

**ENGAGEMENT STRATEGIES IN APPRAISAL SYSTEM: AN ANALYSIS
OF INDONESIAN UNDERGRADUATE INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS
IN AUSTRALIA'S ESSAY**

UNDERGRADUATE THESIS

**Proposed to fulfill the requirements for undergraduate degree in English
Language Education Study Programme**



WRITTEN BY
KIRANA ANJANI ARIELLA LUGIJANA
NIM 1900880

**ENGLISH LANGUAGE EDUCATION STUDY PROGRAMME
FACULTY OF LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE EDUCATION
UNIVERSITAS PENDIDIKAN INDONESIA**

2023

PAGE OF APPROVAL
ENGAGEMENT STRATEGIES IN APPRAISAL SYSTEM: AN ANALYSIS
OF INDONESIAN UNDERGRADUATE INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS
IN AUSTRALIA'S ESSAY
UNDERGRADUATE THESIS

Written by:
Kirana Anjani Ariella Lugijana
NIM 1900880

Approved by,

Supervisor 1,



Prof. Emi Emilia, M.Ed. Ph.D
NIP. 196609161990012001

Supervisor 2,



Dr. Sudarsono M.I, M.A.
NIP. 196607051994031004

Head of English Language Education
Faculty of Language and Literature Education
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia



Prof. Emi Emilia, M.Ed., Ph.D.
NIP. 196609161990012001

**Engagement Strategies in Appraisal System: An Analysis of Indonesian
Undergraduate International Students in Australia's Essay**

Written by
Kirana Anjani Ariella Lugijana

An undergraduate thesis written to fulfil one of the requirements in acquiring
Bachelor of Education under the Faculty of Language and Literature Education

© Kirana Anjani Ariella Lugijana 2023
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia
July 2023

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted
in any forms or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying,
recording, or any information storage and retrieval system without prior
permission in writing from the writer.

DECLARATION OF AUTHORSHIP

Hereby I state the undergraduate thesis under the title “Engagement Analysis in Appraisal System: An Analysis of Indonesian Undergraduate International Students in Australia’s Essay” is my original work and I did not make any kind of infringement nor violate any academic code of ethics in the process.

Bandung, July 2023

Kirana Anjani Ariella Lugijana
Writer

ABSTRACT

Presenting authorial voice is important in academic writing due to the nature of academic discourse which was always established from one point to another making every academic text is heteroglossic in nature. This study examines how Indonesian undergraduate students studying in Australia for an exchange programme who came from non-linguistics and language studies background performs appropriate linguistic choices in their academic essay. The present study examines 12 texts produced by 6 students responding as an expert to a scenario given to them as an assignment in an intercultural communication unit under the Engagement heading of the Appraisal system (Martin & White, 2005). This paper also considers the existence of context of situation and context of culture as this paper considers the approach to tenor and genre in professional context and as a cultural practice. This paper found problems in how dialogic expansion resources are excessively used throughout the students with several contributing factors namely attempts on negotiating identity, failure in recognising power and solidarity, as well as problems regarding lack of familiarity with genre writing and English academic text in general.

Keywords: *Academic writing, Systemic Functional Linguistics, Appraisal, Engagement analysis, undergraduate essay*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE OF APPROVAL.....	2
DECLARATION OF AUTHORSHIP.....	4
ABSTRACT.....	5
FOREWORD.....	6
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	8
LIST OF FIGURES.....	10
LIST OF TABLES.....	11
CHAPTER I.....	12
1.1. Background of The Study.....	12
1.2. Research Questions.....	14
1.3. Aim of The Study.....	15
1.4. Scope of The Study.....	15
1.5. Significance of The Study.....	15
1.6. Clarification of Key Terms.....	16
1.7. Organisation of The Paper.....	17
1.8. Conclusion of Chapter One.....	18
CHAPTER II.....	19
2.1. Systemic Functional Linguistics: An Overview.....	19
2.2. Modelling the Discourse Semantic.....	21
2.3. Appraisal: Attitude, Engagement, and Graduation.....	24
2.4. Engagement in The Appraisal System.....	27
2.3.1. Entertain: Dialogic Expansion.....	28
2.3.2. Attribute: Dialogic Expansion.....	29
2.3.3. Proclaim: Dialogic Contraction.....	30
2.3.4. Disclaim: Dialogic Contraction.....	31
2.5. Modelling The Tenor: Power and Solidarity.....	31

