

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Theoretical Framework

2.1.1 Systemic Functional Linguistic

This study uses SFL to assess the introductory text in EFL students' theses. This Systemic Functional Linguistic or SFL analysis is based on the theory of Halliday & Mattheiessen, (2004). In SFL, language is a semiotic source for making meaning and knowing the type of meaning influenced by the social and cultural context (Zhihui Fang & Zhijun Wang, 2011). SFL is a descriptive and interpretive framework for viewing language as a strategic meaning-making source (Baba, 2014). In SFL, there is a metalanguage, a language for understanding language. Metalanguage consists of ideational, interpersonal, and textual metafunctions. All three have grammatical aspects that build their meaning. Therefore, SFL offers a series of analytical tools to evaluate and determine the effectiveness of the text.

Halliday (1994) describes ideational metafunctions as grammatical aspects representing the world and its experiences. This metafunction consists of two elements, namely the experiential meaning and the logical meaning. The experiential meaning refers to the meaning of human experience expressed in language. The resource of transitivity is involved in showing the experience through grammatical transitivity. The logical meaning shows the meaning of the logical relationship and the relationship of attachment between clauses so that one clause and another clause have a relationship. According to Halliday (1994), this linkage manifests in grammatical sources that are involved in different relationships but are related to the interdependence between clauses and the logical-semantic relationship between clauses.

According to Christie (2002) in Baba (2014), interpersonal metafunction is based on the grammatical source of the relationship between the interlocutor. This interpersonal metafunction is about people's relationships and attitudes toward one another. This is indirectly related to the use of mood, modality, choice of words,

and other sources of assessment that can be used by the author or analyzed by the reader.

On the other hand, textual metafunctions are seen in grammatical aspects that make language organized as paragraphs, texts, and even messages. Regarding this matter, text organizers, such as related information in the text and outside the text, can be seen as writing that is interesting to read or not. Textual metafunctions can see good or bad writing through assessment sources such as themes, rhemes, cohesion, coherence, etc.

Each text contains these three metafunctions, and from there, the grammatical system is a source that allows the text to mean what it means by combining related clauses. Given the systematic relationship between the two, functional language analysis or SFL can determine how meaning is constructed in the text. Analyze the content of the text regarding the meaning of experience using transitivity patterns. Using themes and rhemes to analyze structured text regarding its textual and logical meaning. Analyzing participants' writing styles to build interaction with the reader can involve interpersonal metafunctions.

2.1.2 Create Another Research Space

The present study embraces Swales's (1990,2004) Create a Research Space (CARS) and Halliday & Matthiessen, (2004) Systemic Functional Linguistic. Swales's CARS model has been widely used in many studies and has proven successful (eg Ahmad, 1997; Ahmed, 2004; Jogthong, 2001; Najjar, 1990; Tailor & Chen 1991; Chek Kim 2010; Baba, 2017; Zhihui 2011). In addition according to Milagros (2011) CARS model will be examined in detail. Based on Swales (1981) The relationship between moves and their communicative functions in the scientific text can be examined in swales' move structure or framework for RA introductions.

The CARS model consist of three stages termed “moves” by swales.

1. Move 1 (Establishing a research territory)

Step 1 Claiming centrality

Step 2 Making topic generalization/s

Step 3 Reviewing literature/findings of previous research

2. Move 2 (Establishing a niche)
Step 1a Indicating a gap
Step 1b Adding to what is known
Step 2 Presenting positive justification
3. Move 3 (Presenting the present work)
Step 1 Announcing present research descriptively and/or purposively
Step 2 Presenting research questions or hypotheses
Step 3 Definitional clarifications
Step 4 Summarizing methods
Step 5 Announcing principal outcomes
Step 6 Stating the value of the present research
Step 7 Outlining the structure of the paper

Tabel 2. 1 The CARS Model

These three moves are divided into their constituent steps. A step is defined by swales (1990, 2004) as a smaller unit of discourse that builds moves. In the same word, all the steps will support moves. Move 1 has three steps, Move 2 has two steps, and Move 3 has 7 steps.

2.2 Literature Review

This research was built from the analysis of previous studies that have been done. Five studies are considered in this study, namely Baba (2014), Fan Wei-Kung (2015), Zhipora & Ayelet (2016), Zhihui Fang & Zhijun Wang (2011), and Hadi & Susan (2020). Three of them are assessments of students' academic writing, while Zhihui Fang & Zhijun Wang (2011) are researchers in the form of using SFL in the assessment of students' academic writing. The four studies contributed a lot to this research.

The first research is Baba (2014), "Assessing Students' Academic Writing Using Systemic Function Linguistics at a University in South Africa". This study focuses on assessing the academic writing of first-year students as a form of success in their studies. This study has two objectives. First, to identify the types of coherent

writing strategies for students in a multilingual context. Second, to examine the strategies used by groups of competent and not very competent students in ESL academic writing. In this study, participants were asked to write an essay with the topic “Education Challenges in South Africa” from a total of 80 selected 20 essays that met the criteria. After that, they are separated into groups consisting of 10 essays that have competent writing and 10 essays that have less competent writing. This study uses an 'impression' sign which is guided by how well students express ideas, connecting sentences to form a coherent text so that they can communicate ideas and thoughts well.

The second research by Fan Wei-Kung (2015), "Assessing an innovative advanced academic writing course through blog-assisted language learning: issues and resolutions". In the era of the development of web 2.0 technology that allows many innovations in education, researchers use blogs to explore the perceptions, confidence, and motivations of advanced English language learners along with the strengths and weaknesses they feel in learning with blogs. This study uses a qualitative approach using the principles of inductive analysis. The results of this study more than half of the participants gave a positive impression of the blog but that does not mean that the use of blogs has no drawbacks. It was also recorded that there were more than 1,500 participants who felt dissatisfied because their motivation and self-confidence were not strengthened, one of which was due to the lack of face-to-face class meetings, so the percentage difference was only a few differences even though if the positive responses were calculated there were still more. This study is more about assessing the use of blogs by training efforts to train students to write daily journals every week.

The third study by Zhipora & Ayelet (2016), “Assessing and improving L2 graduate students' popular science and academic writing in an academic writing course” focused on testing whether academic and popular science writing skills would improve after taking an academic writing course. in English. To obtain data, researchers used pre- and post-implementation assessments, intervention assessment tasks, and assessment rubrics. In the pre- and post-assessment, the participants will write an abstract for the academic writing assessment while for the

popular science assessment the participants will write a press release. There were 177 participants in this study. The result is that there is a significant increase in the level of students' writing and English skills.

The last research by Zhihui Fang & Zhijun Wang (2011), "Beyond Rubrics: Using Functional Language Analysis to Evaluate Student Writing" is an interesting study because in this study the researcher describes writing assessment with three kinds of detailed writing assessment consisting of: of content, organization, and style. This study focuses on telling teachers if written assessments can vary. The assessment rubric that is commonly used turns out to have weaknesses such as in explaining what is meant by 'creative', 'effective', 'interesting', 'expressive', 'strong', and 'fresh'. the use of SFL in student writing assessment. The instrument used is a descriptive report text from a ninth-grader who acts as a science writer and the second text is quoted from a US high school science textbook (Science Voyages, 2000). The results found that there were differences from using SFL which assessed content, organization, and writing style, namely that there were clear criteria for assessment.

According to previous research, each wants to do the best research to improve students' writing skills, from writing skills with non-academic themes to being more active in the academic field. The researchers know the importance of writing development and the problems faced by students in writing, so this study which aims to assess students' introductory writing will move the same as previous research, namely as one of the additional literature and efforts to improve students' writing skills.