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Abstract
This study attempts to construe the lexical density (LD) and the grammatical intricacy (GI) of thesis abstract written by English department student of University of Sumatera Utara (USU). There are two types of abstract which concerns on linguistics and literature. Those abstracts were analyzed in terms of lexical density and grammatical intricacy in order to find out the characteristics whether those abstract can be classified into spoken or written language and which type of thesis abstract has lexically dense or grammatically intricate. Qualitative content analysis method was employed in this study. The data of this study were all the text of thesis abstracts comprising of 3 abstracts for each of categories. From the analysis, it can be seen that in linguistic thesis abstract has the average score of GI index 1.83 and LD index 0.67 while the literature thesis abstract has GI index 1.79 and LD index 0.6. In terms of LD and GI, linguistic thesis abstract is higher than literature thesis abstract. It can be concluded that those abstracts are characterized as written language because of having high degree of LD which is more than 0.4 and written in simple language because of low degree of GI.

Keywords: lexical density, grammatical intricacy, thesis abstract
Introduction

In a thesis, there must be an abstract of thesis. Graetz (1982, p.23) argues that the aim of abstract is to give the reader a precise and concise knowledge of the total content of the very much more lengthy original, a factual summary which is both an elaboration of the title and a condensation of the report. In writing thesis abstract, the students are required to produce language to give a brief summary of the whole thesis at glance. This study will try to investigate the characteristics of abstract written by students of English department student in terms of lexical density and grammatical intricacy and to compare the lexical density and grammatical intricacy of the thesis abstracts written by English department student of USU and to characterize if those abstracts can be categorized into written or spoken language.

Literature Review

Lexical Density and Grammatical Intricacy

Fraghi (2006, p.9) holds that lexical density describes number of content words (noun, verb, adjective, and adverb) per clause. Lexical density of a text can be calculated by expressing the number of content carrying words in a text/sentence as a proportion of all the words in the text/sentence (Eggins, 2004, p.97). When a text is lexically dense, the text is characterized to be in a written mode. So, lexical density is the description of the total number of content words per clause. In addition, Ure (1971, p.445) concludes that a large majority of the spoken texts have a lexical density of under 40%, while a large majority of the written texts have a lexical density of 40% or higher.

Eggins (2004, p.97) holds that grammatical intricacy relates to the number of clauses per sentence or clause complexes and the means of calculating by expressing the number of clauses in a text as a proportion of the number of sentences in the text. To exemplify, Putra was absent because he was ill is more complex than his absence was caused by his illness. The high ratio or level of GI is the indicator of a text to be categorized as a spoken language. So, if the number of clause complexes is more dominant than simple sentences in a text, it means that the text has high level of GI, on the contrary if the number of clause complexes is less than simple sentences, the text is said to have low GI. In other words, the ratio of LD and GI can be used to differ between spoken and written language.
Research Method

This study employed qualitative content analysis. Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2007) argue that qualitative content analysis is the process of summarizing and reporting written data – the main contents of data and their messages. The source of the data was 6 thesis abstracts (3 linguistics and 3 literatures) submitted to English department of faculty of cultural sciences, University of Sumatera Utara (USU) in 2014.

Findings and Discussion

In order to find out the findings, the data have been analyzed and separated clause by clause. The first analysis will be through grammatical intricacy analysis as the following;

Abstract 1 (Linguistics): Thesis entitled “An Analysis of Code Switching and Code Mixing Used by Front Office Department Staffs of Grand Elite Medan” is about code switching and code mixing between Indonesian and English in daily conversation when they were working.

From the data 1, it can be seen that there are two clauses in 1 sentence. It means that the grammatical intricacy of the data 1 is 0.5. From the entire data (24 clauses) in abstract 1, there are 15 sentences and 24 clauses. It means that the grammatical intricacy in linguistics thesis is 1.6. The comparison of the two kinds of thesis abstracts written can be seen in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Grammatical Intricacy Characteristics of Abstracts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grammatical Intricacy Characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Ling)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Clauses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sentences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammatical Intricacy Score</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These low grammatical intricacy characteristics simply indicates that both of abstracts have the tendency of written language. Then, the grammatical intricacy of linguistic thesis abstract is higher than literature thesis abstract. To make sure that the characteristics of written
language appear in both abstracts, grammatical intricacy is not enough without checking lexical density score.

Abstract 1 (Linguistics): Thesis entitled “An Analysis of Code Switching and Code Mixing Used by Front Office Department Staffs of Grand Elite Medan” is about code switching and code mixing between Indonesian and English in daily conversation when they were working.

The data presented above shows that there are 26 content words from 39 words as the total word of the data. The percentage of lexical density is 66.6%. From the entire word in abstract 1, there are 294 content words from 400 as the total words of the abstract. Thus, the lexical density of that is 73%. Lexical density of the abstracts will be presented in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lexical Density Characteristics of Abstracts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (Ling)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total lexical words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Lexical density</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of lexical density (L.D), it can be seen that L.D in linguistic thesis abstract is higher than literature thesis abstract. In line with Ure’s statement, a large majority of the spoken texts have a lexical density of under 40%, while a large majority of the written texts have a lexical density of 40% or higher. It means that those abstracts are characterized into written language supported by GI and L.D index data. Those abstracts definitely fulfill the requirement to be grouped into written language as characterized by Eggins (2004).

Conclusion

From the analysis, it can be concluded that in linguistic thesis abstract has the average score of GI index 1.83 and L.D index 0.67 while the literature thesis abstract has GI index 1.79 and L.D index 0.6. In terms of L.D and GI, linguistic thesis abstract is higher than literature thesis abstract. Then, those abstracts are characterized as written language because of having
high degree of LD which is more than 0.4 and written in simple language because of low degree of GI.
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