2.6. Genre as A Cultural Practice.....	35
2.7. Genre Writing and Professional Identity.....	37
2.8. Conclusion of Chapter II.....	39
CHAPTER III.....	40
3.1. Research Design.....	40
3.2. Participant.....	40
3.3. Data Collection.....	41
3.4. Data Analysis.....	43
3.5. Conclusion of Chapter III.....	47
CHAPTER IV.....	48
4.1. Engaging with Other Voices.....	48
4.2. Advancing One’s Opinion.....	55
4.3. Contributing to Genre Writing Practice.....	59
4.3.1. Constructing Power and Identity.....	60
4.3.2. Embedded Genres and Cultural Practices.....	63
CHAPTER V.....	67
5.1. Conclusion.....	67
5.2. Limitations of The Study.....	68
5.3. Implications of The Study.....	68
5.4. Recommendations for Future Research.....	69
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	70

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.2 SFL model of language, adapted from Martin (2016:38).....	20
Figure 2.3 The latest SFL model, adapted from Martin & White (2005:32).....	20
Figure 2.4 Resources of Appraisal adopted from Martin and White (2005:38)....	27
Figure 2.5 The Tenor dimension when originally proposed, adapted from Martin (1992a:526).....	34
Figure 2.6 The relation of language to social context, adapted from Martin and Rose (2008:10).....	36
Figure 3.1 Scenario 1 given to students.....	42
Figure 3.2 Scenario 2 given to students.....	42
Figure 3.3 Scenario 3 given to students.....	43
Figure 3.4 Content analysis data gathering, adapted from Krippendorf (2019:90).....	44
Figure 3.5 Example of data in engagement resources in students' essay.....	45

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1 Reformulated semantic by Martin (1992a; 2002).....	22
Table 2.2 Interpersonal semantic in relation to Tenor and Lexicogrammar resources adopted from Martin and White (2005:35).....	25
Table 3.1 Coding of engagement resources.....	45
Table 4.1 Occurrences for Engagement resources found in students' essay to engage with other voices for Scenario 1.....	49
Table 4.2 Occurrences for Engagement resources found in students' essay to engage for other voices for Scenario 2.....	49
Table 4.3 Occurrences for Engagement resources found in students' essay to engage with other voices for Scenario 3.....	50
Table 4.4 Occurrences for Engagement resources found in students' essay to advance their own opinion for Scenario 1.....	56
Table 4.5 Occurrences for Engagement resources found in students' essay to advance their own opinion for Scenario 2.....	56
Table 4.6 Occurrences for Engagement resources found in students' essay to advance their own opinion for Scenario 3.....	57

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays* (M. Holquist & C. Emerson, Trans.; Vol. 5). University of Texas Press.
- Bartlett, T. (2017). Context in Systemic Functional Linguistics: Towards scalar supervenience?. In T. Bartlett & G. O'Grady (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of Systemic Functional Linguistics*. Routledge.
- Bernstein, B. (1996). *Pedagogy, symbolic control and identity: Theory, research, critique*. Taylor & Francis.
- Berry, M. (2017). Stratum, delicacy, realisation, and rank. In T. Bartlett & G. O'Grady (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of Systemic Functional Linguistics* (pp. 42–55). Routledge.
- Bhatia, V. K. (2017). *Critical Genre Analysis: Investigating interdiscursive performance in professional practice*. Taylor & Francis.
- Brown, R. & Gilman, A. (1968). The pronouns of power and solidarity. In J. Fishman (Ed.), *Readings in the Sociology of Language* (pp. 252-275). De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110805376.252>
- Candlin, C. N., & Plum, G. A. (1999). Engaging with the challenges of interdiscursivity in academic writing: Researchers, students and tutors. In C. N. Candlin & K. Hyland (Eds.), *Writing: Texts, processes and practices*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315840390>
- Chang, P., & Schleppegrell, M. (2011). Taking an effective authorial stance in academic writing: Making the linguistic resources explicit for L2 writers in the social sciences. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 10(3), 140–151. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2011.05.005>

- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (5th ed.). Pearson.
- Derewianka, B. (2009). Using appraisal theory to track interpersonal development in adolescent academic writing. In M. McCabe, O'Donnell, & R. Whittaker (Eds.), *Advances in language and education* (pp. 142–165). Continuum.
- Du Bois, J. W. (2007). The stance triangle. *Stancetaking in discourse*, 139–182. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.164.07du>
- Egins, S. (1994). *An introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*. Continuum.
- Emilia, E. (2011). *Pendekatan genre-based dalam pengajaran bahasa Inggris: Petunjuk untuk guru*. Rizqi Press.
- Foucault, M. (1976). *The archaeology of knowledge*. Pantheon Books.
- Gleason, Jr., H. A. (1968). Contrastive analysis in discourse structure. In J. E. Alatis (Ed.), *Monograph series on languages and linguistics* (Vol. 21). George Town University Press. https://repository.library.georgetown.edu/bitstream/handle/10822/555461/GURT_1968.pdf?sequence=1#page=51
- Gutwinski, W. (1967). *Cohesion in literary texts: A study of some grammatical and lexical features of English discourse*. De Gruyter.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1961). Categories of the theory of grammar. *WORD*, 17(2), 241–292. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00437956.1961.11659756>
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of language*. Edward Arnold.

- Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar*. Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (2014). *Introduction to functional grammar* (C. M. Matthiessen, Ed.; 4th ed.). Routledge. (Original work published 1985)
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). Cohesion in English. *English Language Series* (1st ed.). Longman.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1989). *Language, context, and text* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K., Hasan, R., & Christie, F. (1989). Language, context, and text: Aspects of language in a social-semiotic perspective. *Language education* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Hasan, R. (1978). Text in the Systemic-Functional model. In W. U. Dressler (Eds.), *Current trends in textlinguistics* (pp. 228-246). Walter de Gruyter.
- Hasan, R. (1995). The conception of context in text. In P. H. Fries & M. Gregory (Eds.), *Discourse in society: Systemic Functional perspectives – Meaning and choice in language: Studies for Michael Halliday* (pp. 183–283). Ablex.
- Hasan, R. (2005). Semiotic mediation and three exotropic theories: Vygotsky, Halliday and Bernstein. In J. J. Webster (Ed.), *The collected works of Ruqaiya Hasan, Vol. 1: Language, society and consciousness* (Vol. 1, pp. 13–59). Equinox.
- Hasan, R. (2020). Tenor: Rethinking interactant relations. *Language, context and text*, 2(2), 213-333. <https://doi.org/10.1075/langct.00029.has>

- Hjelmslev, L. (1961). *Prolegomena to a theory of language*. University of Wisconsin Press.
- Hood, S. (2006). The persuasive power of prosodies: Radiating values in academic writing. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 5(1), 37–49. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2005.11.001>
- Hunston, S., & Thompson, G. (2001). *Evaluation in text: Authorial stance and the construction of discourse (Oxford Linguistics)*. Oxford University Press.
- Husin, M. S., & Nurbayani, E. (2017). The ability of Indonesian EFL learners in writing academic papers. *Dinamika Ilmu*, 17(2). <https://doi.org/10.21093/di.v17i2.725>
- Hyland, K. (2004). *Genre and second language writing*. University of Michigan Press ELT.
- Hyland, K. (2005). Stance and engagement: A model of interaction in academic discourse. *Discourse Studies*, 7(2), 173–192. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445605050365>
- Kartika-Ningsih, H., & Gunawan, W. (2019). Recontextualisation of genre-based pedagogy: The case of Indonesian EFL classrooms. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 9(2). <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v9i2.20231>
- Krippendorff, K. (2019). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology* (4th ed.). SAGE.
- Lee, S. H. (2015). Evaluative stances in persuasive essays by undergraduate students: Focusing on appreciation resources. *Text & Talk*, 35(1). <https://doi.org/10.1515/text-2014-0029>

- Lemke, J. (1995). *Textual politics: Discourse and social dynamics*. Taylor & Francis.
- Malinowski. (2013). *Coral gardens and their Magic*. Routledge.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315013251>
- Martin, J. R. (1992a). *English text: System and structure*. Benjamins.
- Martin, J. R. (1992b). Genre and literacy-modelling context in educational linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 13, 141–172.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/s0267190500002440>
- Martin, J. R. (1997). Analysing genre: Functional parameters. In J. R. Martin & F. Christie (Eds.), *Genre and institutions: Social processes in the workplace and school* (pp. 3–39). Continuum.
- Martin, J. R. (1999). Modelling context: A crooked path of progress in contextual linguistics (Sydney SFL). In M. Ghadessy (Ed.), *Text and context in functional linguistics* (pp. 25–61). Benjamins.
- Martin, J. R. (2000a). Beyond exchange: APPRAISAL system in English. In Hunston & Thompson (Eds.), *Evaluation in text: Authorial stance and the construction of discourse* (pp. 275–298). Cassell.
- Martin, J. R. (2000b). Design and practice: Enacting functional linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 20, 116–126.
doi.org/10.1017/s026719050020007x
- Martin, J. R. (2002). Meaning beyond the clause: SFL perspective. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22, 52–74. doi.org/10.1017/s026719050200003x
- Martin, J. R. (2014). Evolving systemic functional linguistics: beyond the clause. *Functional Linguistics*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/2196-419x-1-3>

