that he had not received necessary information about expert readers' expectation for research article writing. The student explained that what he had done in his thesis writing had fulfilled the expectations of the supervisors, evaluators and examiners in the department, which is evident in the score A he received in the thesis defense examination. However, this score A does not mean that the student's introduction has fulfilled expert readers' expectations.

To improve the standard of thesis writing in the related department, it is suggested that thesis writers, supervisors, evaluators and examiners should always improve the department's thesis writing guidelines so that it would be more helpful for thesis writers. It is expected that by so doing the department would make students produce at least an introduction that is more consistent with expert readers' expectations. Also, a class to prepare students for writing a thesis that is consistent with expert readers' expectations is necessary for the intended improvement. It is hoped that in the future, a student who receives grade A in the thesis defense examination will have presented an introduction section that fulfills expert readers' expectations.

REFERENCES

- Ahmad, U. K. (2011). Research article introduction in Malay: Rhetoric in emerging research community. In A. Duszak (Ed.), *Culture and styles of academic discourse* (pp. 273-304). New York: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Berkenkotter, C., & Huckin, T. (1995). *Genre knowledge in disciplinary communication*. Hillsdale, NJ: Laurence Erlbaum.
- Habibi, P. (2008). Genre analysis of research article introduction across ESP, Psycholinguistics, and Sociolinguistics. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 11 (2), 87-112.
- Jogthong, C. (2001). Research article introductions in Thai: Genre analysis of academic writing. Unpublished dissertation, College of Human Resources and Education, West Virginia University.
- Jubhari, R.R. (2003). *Cultural influences on the rhetorical structure of undergraduate thesis introductions in Bahasa Indonesia and English*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Monash University.
- Lakic, I. (n.d.). Genre analysis of article introductions in Economics. Institute for Foreign Languages, University of Montenegro. Retrieved 6 October 2011, from <http://www.isj.ac.me/zaposleni/igor/Genre%20analysis.doc>
- Samraj, B. (2008). A discourse analysis of master's theses across disciplines with a focus on introductions. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 7, 55-67.

- Sutton, B. (2000). Swales's moves and the research paper assignment. *TETYC*, pp. 446-451. Retrieved 6 October., 2011 from http://sdsuwriting.pbworks.com/f/Sutton_Swales_Moves.pdf
- Swales, J.M. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yugianingrum. (2010). Producing an English academic paper: Process, problems and solutions. *US-China Foreign Language International Journal*. 8 (1) 39-49.
- Xiaoman, S. (2007). Discourse analysis of the research report introduction and its application for teaching English writing. *CELEA Journal* 30 (4) 29-35
- Zhou. Y. (2007). Recipe for a quality scientific paper: Fulfill readers' and reviewers' expectations. Indiana University School of Informatics. Received 22 July 2011 from http://sparks.informatics.iupui.edu/Publications_files/write-english.pdf

APPENDIX

THE RESEARCHER'S CURRICULUM VITAE

Dr. Yugianingrum, dra., M. S. was born in Pemalang, Central Java on 25 October 1947. She is married to Dr. Harjoto Djojosebroto, has three children and two grandchildren. In 1966 she finished her 4 year education in Sekolah Analisis Kimia, Bogor. She got her S1 degree from the English Department, Faculty of Language and Literature Education of IKIP Bandung (1980-1984). She continued her studies to S2 Linguistics Program of Universitas Padjadjaran Bandung (1989-1993) and got her doctorate degree from the English Education Program, Graduate School of Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Bandung (2004-2008). Since 1985, she has been teaching English and Linguistics in Maranatha Christian University and supervising students' thesis writing. She used to teach English in some other institutions, too, including SMP Taruna Bakti (1980 and 1984-1989), Sekolah Analisis Kimia ITB (1982-1984), and Akademi Akuntansi Bandung (1984-1989). She has conducted a number of studies, and her academic papers have been presented and published in local, national and international seminars and journals. At present her interest is focused on the learning and sharing English for Research Purposes.