- Martin, J. R. (2016). Meaning matters: a short history of systemic functional linguistics. *WORD*, 62(1), 35–58.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00437956.2016.1141939>
- Martin, J. R., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (1991). Systemic typology and topology. In F. Christie (Ed.), *Literacy in social processes: Papers from the Inaugural Australian Systemic Functional Linguistics Conference, Deakin University, January 1990*. Centre for Studies of Language in Education, Northern Territory University.
- Martin, J. R., & Rose, D. (2007). *Working with discourse: Meaning beyond the clause*. Continuum. (Original work published 2003)
- Martin, J. P., & Rose, D. R. (2008). *Genre relations: Mapping culture*. Equinox.
- Martin, J., & White, P. R. R. (2007). *The language of evaluation: Appraisal in English* (2005th ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.
<https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1057/9780230511910.pdf>
- Miller, R. T., Mitchell, T. D., & Pessoa, S. (2014). Valued voices: Students' use of Engagement in argumentative history writing. *Linguistics and Education*, 28, 107–120. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2014.10.002>
- Mori, M. (2017). Using the Appraisal framework to analyze source use in essays: a case study of engagement and dialogism in two undergraduate students' writing. *Functional Linguistics*, 4(1).
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s40554-017-0046-4>
- Musthafa, B., & Hamied, F. (2014). Teaching English as a foreign language in Indonesian schools in the reform era: What do teachers have to say? *The New English Teachers*, 8(2), 1-14.

- O'Halloran, K., Tan, S., & Wignell, P. (2019). SFL and Multimodal Discourse Analysis. In *Cambridge University Press eBooks* (pp. 433–461). <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316337936.019>
- Oliver, S. (2015). Spanish authors dealing with hedging or the challenges of scholarly publication in English L2. In R. P. Alastrué & C. Pérez-Llantada (Eds.), *English as a scientific and research language: Debates and discourses: English in Europe* (Vol. 2, pp. 141–157). Walter de Gruyter, Inc.
- Poynton, C. (1989). *Language and gender: Making the difference*. Oxford University Press. (Original work published in 1985)
- Poynton, Cate, & Lee, Alison. (2009). Debating appraisal: On networks and names. In H. Chen & K. Cruickshank (Eds.), *Making a difference: challenges for applied linguistics*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Prihatni, T. N. (2017). English academic writing bagi mahasiswa di Institut Teknologi Nasional Malang: Hambatan dan solusi. *Prosiding SENIATI*, 3(2).
- Pujianto, D., Emilia, E., & Ihrom, S. M. (2014). A process-genre approach to teaching writing report text to senior high school students. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 4(1), 99. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v4i1.603>
- Saussure, F. D. (1961). *Course in General Linguistics*. McGraw-Hill.
- Sun, S., & Crosthwaite, P. (2022). “The findings might not be generalizable”: Investigating negation in the limitations sections of PhD theses across

- disciplines. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 59, 101155.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2022.101155>
- Swain, E. (2009). Constructing an effective “Voice” in academic discussion writing: An Appraisal theory perspective. In M. McCabe, O’Donnell, & R. Whittaker (Eds.), *Advances in language and education* (pp. 166–184). Continuum.
- Van De Poel, K., & Gasiorek, J. (2012). Effects of an efficacy-focused approach to academic writing on students’ perceptions of themselves as writers. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 11(4), 294–303.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2012.07.003>
- Webster, J. J. (2019). Key terms in SFL model. In G. Thompson, W. L. Bowcher, L. Fontaine, & D. Schöntal (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Systemic Functional Linguistics* (pp. 35–54). Cambridge University Press.
- White, P. R. R. (2003). Beyond modality and hedging: A dialogic view of the language of intersubjective stance. *Text - Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse*, 23(2). <https://doi.org/10.1515/text.2003.011>
- White, P. R. R. (2011). Appraisal. In J. Zienkowski, J. Östman, & J. Verschueren (Eds.), *Discursive Pragmatics* (pp. 14–36). John Benjamins Publishing Company.